

History and Significance of the Southern Area

The Southern section of the Harlem River Study Area consists of the northern end of Central Harlem on the Manhattan side, and southern Mott Haven and the Bronx Terminal Market on the Bronx side. This portion of the study area has developed primarily through a mixture of industrial development, the advent of above and below ground infrastructure connecting the Bronx and Manhattan, and the migration of populations from downtown and beyond in search of jobs. The Harlem River's role in this development scheme and long history is a complex one. It was the river's presence that initially attracted industries to the shores of the Bronx, this development trend then spread across the body of water to Harlem with the promise of jobs. With the disappearance of industry, however, the river's role was considerably diminished, and in the latter half of the twentieth century, portions of its shores have become a magnet for attempts at renewal and improvement in city life.

The Southern section's built landscape reflects the history of these neighborhoods' development. Industrial structures define much of the Bronx Terminal Market and Mott Haven areas, each telling the story of once important enterprises, ranging from raw iron to pianos. Today, the world's most famous baseball stadium sits alongside what was once the busiest terminal market on in the United States, in a neighborhood of industrial buildings that once broke new ground in design and working conditions for their employees. Just across the river in Harlem, rows of tenement apartments from the 1890s give way to the once revolutionary masonry clad towers of the early public housing projects. Also found in Harlem are the 1960s modernist expression of subsidized housing, Riverbend and Riverton Houses. The Southern section of the Harlem River, as a whole, continues to bustle with activity along massive city infrastructure projects, such as bridges and elevated freeways, each of which testifies to the shifting phases of development and commerce witnessed by the area.

The two Bronx neighborhoods, Mott Haven and the Bronx Terminal Market area, were initially linked together by the manufacturing industry that began with Mott's Iron Works in the 1840s. However, these can be more closely linked by the development of transportation systems. Large-scale conduits into the Southern area began with elevated railroads. In 1841, the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad constructed a bridge over the Harlem River at Park Avenue creating the first connection between Manhattan and the Bronx. Taking advantage of the new crossing, mostly Irish and German immigrants began moving into Mott Haven to work in its factories. Although the Manhattan Elevated Railway, which crossed the Harlem River into Mott Haven in 1886, was at the time considered a revolutionary mass transit system, the Interborough Rapid Transit (IRT), with its cheaper fare and faster travel, further opened up the Southern area to new residents.

The IRT subway had opened its downtown and midtown stations by 1904; it continued to expand north and northeastwardly into the Bronx throughout the first decade of the twentieth century. In addition to rail-based network of connections between Harlem and the Southern Bronx, six bridges were constructed in the area between 1895 and 1954: the Macomb's Dam, 125th Street, Madison Avenue, Park Avenue, Third Avenue, and Willis Avenue Bridges. Over the next decade, subway expansion provided an arterial connection that would forever change the Southern section, providing cheap rapid transit that drew Yugoslavians, Armenians, Italians, and especially Central and Eastern European Jews.ⁱ As was the case in most industrial cities at the time, residential areas were built up nearby to house workers of factories. At the turn of the twentieth century, census records indicate that workers at the various piano factories in Mott Haven lived in the area immediately adjacent to their work.ⁱⁱ

Later infrastructure that made way for automobiles is equally important to the development of the Southern section. The Major Deegan Expressway in the Bronx and the Harlem River Drive in Manhattan are the two major expressways of the Southern area. Built under the City's Department of City Planning's philosophy of the time, which held that expressways were an important constituent of urban renewal, the relatively un-used Harlem River waterfronts were

perfect locations for their construction. Not only did these paved conduits relieve congestion on local streets and connect the Southern area with the regional highway system, but in some cases, they improved the city's waterfront by landscaping surrounding areas with parks and recreational zones. These improvements, however, came at a price paid by neighborhoods cut off from direct waterfront access or cast into shadows by highway overpasses.

In analyzing the significant architectural diversity found in the Southern area, it is important to understand its patterns of development and the role the Harlem River has played in the area's evolution, cohesion, and separation. Devising effective preservation tools and plans for the ongoing survival of this built landscape further requires a brief overview of the trends that spurred the development of its three neighborhoods: Harlem, Mott Haven, and the Bronx Terminal Market area.

Harlem:

The large manufacturing facilities built along the Southern section of the Harlem River and the employment opportunities promised by the railroads and commercial businesses stimulated a substantial migration from Southern Manhattan to Harlem and the South Bronx in the 1890s. The less congested and better-designed housing stock, with amenities such as bathrooms and kitchens, lured many immigrants to the region, particularly from Manhattan's Lower East Side. The construction of the subway system contributed to the development of this area.

Beginning in the 1920s, African Americans from the Southern United States, who had been arriving in the City as part of the Great Migration, moved to Harlem and added to the diversity of the immigrant population already living there. The Great Depression of the 1930s brought about a significant period of economic decline in the Southern section of the Harlem River, during which time workers in all sectors lost jobs. The citywide housing shortage at the end of World War II aggravated the situation, resulting in the government's decision to start building large-scale public housing projects, most notably the Harlem River Houses, built in 1937, and the Abraham Lincoln Houses and Riverton Houses, both constructed in 1948. The post-War era also saw the early phases of large-scale immigration of Puerto Rican families into Harlem and the South Bronx. In the 1970s, large numbers of Dominicans began to arrive in the area, creating the second mass migration of Spanish-speaking individuals to the neighborhood.

By the 1960's, with the de-industrialization of New York City, most of the factories along the Bronx waterfront had moved elsewhere, leaving many residents jobless in their wake. Beginning around this time, the Southern area of the Harlem River sank deep into another economic downturn. These conditions, coupled with advancing social challenges, such as crime and vandalism, spurred the city into a second wave of subsidized housing development, this time sponsored by New York State and targeted at the fleeing middle-income residents. Although this approach was met with some success, the area remained a target for urban renewal projects and highway development while not necessarily replacing lost jobs. This cycle of depression and rebirth has left many of Harlem's once tidy buildings in states of extreme neglect, leaving some areas of dilapidated tenement buildings alongside vacant lots.

Mott Haven:

Once dominated by farmland and rural estates, Mott Haven was established in 1828 when Jordan L. Mott purchased a plot of land at the southern most part of Westchester County. The area Mott selected would eventually be strategically located at the confluence of water (Harlem River) and rail (New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad), making it an ideal location for industrial activity.

After the New York & Harlem Railroad linked the southeast Bronx to Manhattan in 1840 and Mott built his canal in 1850, Mott Haven began to flourish as an industrial center. Known for its metal works, saw mills, and stone yards, Mott Haven's industry expanded into the fields of piano

factories, lumberyards, furniture manufacturers, and food and ice producers over the course of the nineteenth century. By the early twentieth century, the area had one of the largest concentrations of manufacturing buildings and facilities along the Harlem River.

Architecturally, the majority of Mott Haven's industrial buildings were load-bearing masonry structures. Each building, or complex of buildings, was monolithic, grand in scale, and able to handle hundreds of workers along with heavy machinery. Later manufacturing facilities were of the "daylight" factory style, with reinforced concrete beam and slab construction and large bays of casement windows designed to provide workers with plenty of natural light and ventilation. By the mid-twentieth century, Mott Haven factories mass-produced a wide variety of products from iron to refrigeration systems, enamel products to paper box containers, mechanical printing presses to machine made furniture.

The 1950s signaled a decline in the manufacturing sector citywide, thus marking the end of Mott Haven's period of economic prosperity. The area and many of its buildings thereafter fell into a long period of disuse, leaving many of its late-nineteenth-century masonry and concrete daylight factories vacant or neglected. Present day Mott Haven sits at the crossroads of development, as new uses are being sought for these long overlooked buildings. The potential new influx of residents to the neighborhood would signify nothing new for Mott Haven, but rapid real estate development there profoundly threatens the important existing historic built fabric.

Bronx Terminal Market Area:

Already a small-scale waterfront industrial area, at the turn of the twentieth century, city politicians proposed the creation of a terminal market system anchored in the west Bronx. Driven by a desire to make New York's food distribution process more efficient, sanitized, centralized, and easily controlled for the city's mushrooming population, Mayor John Hylan selected the Bronx Terminal Market site for its proximity to the Harlem River, road connections to Manhattan and beyond, and railroad lines. The creation of the Bronx Terminal Market was seen as a means for putting the much-despised pushcart vendors out of business, as well as reinforcing New York City's role as a leader in technology and ingenuity.

The Bronx Terminal Market's buildings were designed so that food could be unloaded and stored, prior to distribution, with a maximum amount of efficiency. The two original market buildings, built between 1925 and 1929, were praised as exemplary of this idea of storage and distribution efficiency. While still under construction, however, the Bronx Terminal Market fell victim to the era's endemic political corruption and quickly became an embarrassing "white elephant" for the city. In 1935 Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, then early in his mayoral career, set about rectifying the situation by revitalizing the original markets and by building a series of more modest buildings to be added to the complex. In contrast with the original two fortress-like structures, these new buildings were small-scale concrete stalls, designed with a more modern look and even more efficient organization, conveying an image of efficiency and sterility. These later buildings made the Bronx Terminal Market a source of civic pride and profit until operations were moved to Hunts Point, Bronx in 1976, initiating a long period of decline for the Bronx Terminal Market area.

Parallel with the development of the Bronx Terminal Market itself, a number of other important industries flocked to the area immediately to the complex's south and east. Similar to Mott Haven, masonry factory buildings began to spring up, quickly followed by concrete and casement window daylight factories in the first decades of the twentieth century. Reflective of increasingly progressive working conditions, these new buildings allowed for greater natural light and air circulation, all encapsulated in the more modern, sleek designs. Also like Mott Haven, however, with the departure of these industries, along with the move of the Market itself, the area has been in decline now for decades.

In 2004, the lease for the city-owned Bronx Terminal Market site was sold to Reliable Development Corporation and current plans call for razing the old market buildings. Damaged by

years of inappropriate alterations, arson, neglect, and lack of maintenance, the buildings have fallen into a considerable state of disrepair. Already condemned, the Cold Storage Building has been identified as the first building to be torn down prior to redeveloping the site as a retail and office complex.

The legacy of the Southern area's development has resulted in several square miles of historic structures that have been left to decay as industry, jobs, and communities have moved elsewhere. Preservation of these resources simultaneously hinges on, and can be an instrument for, restoring the Harlem River to its once prominent role in New York City. But application of the proper preservation tools and recommendations will only come through analysis of the Southern section's history, identification of its resources, and an examination of the current community's challenges.

Significant Resources

Below is an inventory and description of the significant resources found in the Southern section of the Harlem River Study Area. For an explanation of the recommended acknowledgements and a key to the represented symbols, please see the Evaluating Criteria portion of this plan. For further information about our significance criteria, please refer to Appendix X: Researching Methodology.

Harlem:

12 and 16 East 132nd Street
Block/Lot: 1756/61; 1756/62
1895

Architect: F.P. Dinkelberg

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

The two residential apartment houses at 12 and 16 East 132nd Street in Harlem are examples of progressive design in New York City housing. Two out of the original three apartment houses survive as examples of the city's attempt to improve the quality of housing in Harlem. Frederick P. Dinkelberg designed the houses at the end of the nineteenth century. Later, Dinkelberg worked for the firm of D.H. Burnham, where he was involved with the design of such noteworthy structures as the Flatiron Building. These two buildings in Harlem are characteristic of Dinkelberg's early work in residential design. The T-shaped design of these structures was advanced for residential apartment buildings of this time, as this plan was not generally used until six years later when New York City tenement laws mandated the plan and design of apartment houses. Dinkelberg's houses are of brick construction and feature brownstone lintels and doorframes.

12 and 16 East 132nd Street have been renovated and altered since their erection. 14 East 132nd Street, the third building that comprised the original unit, has since been demolished. In its place is a landscaped playground, which is a rarity in this neighborhood.ⁱⁱⁱ While many of the physical components of this complex have changed through time, the remaining elements are a testament to the neighborhood's evolution and movement to improve living conditions.

Madison Avenue Bridge

1884, 1910

Architect: Alfred P. Boller

Recommended Acknowledgement: Educational Element

Alfred P. Boller, architect of four of the Harlem River bridges, designed the Madison Avenue Bridge, a swing bridge between Madison Avenue in Manhattan and 138th Street in the Bronx. The bridge was primarily used for trolley traffic during, but in 1910, a steel swing bridge, also designed by Boller, replaced the original bridge. It was designed to relieve traffic congestion

between Manhattan and the Bronx, and was open to pedestrians and automobile traffic. The approaches were built of reinforced concrete rather than traditional masonry.^{iv}

**369th Regiment Armory*

2360 Fifth Avenue

Block/Lot: 1740/17

1921-24 (drill shed), 1930-33 (administration building)

Architect: Tachau and Vought (drill shed); Van Wart and Wein (administration building)

Landmark Status: New York City Landmark (1985)

This city landmark was one of the last armories constructed in New York City. The administration building features both the medieval motifs typical of the building type and Art Deco elements typical of the period. It was home to the African-American regiment, the Harlem Hell Fighters.^v

**Dunbar Apartments*

202 West 150th Street

Block/Lot: 2305/1

1928

Architect: Andrew J. Thomas

Landmark Status: New York City Landmark (1970), National Register (1979)

Financed by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the Dunbar Apartments were one of the first attempts to provide quality affordable housing to Harlem's African-American residents.^{vi} The five-acre complex includes a playground, stores, and a bank.

**Harlem River Houses*

West 151st Street to West 153rd Street, Macombs Place to Harlem River Drive

Block/Lot: 2307/11; 2016/60

1936-37

Architect: Archibald Manning Brown, chief architect

Landmark Status: New York City Landmark (1975), National Register (1979)

The Harlem River Houses are the earliest example of public housing in the Harlem River area and are a New York City Landmark. Archibald Manning Brown designed the Harlem River Houses to provide quality affordable housing to African-American residents; the events following the 1935 Harlem Riots inspired city planners to build suitable housing for the city's African-American community, which was prevented from residing in certain areas. These are the first example of federally subsidized public housing in the country.

Abraham Lincoln Houses

East 132nd Street and East 135th Street; Fifth Avenue to Park Avenue

Block/Lot: 1757/1; 1757/20

1948

Architect: Edwin Forbes, Louis Skidmore of Skidmore Owings and Merrill, and John Vertner Tandy

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

The Abraham Lincoln Houses are representative of a major public housing projects built during the urban renewal era in New York City. The buildings occupy a "superblock", bound by East 132nd and 135th Street and bisected by Madison Avenue. Architects Edwin Forbes, Louis Skidmore, and John Vertner Tandy designed the complex in 1948; Tandy was the first African-American architect registered in New York State. The development consists of eight fourteen-story cruciform masses and six six-story low-rise structures, with a path running through the surrounding landscape. A communal green space unifies the buildings and serves as a gathering spot for residents. Each building, in combination with the green space and surrounding structures, contributes to the creation of a visually compelling composition.

The concrete slab construction features red brick cladding. The overall design follows Le Corbusier's "tower in the park" concept that is typical for many New York City Housing Authority projects; Le Corbusier called for high-density housing mixed with open space. This particular project was an early manifestation of a style that later proliferated in public housing throughout New York City. Housing developments such as the Abraham Lincoln Houses were sources of debate in post-war New York City. While they altered the aesthetic fabric of the city, they provided homes for many New Yorkers.

Riverton Houses

Fifth Avenue to Madison Avenue; East 135th Street and East 138th Street

Block/Lot: 1760/101; 1760/1

1948

Architect: Irwin Clavan

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

Built in response to the nation's and New York City's needs for public housing after World War II, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company built Riverton Houses as privately funded housing for middle-income residents. Designed in 1948 by Irwin Clavan, this complex reflects Le Corbusier's "tower in the park" concept. The site includes seven thirteen-story cruciform buildings arranged around expanses of open space. The brick façade and concrete bands demarcating each floor are typical of other high-rise apartment buildings constructed during this era.

Erected during a period of racial tension, Riverton was built in a predominately African-American area to meet the needs of that community, which had been excluded from many other housing projects; Metropolitan Life's Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Villages offered middle-income housing to white residents only, a decision that prompted criticism and resulted in Riverton's construction. Riverton Houses provided high-quality, comfortable living accommodations that were worthy of pride.

Riverview Welfare Center

1951 Park Avenue

Block/Lot: 1780/1

1950

Architect: A.J. Daidone

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

The Riverview Welfare Center, at 1951 Park Avenue, was built in 1950 to provide public assistance to New Yorkers. The building was the first municipal facility designed as a welfare center. Erected early in the development of federally funded social service programs, the building continues to symbolize public commitment to eradicating urban poverty.^{vii} This concern was previously addressed in the construction of several public housing projects in close proximity to the Center, including the Abraham Lincoln and Harlem River Houses.

A.J. Daidone, a Department of Public Works architect, designed the building. The four and one half story structure is a combination of Neo-classical and Modern design. Four limestone columns mark the entrance at the east façade of the building and are typical of the Neo-classical influence and monumental design of civic architecture. The bold horizontal limestone bands wrapping around the edges of the building serve to give Modernist expression to a classical structure.

Park Avenue Railroad Lift Bridge

1956

Architect: Hardesty and Hanover

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

The Park Avenue Railroad Lift Bridge crosses the Harlem River from Park Avenue in Harlem to Mott Haven. It replaced two earlier railroad bridges—the 1841 fixed bridge with an iron drawbridge, and the 1893 steel swing bridge designed by Alfred P. Boller. In 1956, the New York New Haven, and Hartford Railroad commissioned the existing steel truss vertical lift bridge, designed by the Hardesty and Hanover, with two double tracks that operate independently with separate lifting mechanisms.^{viii} The bridge is one of only six vertical lift bridges in New York City, and one of two that are exclusively railroad bridges.

Riverbend Houses

2289, 2301, 2311, 2333 Fifth Avenue

Block/Lot: 1763/1

Date: 1967

Architect: Davis/Brody Architects

Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

Harlem's Riverbend Houses represent a shift in attitude towards the design of New York City subsidized housing. Located between East 138th Street and East 142nd Street along the Harlem River Drive, the buildings were constructed to allow views of both the Harlem River and the South Bronx. Constructed between 1962 and 1966, the project was created pursuant to the Mitchell-Lama housing program of 1954. This policy was created by New York City in an effort to encourage middle-income residents to remain in the city, giving them the benefits of both urban and suburban living. Architects Davis/Brody designed Riverbend to provide a safe environment for middle-income tenants; amenities included gated entries, private gardens, and walkways between each unit.

The complex's design is a stark contrast to traditional "faceless" public housing; its modern design, as well as the use of large red bricks and the presence of terraces and balconies creates an aesthetic effect rare in subsidized housing projects. The interior organization of the towers provides multiple means of egress and circulation.

Mott Haven:

Mott Haven Industrial District:

The proposed Mott Haven Industrial District, which is explained in further depth as part of the recommendations section of this plan, consists of factories, warehouses, and housing built in response to Mott Haven's growth as an industrial area in New York City. These buildings were erected between 1880 and 1928, and were significant in Mott Haven's development as an industrial sector. The structures recommended below for "individual" or "contributing" designation are envisioned as part of this proposed historic district, which is recommended for designation as a New York City Historic District and a National Register Historic District a local, state and national landmark district through the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Register for Historic Places. This proposal is further discussed in the following sections.

Mott Iron Works

2401 Third Avenue, 2413 Third Avenue, and 220 East 134th Street

Block/Lot: 2319/98; 2319/2

1880-1892

Architect: Thomas McAvoy; A.G. Thomas (additions)

Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

The grounds and four remaining buildings from the original Mott Iron Works complex are among the most notable historic resources in Mott Haven, and the Bronx as a whole. In 1828, Jordan L. Mott, the inventor of the anthracite coal-burning stove, purchased a plot of land at the southernmost part of Westchester County (now the Bronx) along the Harlem River at Third Street.

He constructed a foundry complex with the hope of drawing other industrialists to the area. Mott's foundry complex manufactured a wide range of products, including kitchen and bathroom fixtures, stable fittings, gates, statuary, and garden furniture, in a variety of metals, including iron, brass, bronze, and nickel-plate. Originally, the foundry complex consisted of eight buildings, each of which served a specific function and were enclosed in a stepped brick wall. This compartmentalization was common in foundry design, as it decreased the potential damage from fire.

The remaining structures in the complex are one of the two original iron foundries, two original machine shops, and the original casting shops. In 1850, Mott commissioned the Mott Haven Canal for the transportation of products from the inland iron foundry to the Harlem River. Intended to encourage local industrial development by facilitating transportation of goods manufactured in the area, the canal occupied the site northwest of the remaining foundry buildings. In 1965, after many years of neglect, it was filled in.

The four extant buildings were constructed between 1880 and 1892 during a period of growth. They were expanded in the early 1890s prior to the relocation of the Iron Works to Trenton, New Jersey in 1906. The single-story building has load-bearing brick walls and a double-ridged roof with gabled ends. The five-story brick machine and casting shop is a largely utilitarian structure, with the exception of an elaborate raised brick lettering, on the south façade, stating the building's original name. The Third Avenue elevation features delicate, decorative floral pattern terra-cotta blocks. The six-story brass foundry and machine shop is a functional, austere brick structure. Located in the six-story U-shaped brick building with a central circulation core, the cleaning shops prepared and stored the cast products before they were shipped. Historic Belgian block paving also remains throughout the complex. Viewscapes within the original Iron Foundry complex afford vistas of the Manhattan skyline and the Harlem River, as well as the Triborough Bridge.

Estey Piano Factory

112 Lincoln Avenue

Block/Lot: 2309/1

1885, additions in 1906 and 1926

Architect: A.B. Ogden and Son

Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

The Estey Piano Factory is one of twenty piano factories constructed in Mott Haven in the late nineteenth century. A.B. Ogden and Son designed the building in 1885 for the manufacture of upright pianos for a growing population of middle-income consumers. Manufactured in assembly-line fashion, the pianos were shipped from the factory by train to destinations throughout the country. As a result of the Estey Company's success, the building was expanded in 1906 and again in 1926. The factory's size and architectural detailing symbolize the increasing purchase power experienced by middle-income families after the Civil War.

The L-shaped, five-story factory with its seven and a half story clock tower, sits on the corner of Bruckner Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue. The factory's wood-frame structure is typical of nineteenth century New England mills, featuring load-bearing brick masonry and terra-cotta details. Although the original wooden windows have been replaced and the sandstone belt course has deteriorated, the building remains remarkably similar to its original appearance. The corner tower is a dominant element of the factory's façade, distinguishing the corner site and the factory's orientation toward the Harlem River and the Third Avenue Bridge to Manhattan. The Estey Piano Factory follows a layout and plan typical of industrial buildings of the time period. Today, the building stands as a striking example of late nineteenth century industrial architecture in New York City.

△Henry Spies Building, later Segar Factory

82-96 Lincoln Avenue

Block/Lot: 2308/1

1888; alterations: 1895

Architect: C.C. Buck, Walter Hornum

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

C.C. Buck designed the Henry Spies Building, a three-story brick structure with stores on the ground level and industrial space on the upper floors, in 1888. The building is typical of Romanesque Revival, which was popular in late nineteenth-century industrial architecture. The structure features two-story arches, corner turrets, and Queen Anne-style storefronts. The brick detail, typical of this era of industrial architecture, remains intact. Two towers, removed during the twentieth century, marked the Lincoln Avenue façade. The building, visible from the Harlem River, served as a visual landmark to boaters and Manhattanites.

The building once housed manufacturing facilities for cigars and, as a result, was called “The Cigar Factory.” The regional pronunciation for “cigar” remained, and now the building is known as “The Segar Factory.”

ΔHaines Brothers Piano Factory

26 Bruckner Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2308/15

1888

Architects: Kreitler and Hebbard

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

Architects Kreitler & Hebbard designed the Haines Brothers Piano Factory on Bruckner Boulevard and East 132nd Street to meet the late nineteenth century demand for upright pianos. The factory was one of the first to manufacture all constituent parts of a piano in one facility. At the time, few piano manufacturers had the resources to produce everything “in-house,” and most had to use sub-contractors for parts such as the cast-iron frames, brass tuning pins, ivory for the keys, and other fixtures.

The factory stands five stories tall, with an L-shaped footprint, and is constructed of load bearing brick masonry with interior cast-iron columns. Most of the building’s original details remain unaltered. The interior, after renovations and alterations resulting from different uses, has been modified from its original open floor plan. The building’s dramatic arched windows and swirled sandstone flourishes make it a powerful example of the Romanesque revival industrial architecture, which was popular in the 1880s but had waned in prominence by the end of the nineteenth century.

ΔMott Haven Working-class Housing

340-354, 400, and 432-462 East 134th Street; 128 Willis Avenue; 39-69 Bruckner Boulevard; 126-134 Alexander Avenue

Block/Lot: 2278/24, 2278/25, 2278/26, 2278/27, 2278/28, 2278/29, 2278/30, 2278/31, 2278/33, 2278/34, 2278/35, 2278/36, 2278/37, 2278/38, 2278/39 (more BBLs to come)

c. 1890

Architect: Various

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

While the neighborhood of Mott Haven is largely industrial, there is a sizeable portion of residential structures within the industrial district, including tenements and row houses. Consisting of two to three-story brick row houses along 134th Street and three to four-story brick tenement buildings along Bruckner Boulevard, the residences were constructed in the 1890s as speculative housing for employees of nearby industries, including the J. L. Mott Iron Works and the piano factories. The residences, typical of late nineteenth century workers’ housing, retain their original details such as cornices, elaborately pedimented entries, and storefronts. The houses display a diverse range of architectural styles, including Beaux-Arts, Renaissance Revival, and Romanesque Revival; yellow brick facades and cast-iron balustrades are notable details.

The row houses feature historic storefronts that once served residents and employees of Mott Haven factories. The Bruckner Boulevard apartments and stores contribute to the current revitalization of the area, particularly with the development of “Antiques Row,” a strip of new antique stores housed in the old storefronts.

ΔRuppert Ice House

20 Bruckner Boulevard

Block Lot: 2308/5

1899

Architect: Julius Kastner

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The Ruppert Ice House took advantage of the growing need for manufactured ice after natural ice sources became too polluted. Before the advent of modern refrigeration, ice could only be produced by large icehouses, of which this building is a rare example in New York City. Ice was a particularly important component for the brewing of beer, and in 1899 this factory was designed and built by Julius Kastner for Jacob Ruppert, a well-known brewer.

The four-story steel frame factory with brick cladding utilized a steam powered ammonia compression system to manufacture ice and took advantage of the site’s proximity to truck, water and rail transportation for the shipment of the finished product to Ruppert’s brewery at Third Avenue and 92nd Street in Manhattan, in addition to other area merchants. The ice factory became obsolete with the invention of modern refrigeration in the 1940s, which made small-scale ice production a more feasible operation. The building is consistent with the surrounding factories and warehouses, contributing to the overall character of the industrial district.

ΔBorden Milk Distribution Center

40-50 Bruckner Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2295/51

1901

Architect: Unknown

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The three-story building at 40-50 Bruckner Boulevard was built in 1901 by the New York Condensed Milk Company, which later changed its name to the Borden Milk Company. This building facilitated the distribution of dairy throughout the metropolitan area during the twentieth century. The building later changed ownership and housed a rag sorting and boiling business as well as a small-scale paper-manufacturing company. The interior accommodated manufacturing operations and office space; the building was also said to have stored rails from the nearby rail yards at one point in its history.

The exterior buff-colored brick and thin mortar joints exhibit fastidious workmanship. In addition, the façade is adorned with cast stone that is crafted to provide Neo-classical and Beaux-Arts style ornamentation. Three oversized classical pediments, along the Bruckner Boulevard façade, are unique examples of Mannerist architecture in Mott Haven. There are five loading docks with floors constructed of historic Belgian blocks.

ΔWelte and Sons Piano Factory

27 Bruckner Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2309/33

c.1910

Architect: Unknown

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The Welte and Sons Piano factory, which predates the “daylight” factory, is one of the earliest industrial buildings in Mott Haven. Welte and Sons merged in 1921 with the Estey Piano Company, whose factory was located nearby. The four-story Welte and Sons facility, with its brick construction and steel frame windows, differs from the other piano factories with its square footprint, rather than an L-shaped plan. The building bridges the gap between older industrial buildings, such as the Estey Piano Factory, and newer industrial structures in the area with similar square footprints and large bands of windows. As one of the piano factories in this area, this building contributes to the larger industrial district, demonstrating the evolution of industrial design during the height of the area’s commercial vitality.

△The Hudford Factory

2439 Third Avenue

Block/Lot: 2319/37

1916

Architect: unknown

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The Hudford Factory, which still bears its name in terra cotta above its entrance, was constructed in 1916 as a floor-covering factory. The Hudford building maximizes the infiltration of natural light through the exterior walls. Its alternating window bay sizes distinguish it from other factories that typically have a more regular fenestration. With its white glazed brick and green terra cotta, the Hudford adds a particularly colorful contribution to a larger collection of industrial buildings constructed in Mott Haven during a time of rapid development.

△2417 Third Avenue

Block/Lot: 2319/100

1928

Architect: E.A. Kunze

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The former New Jersey Central Railroad Station is an eight-story “daylight” factory built in 1928 among other industrial structures in Mott Haven. It stands at the corner of Third Avenue and 134th Street. The New Jersey Central Railroad, the original owner, constructed the building as a facility for light manufacturing—an activity integral to the thriving rail-industry of the area. The steel windows cover more than fifty percent of its façade.

Modern construction techniques, including reinforced concrete construction, mushroom columns, and the maximization of interior space characterize this building.

△Third Avenue Bridge

1795, 1860, 1898

Architect: Thomas C. Clarke

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

The Third Avenue Bridge has existed in multiple variations since the end of the eighteenth century. Erected in response to the need to facilitate travel between the southern area of the Bronx and the northeast vicinity in Manhattan over the Harlem River, the bridge provided a direct transportation route. This eased accessibility to the industrial and residential communities in the Bronx. The first bridge at Third Avenue was built in 1795 and was constructed of wood and used for private purposes. In 1860, the first iron bridge constructed in New York replaced the original. It was a swing bridge that allowed boats to pass under its platform. This bridge proved to be inadequate and was replaced in 1898 with a steel truss swing bridge designed by Thomas C. Clarke. In 1891, the bridge was altered to serve the Third Avenue Elevated Train, constructed by the Morrisiana and Fordham Railroad Company.^{ix}

The bridge eased problems caused by the increased traffic between Manhattan and the Bronx. In addition, it provided a route for people traveling between New York City and Boston. While traffic congestion continued to worsen, additional bridges were constructed to create alternate routes of travel. Although the Third Avenue Bridge required the construction of more methods of travel, it was the first means of connection between Manhattan and the Bronx in this area.

_New Haven Passenger Railroad Station

82 Willis Avenue

Block/Lot: 2260/62

1891

Architect F.S. Curtis

Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Mott Haven's development coincided with a boom in American industry spurred by railroad expansion. For many years, the New Haven Railroad Passenger Station, served as the hub for the railroad that connected Mott Haven and Manhattan to the rest of the country. F.S. Curtis, staff architect for the New Haven Railroad designed the massive, four-story structure to house railroad offices and a waiting station for passengers traveling to and from points in southeastern New England. The brick building, with cast stone lintels, measures 30' x 300.' Its Willis Avenue elevation faces the Mott Haven Rail Yards. With its extreme and unusual profile and simple design, this building expresses New Haven Railroad's prominent position in the industrial development of Mott Haven.

ΔWillis Avenue Bridge

1901

Architect: Thomas C. Clarke

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Mott Haven Industrial District)

Constructed to relieve the congestion of the Third Avenue Bridge, the Willis Avenue Bridge was the last swing bridge constructed on the Harlem River. The bridge was designed by Thomas C. Clark, at the location of a ferry service between Manhattan and the Bronx, which began in 1669.^x Construction on the bridge began in 1894, but was not completed until 1901 due to conflicts between the city and the New Haven Railroad. This steel truss bridge served pedestrian, trolley and rail traffic before being adapted to automobile traffic in the early twentieth century.^{xi}

**Bronx Grit Chamber*

158 Bruckner Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2546/15

1937

Architect: McKim, Mead and White

Landmark Status: New York City Landmark (1982)

The Bronx Grit Chamber, built 1936-37, is a New York City landmark located on Bruckner Boulevard between Cypress Avenue and St. Anne Avenue. Part of the Ward's Island Sewage Treatment Works, designed to be one of the world's largest and most modern activated sewage disposal systems, the chamber continues to function in its original capacity. McKim, Mead, and White designed the chamber's exterior.^{xii} The chamber features Roman brick and limestone in an exaggerated Neo-classical style, and expresses McKim, Mead, and White's belief that all buildings, regardless of their use, could be designed to be aesthetically pleasing.

Bronx Terminal Market:

Bronx Terminal Market District:

The Bronx Terminal Market, due to its role in providing fresh food to the city of New York for decades, is part of a proposed for designation as a local, state and national landmark district

through the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Register for Historic Places. This proposal will be further explained in the recommendations section of this plan, but each of the included contributing buildings of the Bronx Terminal Market Complex are labeled and described below.

ΔSlips and Piers

Block/Lot: 2539/2

c.1891-1897

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Bronx Terminal Market District)

Five slips and piers were constructed as a speculative investment between 1891 and 1897. They served as the foundation for industries that required access to the river, including a banana curing plant, coal yard, and gravel factory; the Bronx Terminal Market was built in its current location due to the proximity of the slips and piers. Although one slip has been filled in, they remain the last examples of their type along the Harlem River.

ΔRefrigeration Plant

69 Major Deegan Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2539/2

1925-1929

Architect: Elisha H. Janes and August W. Cordes

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Bronx Terminal Market District)

The Refrigeration Plant, at the heart of the Bronx Terminal Market, featured cutting-edge refrigeration machinery when cold storage was still a technological marvel that had not yet gained widespread public acceptance. The two-story brick building facilitated the manufacture and distribution of ice to market stalls in the storage facility across the street and later to the concrete stalls lining Exterior Street. The second floor housed the market's machine shop. Similar to the Wholesale Market and Storage Building, the Refrigeration Plant features rectangular turrets, and an elaborate limestone cornerstone proclaims Mayor Hylan's role in initiating the project. A series of large arched ground-level windows displayed the plant's innovative machinery.

ΔWholesale Market and Storage Building

59 Major Deegan Boulevard

Block/Lot: 2539/32

1925-1929

Architect: Elisha H. Janes and August W. Cordes

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation (Bronx Terminal Market District)

Incorporating the existing Slips and Piers, the original Market designs combine two important technological innovations: refrigeration and transportation. As one of the largest refrigerated warehouses in the country, the Market Storage Building incorporated rail and truck loading bays devoted to market stalls, dry storage, cold storage, and freezer storage. This progressive design was the first of its type in New York City, and provided fresh goods to New York City residents.

The six-story Wholesale Market and Storage Building is a steel frame structure with a massive brick façade, limestone trim, and steel casement windows. The interior is concrete slab construction with cork insulation. The roof of this massive structure was topped by six turrets, which have since been removed. Originally, the second floor viaduct, connecting this floor to Exterior and Cromwell Streets permitted trucks to travel around and through the second floor of the building. Rail lines and truck roadways passed through the building on the ground floor for the efficient loading and unloading of goods. Six large freight elevators completed this system of transportation by allowing quick movement from train or truck to the upper storage levels and the first and second floor market stalls. Refrigeration was provided across Exterior Street through a series of underground conduits from the Refrigeration Plant.

The Bronx Terminal Market was the busiest market of its type in New York City, and one of the world's most active. Like other markets in the city, such as the Essex Market on the Lower East Side, the Bronx Terminal Market provided an important service to New Yorkers.

△Market Stalls, Farmer's Bank and Hotel, & Restaurant Building

Block/Lot:

1935

Architect: Samuel Oxhandler, John D. Churchill, and Albert W. Lewis

Recommended Acknowledgement: Contributing Designation

The design of the 1935 Market Stalls improved the transportation network of the market. The two-story buildings line both sides of Exterior Street with loading bays for trucks on one side, rail cars on the other, and setbacks on the second floor for offices. The complex was divided into forty-eight stalls, which had a continuous line of loading platforms that allowed food to be quickly unloaded from railcars, stored, and then shipped by truck with fewer transport steps, thus cutting labor costs and time. The reduced labor, increased order, and tighter control over the Market environs by the city also drove out the corruption that had colored the market's early years, further cutting costs and increasing efficiency. After years of teetering on the verge of financial collapse, the Bronx Terminal Market was revived by this addition.

The 1935 addition also included the Farmer's Bank and Hotel, and a late-night restaurant and bar to accommodate the Market's operating hours (early evening to mid morning). These buildings provided amenities for the market's users, including bathroom facilities, hot and cold plumbing, electrical lighting, covered sidewalks, and water hydrants.

The Moderne interest in efficiency and cleanliness is apparent in the streamlined concrete lines and steel casement windows of the 1935 buildings. The streamline effect is evident in the rounded corners and dramatic second-floor windows on the restaurant building. The Lombard strip detailing in the original buildings is reflected in the 1935 concrete additions, and unifies the aesthetic expression of the market complex. The cast-in-place concrete construction also is a more efficient and durable construction method than that of the earlier buildings. The quality of this method is evident in the stable structural condition of the stalls.

**Public School 31*

425 Grand Concourse

Block/Lot: 2346/1

1897-99

Architect: C.B.J. Snyder

Landmark Status: New York City Landmark

This elementary school, designed by C.B.J. Snyder, was one of the first Collegiate Gothic schools constructed in New York City. It was built to accommodate the growing population of the Bronx in this period.^{xiii} Its interior lighting, designed by Louis Comfort Tiffany, has been a topic of research throughout the twentieth century. It is currently undergoing a major renovation project.

145th Street Bridge

1905

Architect: Alfred P. Boller

Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

Alfred P. Boller, architect of the Madison Avenue, University Heights, and Macombs Dam Bridges, designed the 145th Street Bridge in 1905. It connects 145th Street in Manhattan to 149th Street in the Bronx. This steel truss swing bridge, used electricity rather than steam to power its machinery. Specification at that time required the prudent use of the materials, which resulted in the use of reinforced concrete and steel for the approaches, and a more austere design than that of the nearby Macombs Dam Bridge.

General Baking Company
360 Gerard Avenue
Block/Lot: 2344/112
1922
Architect: The Ballinger Company
Recommended Acknowledgement: Appropriate Signage

The General Baking Company building, constructed in 1922, originally served as a factory with attached stables in the rear. Although the windows have been filled in, the building retains most of its original ornamentation and materials. The factory has elaborate brick ornamentation at the cornice and carved limestone detailing on the Gerard Avenue elevation. General Baking's attention to detail, in comparison with earlier industrial buildings in the Terminal Market area, demonstrates an evolution of industrial design from the masonry structures to the daylight factories of the late 1920s onward.

Yankee Stadium
161st Street and River Avenue
Block/Lot: 2491/1
1923
Architect: Osborn Engineering
Recommended Acknowledgement: Educational Element

Yankee Stadium is one of the best-known unofficial landmarks and tourist destinations in New York City. Home to the New York Yankees Major League Baseball Team, the stadium was completed in 1923 and significantly renovated in 1976. It is one of the oldest operating major league baseball parks in the country.

_The Lehigh Bronx Building
385 Gerard Avenue:
Block/Lot: 2349/90
1928
Architect: Unknown
Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

The Lehigh Bronx Building, commissioned by the Lehigh Valley Railroad in 1928, is a twelve-story reinforced-concrete "daylight" factory. Built rapidly from company plans, the building included a ground-level storage area for the railroad, as well as areas for other types of storage and light industry that could be rented by others. Originally, rail cars would travel across the Harlem River by boat, then connect to rail lines on the opposite side which led to the Lehigh-Bronx building, where they would unload cargo. The construction of the Major Deegan Expressway, as well as the new focus on automobiles use during World War II, resulted in the Lehigh Valley Railroad's decision to sell the building in 1944 for use as a mixed office space. The building is fully occupied, and serves as an important visual landmark in the area.

Built with reinforced concrete slab construction, the Lehigh-Bronx, as a "daylight factory," has large pivot steel casement windows that remain on all four exposures. This fenestration allows a large amount of natural light and ventilation to reach all areas of the building. Mushroom structural concrete columns support the floor slabs, and loading docks dominate the front and rear sides, allowing trucks to load and unload cargo. The six freight elevators remain as well.

The factory's entrance is marked by a tower element that is set at an angle to the rest of the building. Polychrome terra-cotta details on the tower, above the entrance and on several spandrel panels, are atypical of the later industrial buildings in the Bronx. Such details indicate the Lehigh Railroad's aspirations for this building to be the centerpiece of the new Bronx industrial district.

Cashman Laundry Building

340 Gerard Avenue

Block/Lot: 2344/96

1932

Architect: Cory and Cory

Recommended Acknowledgement: Individual Designation (New York City and National Register)

The Cashman Laundry Building, designed by Walter and Russell Cory in 1932, occupies a site at the northeast corner of East 140th Street and Gerard Avenue. The building's historic and architectural importance lies in the progressive example it set for the laundry building type, both in program and in style. The Cashman is one of the earliest examples of the Moderne style in the United States. The building uses its reinforced concrete construction, streamlined form, and minimalist orientation to convey physical expression to its function. Its massing consists of a prominent off-center tower element and horizontal bands of steel casement windows. The tower element gives the building a monumental presence, while serving as the main entrance and vertical circulation shaft.

The interior columns are flared mushroom columns, which permitted open interior space while allowing factory functions to run in continuous lines; this reflects the late 1920s push for greater industrial efficiency. The building's program also indicates changes in working conditions during this time. The women who worked in the Cashman Laundry building enjoyed amenities such as a cafeteria, locker rooms, and large windows with plenty of fresh air and natural light. Most factories at the time lacked these facilities, and the whole design coincides with contemporary reforms that sought to make factories more humane working places in the early twentieth century.

In 1995, the building was converted to a New York City magnet high school, and as a result, many alterations to the building have taken place; however, many of these interventions are reversible such as the changes to fenestration. Despite these modifications, Cashman Laundry Building continues to hold an important place in the history of the United States' labor movement and in the development of modern architecture in New York.

Challenges in the Southern Area

Over the past half-century, the flight of industry and subsequent loss of jobs have resulted in a host of issues that challenge preservation of the Southern area's important historic built fabric. This set of circumstances has spawned a variety of other issues, such as building neglect, vacant structures, lots built well under the allowable FAR, and a lack of recreational space, all of which significantly impact efforts to preserve the industrial buildings and historic residential structures found on either side of the river. Recent interest in reinvestment in Mott Haven and the Bronx Terminal Market in particular, although promising for the area's long-term economic health, acts as a double-edged sword for preservationists, as eager developers and uninformed new residents threaten historic buildings with demolition and insensitive alterations.

But before we can consider a potential influx of new residents, we must analyze the existing communities in the Southern area to reveal several issues endemic to the region as a whole. The neighborhoods of Mott Haven and Bronx Terminal Market are not primarily residential, and research suggests that there are few local resources for supporting or restoring existing historic buildings. In Harlem, on the other hand, the far more residential character of the neighborhoods, as evidenced by building type and relative population figures, also does not appear to support a population for whom preservation is a top priority.

The considerable challenge of housing affordability and availability is reflected in the percentage of renters versus owners in the Southern area, particularly in Harlem. In 2000, only 8.5% of residents own their dwellings in Mott Haven, Harlem, and the Bronx Terminal Market area, as compared to 30.2% citywide. Ownership issues are aggravated by an unemployment rate of 16.8% in the Southern area, which is nearly double the citywide rate of 9.6%. Median income

and the percentage of households that fall under the poverty level also reflect the larger economic issues that impact the community's ability, willingness, and interest in preserving their built resources. Median income in the area in 1999 was just over \$10,000 per year, less than half the citywide average, and nearly one third of the Southern area residents lived below the poverty level (Refer to "Appendix II: Demographics" for additional information).

Social challenges attendant to the economic ones detailed above include public safety, poverty, teenage pregnancy, and substance abuse. Although social challenges do not necessarily impact preservation efforts directly, they do tend to overwhelm them when it comes to allocation of oft-scarce community resources and attention. Addressing some of these demographic issues – particularly home ownership – can lead to a greater awareness of preservation priorities in the area. While the specific application of existing preservation tools, laws, and the implementation of new programs will be covered in the subsequent Recommendations section, an overview of the challenges that impact Harlem, Mott Haven and the Bronx Terminal Market area must first be considered.

Harlem:

Housing

For many years Harlem has been characterized by its high percentage of public housing projects, and the negative connotations associated with these structures. The general public often views residential complexes in Harlem, like the Harlem River Houses, Abraham Lincoln Houses, Riverbend, and Riverton, in a negative light, even though they were designed to improve living conditions within the city. Currently many of these developments are experiencing a rebirth as property values rise in Harlem and city management agencies increasingly work with tenants to resolve problems with crime, maintenance, and vandalism. These buildings are now increasingly seen as quality, affordable housing, and in the case of some, the negative associations with their past are quickly dissipating.

Despite the presence of these large residential structures, the Harlem portion of our study area continues to suffer from shortage of affordable housing. To the west and south of the neighborhood, in Central Harlem, new development has already taken place. Big box retailers such as Pathmark and Old Navy have moved in and the price of residential real estate has risen. Dozens of vacant tenement buildings in Central Harlem, which could have been used for lower and middle-income mixed housing units, have been subjected to serious alterations, including cornice removals, window replacement, and gut renovations. The recently renovated historic brownstones are selling for a minimum of \$500,000. These nearby development projects have raised issues in our study area of gentrification; rehabilitation projects may attract new tenants into the area, but only those with the funds to undertake such expensive renovation projects. Meanwhile, much of the existing housing stock remains vacant, left vulnerable to deterioration, and in dire need of positive development.

Vacant Lots

The high visibility of vacant lots in Harlem is indicative of a lack of investment in the area. These voids in the streetscape also contribute to negative perceptions of Harlem. Frequently, these vacant lots have become cluttered with refuse and developed into dangerous places where local residents feel unsafe. Although some have been converted to community gardens, parks or playgrounds, vacant lots are generally fenced off and inaccessible. Lots that have not been developed along these lines need to be developed in a manner sensitive to their surrounding environment.

The new developments should not only be sensitive aesthetically, but socially and economically as well, incorporating existing architecture into overall design schemes. In Harlem, there exists a strong need for public space and social programs for the community, which could be provided

through a revitalization of the vacant lots. Some programs are already underway, and suggestions for expansion of these services are described in the Recommendations section.

Social Challenges

In addition to the social challenges mentioned above, which are present throughout the Southern area, there is the problem in Harlem that most of the residents are renters. This becomes a challenge when residents feel they can do little to initiate rehabilitation of the buildings in which they live. As a result, the responsibility belongs to building landlords, many of whom have perpetuated the neglect of their buildings or do not live in the area. With greater attention focused on Harlem through revitalization programs, increased pressure could come to bear on negligent landlords to improve their buildings. In the grand tradition of Harlem social support systems, the impact could conceivably ripple outward, helping to alleviate social issues along with the built landscape.

Mott Haven:

Vacant Industrial Buildings

Neglected buildings, vacant lots, and absence of street life all contribute to the perception that Mott Haven is an undesirable area of the Bronx. But these biases overlook the potential inherent in the infrastructure that has served the area throughout its history. Mott Haven's abundance of warehouses and factory buildings offer both an opportunity and a challenge to the ongoing preservation of the area. What was once considered an industrial foothold is now an area in dire need of repair and revitalization.

Much like the Bronx Terminal Market area, Mott Haven's image and health of its built fabric has suffered considerably by the evaporation of the industrial economy in New York City during the mid-twentieth century. However, Mott Haven is currently the target of residential and commercial development due to its proximity to the East Side of Manhattan, good transportation and abundance of underused, historic industrial buildings, which could be converted to residential lofts.

Preservation and reuse of these former piano factories, metal working shops, and light industrial facilities hinges on stabilization and application of proper conservation and maintenance programs. The predominant structural system in the area are load-bearing masonry buildings, which were generally built in the period between 1880 and 1920. Structurally sound, these buildings suffer from a number of conservation-related issues stemming mainly from willful neglect, inappropriate maintenance, and insensitive alterations. These challenges also affect the windows of many factories, which were either wood framed in the late nineteenth century or steel casements in the later daylight factories. While these are an important architectural element to the buildings, many have been lost. This issue is examined in more detail in "Appendix I: Conservation."

Unsteady Economic Opportunities

Mott Haven faces a lack of both economic investment and initiation of historic preservation programs. It is a neighborhood that contains a variety of structures that once successfully operated together to generate economic vitality for over a century. Although these issues remain extremely important for the promotion of civic pride in the area, about half of Mott Haven's community lives below the poverty level, which results in more pressing and immediate social concerns. Due to the lack of funding for the revitalization of the Mott Haven area, the situation has generated and exacerbated more problems such as vacant lots, illegal dumping, and a lack of recreational activities. Mott Haven seems to be on the fringes of the city's consciousness, and its buildings are the recipient of abuse, neglect, and in many cases, grossly oversized billboards.

Despite these challenges, there seems to be hope in recent developments in Mott Haven. Slowly, some real estate development has seen the conversion of factory spaces into the coveted artist's loft, and a small-scale economic revitalization program has given birth to "Antiques' Row," a row of shops that specializes in used furniture, along Bruckner Boulevard. Yet, presently, these are very small aspects of what could be a significant development. The area's excellent transportation links to Manhattan, including both rail and auto, along with its low rents are attracting the attention of developers, renters, and professionals alike, as all of them are seeking the "next big discovery" in New York neighborhoods. Planning for this kind of development with preservation in mind will only enhance its long-term chances for success, revitalization, and maintenance of this community's distinct industrial character.

Redevelopment Plans

A number of potential "soft-sites" in Mott Haven are currently threatened by demolition and new construction due to existing zoning regulations, increasing pressure on historic structures from real-estate development, and housing demands. Adapting current structures for housing and introducing new zoning with commercial overlays and residential districts could encourage a mixed usage of the neighborhood. This would increase investment to the area and create an influx of residents and businesses.

Some reinvestment of this type has already begun in the area. As this continues, owners must be educated about how to properly care for their historic buildings and how to adapt them sensitively to new uses. Many of the factories and warehouses have already been converted into illegal residential lofts, and others serve as support for large signage or billboards. Neither of these practices is appropriate for the historic structures in the area nor do they provide a long-term community investment. It is essential that new development is regulated and modifications and alterations be monitored. The fundamental goals of preservation in an area on the brink of renewed interest, like Mott Haven, should be to try and make the area economically self-supporting while preserving its architectural fabric.

Finding suitable uses for the existing historic buildings as an alternative to all-new construction remains a pressing issue in the area. The situation is further hampered, by the legacy of the industrial era and the presence of Brownfields on some of the neglected industrial sites (See Appendix V: Ecological Concerns for more information on Brownfields). Although, because of existing federal and state programs, sites such as the Mott Iron Works could yet become prime candidates for developers taking advantage of tax credits on these polluted lots.

Bronx Terminal Market:

Underused, Under-built Historic Industrial Sites

The diminished industrial economy in New York City has negatively impacted the area of the Bronx Terminal Market in much the same way as its neighbors to the south and west. The phenomenon has left many of the buildings underused and neglected, and as a result, many of the lots are significantly under-built due to the current allowable FARs. Such soft sites include the Bronx Terminal Market complex itself, and its attendant piers and slips, where as-of-right redevelopment could add up to a total of two million square feet.

Many of the industrial buildings in the area have been subject to insensitive alterations and willful neglect by absentee landlords. Although the buildings for the most part are structurally sound, insensitive modifications have been made in many cases to accommodate new uses. The Cashman Laundry Building, for example, in its conversion to a school, lost its original windows and other Moderne details that had distinguished this important historic structure. At the Bronx Terminal Market itself, new wholesale market tenants have blocked up windows, punctured walls, and modified the exteriors of the original concrete facades. The larger Cold Storage Building has suffered a worse fate, with the removal of its rooftop towers, damage from arson, and structural

destabilization through neglect. Other more mundane maintenance issues, such as graffiti, the presence of billboards on historic building facades, and the improper maintenance of materials, have also resulted from the under-utilization of these once busy structures.

Due to the aesthetic conditions in this area, that have resulted from neglect and under-use, the Bronx Terminal Market has been unfairly characterized as a blighted district with few redeeming qualities. This attitude, when combined with negligence on the part of property owners, feeds a negative perception of the South Bronx, which is frequently viewed as one of the city's most stagnant and economically depressed areas. Shifting economic circumstances, particularly the departure of industry from New York, have impacted many other areas of the city over time; neighborhoods, such as Soho, Williamsburg, and DUMBO have all been affected by these changes, but their communities and historic built fabric have managed to bounce back and find new uses. This type revitalization could also occur in the Bronx Terminal Market.

Threats from New Development

Despite the threats that underdevelopment and under-use pose to the historic built fabric of the Bronx Terminal Market area, future development, particularly at the Terminal Market site itself, presents an equally challenging issue. For nearly thirty years, the City and the Terminal Market's leaseholder, Strategic Development Corporation, clashed over the future of the site and its buildings. In March of 2004, however, the stalemate was broken when the lease was sold to the Related Companies, the development corporation behind the new Time-Warner Center on Columbus Circle. The Bronx Terminal Market area is now set for development as a retail complex. Among the early announced plans are razing the 1925 Cold Storage building, which was once the centerpiece of the bustling market complex.^{xiv}

The significantly under-built lots, particularly the two-story concrete structures and refrigeration plant, are at immediate risk of demolition by developers eager to take advantage of the sites' potential. The political players involved in the future of the site seem to share the developers' apparent disregard of existing historic resources. Also of concern is the impact on the surrounding industrial built fabric if the Terminal Market site is razed in favor of new construction. The goals of developers and preservationists do not have to be mutually exclusive in the Bronx Terminal Market area, and the Recommendations section details a plan for taking advantage of the sites' obvious development potential along with its significant historic resources.

Although the existing Bronx Terminal Market businesses employ about 500 people, the buildings remain an underutilized resource for an area in need of economic stimulation.^{xv} The adjacent residential community is underserved by the nearby riverfront and the lack of a year-round connection between the Market and Yankee Stadium misses an opportunity enjoyed by the surrounding areas of major sports complexes in other cities. These issues should be combined with the goal of preserving the locally, regionally, and nationally significant resources in the area.

Bridges and Transportation Infrastructure

Transportation has always been a key feature of the Bronx Terminal Market's built environment. However, the area faces the challenge of meeting modern traffic demands while maintaining the historic integrity of the infrastructure. As noted previously, six bridges, constructed between 1895 and 1954, span the Harlem River in the Southern section; these are the Macomb's Dam, 125th Street, Madison Avenue, Park Avenue, 3rd Avenue, and Willis Avenue Bridges. Of these, all but the Park Avenue railroad lift bridge, are swing bridges. Their construction represents an important engineering development of the late nineteenth century that was perfectly suited to the low elevation banks of the southern Harlem River. The conservation issues of the bridges in this area are similar to those discussed in depth in the Central Section of the Preservation Plan, please refer to this portion of the text for more details.

The Bronx Terminal Market area, and indeed the entire Harlem River waterfront of the South Bronx, also faces difficulties due to the presence of the Major Deegan Expressway. This presence of the elevated roadway casts a long shadow over large sections of land, which creates a psychological and sometimes physical barrier to pedestrian traffic. As will be discussed in greater detail in the Central section of the preservation plan, the presence of the Major Deegan Expressway is an asset and liability to the study area. It simultaneously offers easy automotive transportation access while casting a pall over the waterfront area. The Metro North tracks and other freight lines in the Terminal Market Area also complicate preservation and development by cutting access to the waterfront.

Recommendations

There are many opportunities for preservation within these neighborhoods, and there exists a number of financial and educational initiatives that could empower community members and outside interests to reinvest in the Southern section of the Harlem River. These include, but are certainly not limited to: rezoning, landmark designation, adaptive reuse, and the utilization of tax incentives sponsored by the city, state, and federal government, landmark designation, and adaptive reuse. Through a selective application of the above tools, or several combinations thereof, the aforementioned problems in the Southern section can be addressed simultaneously with the preservation of the historic built fabric.

Harlem:

Rezoning and Design Recommendations for Vacant Lots

In Harlem there are many different categories of zoning, but the majority of the area is zoned R7-2. This zoning is intended for medium density apartment housing districts. Along the avenues, there exists R7-2 with a C1-4 overlay. Typical establishments in these zoning areas include barbershops, grocery stores, dry cleaners, and restaurants. The area also has smaller areas of R-8 zoning, which consists of high-density apartment houses. There are a few areas of C8-3 zoning, which includes automobile showrooms, warehouses, and service facilities, and there are very small areas of light and heavy manufacturing, which have M1-1, M1-2, and M3-1 zoning (For more information on zoning refer to "Appendix XI: Zoning").

The most urgent issues in the area are vacant lots and buildings that stand as empty shells; out of nine blocks surveyed, there were fifty lots that were devoid of any built fabric. In order to create a continuous streetscape and massing, we propose rezoning the blocks 1755, 1756, 1779, 2014, 2015, 2036, 2038, 2039, and 2040 from R7-2 to R6-A. **(MAP)** This zoning will allow for six-story apartment buildings designed for compatibility with the other buildings in the neighborhood.^{xvi} The new construction that is proposed for infill should be consistent with the height and massing of adjacent structures, which vary from four to six-stories and are built to the lot line.

Incorporating a variety of uses would also assist in the development of the neighborhood. Although quality housing is a major issue in the area, there is a need for addressing the other social concerns that plague Harlem today. One recommendation is the development of a community and educational facility incorporating adaptive reuse of historic buildings while sensitively infilling vacant lots. This proposal would be addressing historical context, contemporary life, and economic development. The intervention would restore pride and the cultural dynamism characterizing much of greater Harlem's past. A design proposal for such a facility is outlined in Appendix IV: Design Charrette.

Funding Options for New Housing and Improvements

For existing structures, many funding options exist for facilitating the rehabilitation of residential buildings. New investment to the area can also initiate change on a larger scale. Through preservation and the construction of appropriate infill, perceptions of the area can be improved

and community pride will increase. The Low-Income Rental Housing Tax Credit is one federal subsidy available through the Internal Revenue Service. Tax credits of 30 or 70% can be used for substantial rehabilitations of buildings where occupants are earning 50 to 60% below the locality's average income.^{xvii}

The J-51 Tax Incentive Program offered through New York City's Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) is a tax abatement program that could be used for the renovation of multiple dwelling properties in Harlem.^{xviii} The 421-a tax incentive, also through HPD, is particularly applicable in this area. This incentive program provides limited tax exemptions to developers and property owners constructing new multiple dwellings on sites that are either primarily or entirely vacant.^{xix}

The Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) could also help encourage rehabilitation projects. Some of the projects that are under the CDBG program include the rehabilitation of privately owned residential properties, the maintenance of properties acquired by the city through tax foreclosures, and the foundation of green spaces and community gardens on vacant lots.^{xx} Work accomplished through such grants can serve to entice other investment into the area, and assist the grassroots-level community garden program. (For more information on funding options, refer to Appendix VI: Financial Tools).

To satisfy the requirements of several of the above tax incentives, property owners will be required to apply sensitive restorations and renovations to their historic structures. In the past, the area's remaining tenement buildings have been subjected to severe alterations, including cornice removals, window replacement, and insensitive renovations. As a result, we propose to educate building owners through the distribution of manuals and pamphlets outlining the proper maintenance and repair of historic resources based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Through a combination of awareness and incentives, conservation measures for Harlem's historic row houses can be achieved.

Education and Alternative Tools for Addressing Social Ills

In order for effective preservation to take place in Harlem, awareness of the area's significance must be imparted upon the community as well as other stakeholders, such as the local government agencies and other area investors. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) is one organization that could be used to generate resident-led initiatives in support of Community Development Corporations (CDCs). The LISC is a non-profit organization that gives residents the tools they need to further the growth of their community.^{xxi} A local community organization can be useful as an advocacy group, promoting preservation of existing building stock as a means to improving social conditions.

Educational workshops and lectures at both community and grade school levels could also help to promote awareness of local history and culture. In conjunction with area museums, school children can be educated about the history of their neighborhood and pass this information on to their parents (See Appendix IX: Related Initiatives for some examples of educational programs already in existence). In order to advance the prominence of built heritage in the minds of the community members, we also propose the Riverbend Houses (1967) for individual landmark designation by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. The Riverbend Houses (1967) is an excellent example public housing in New York City and describes an important element of the development of Harlem over the past half-century. In addition, it reflects the intense debate centered on ideas of progressive social reform in New York and throughout the country.

Mott Haven:

Revitalization through the Designation of a Mott Haven Industrial Historic District

As previously mentioned, designation of an industrial historic district in Mott Haven is recommended. This district would preserve the historic and architectural character of the nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial and transportation center. Known as the “Mott Haven Industrial Historic District,” this collection of valuable historic structures would be proposed to the Landmarks Preservation Commission as a New York City historic district designation. It would also be presented as a New York State district under the State Historic Preservation Office, and as a district under the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The Mott Haven Industrial Historic District would encompass brick warehouses and factories, daylight factories, tenement buildings, row houses, bridges, and a passenger railroad station. The boundaries of the district would be south of the Major Deegan Expressway, east of Brown Place, north of the Harlem River, and the Mott Haven Canal site with the inclusion of Willis Avenue and Third Avenue Bridges. **(MAP)**

The Mott Haven Industrial Historic District is a perfect means for protecting and finding uses for the underused buildings in the area. Regulating new development and injecting the area with the prestige that frequently comes along with such designations can provide the area with a number of economic opportunities. Among the benefits of creating a Mott Haven Industrial Historic District are:

- Education of community members from Mott Haven, the Bronx, and New York City regarding the vital importance that industry in general, and Mott Haven in particular, played in contributing to the financial success of the New York’s economy
- Allowance for the upkeep of historic buildings and the clean-up of illegal dumping grounds and Brownfield areas
- Encouragement of sensitive infill and adaptive reuse of existing historic buildings
- Access to funding via municipal, state, and federal government agencies

The creation of the Mott Haven Industrial Historic District would include the preservation of many important industrial buildings that produced goods for an industrial age economy. The district should include Mott Iron Works, the piano factories (Estey, Haines Brothers, Welte & Sons), Ruppert Ice House, Segar Factory, and Hudford Factory. The district should also encompass the essential transportation networks that remain within its boundaries. The New Haven Passenger Railroad Station, for example, managed not only passenger travel but also the scheduling and movement of trains in and out of the Mott Haven area. The Willis Avenue Bridge was an innovation in swing-bridge engineering and allowed increased water traffic, and the former Third Avenue Bridge supported the original Elevated Railroad from Manhattan. These should be included as part of the district’s infrastructure components. An often overlooked component of Mott Haven is the survival of worker housing, such as the row houses and tenement housing for the working class on Alexander Avenue to Brown Place. In an effort to present a comprehensive view of an industrial area, from factories to workers, these structures should also be included in the proposed historic district.

The industrial area of Mott Haven represents the evolution of industry from hand-made, locally manufactured goods to mass production and distribution. It contains physical evidence of the stages of manufacturing development from the beginning of the industrialization in New York City to its demise in the late twentieth century. The district should include all ancillary networks that supported these industries such as transportation infrastructure and residential units.

Funding opportunities offer a vast range of possible revenue to manage and preserve the Mott Haven Industrial Historic District. Possible sources could include the Federal Historic Tax Incentive Program for rehabilitation of historic buildings, the Community Partners Program that includes the National Trust Loan Fund made especially for low-income historic districts, and TEA-21 from the New York State Department of Transportation, which aids in rehabilitation initiatives on any historic transportation structures (For more detailed information please see Appendix VI: Financial Tools).

Local support for such a large-scale proposal is an important issue for the establishment of the Mott Haven Industrial Historic District, since community participation will be a critical component of the area's success. New York City's Historic Districts Council (HDC) should be involved in gathering community organizations for the purpose of explaining the implications and potential benefits of such a designation process. The HDC could help galvanize support and create strategies and plans for the establishment of the district, per the organization's expertise. Due to the area's distinct industrial identity, special consideration would have to be made to appeal to existing business owners to support a historic district. The involvement of the Bronx Historical Society would also be integral in this process due to the organization's grassroots network of support and their interest in the preservation of local culture (particularly towards Mott Haven, as the first epicenter of economic prosperity for the Bronx).

Historically Sensitive Design Proposals for New Development

Artists have carved out a niche in the Mott Haven area, and the Bronx Council on the Arts has recognized their presence by providing tours to artists' studios and sponsoring open houses. In keeping with this current development trend, a design proposal has been produced for a cultural center and park. It would be located in the Harlem River Rail Yards and the adjacent New Haven Passenger Railroad Station. The reprogramming of the Harlem River Rail Yards would include a park area near the Harlem River, a promenade, and an indoor and outdoor theatre space. The New Haven Passenger Railroad station would promote the arts with studios for musicians, dancers, photographers, and multi-media artists. It would also include a restaurant and café, a garden area, kinetic sculptures, and a railroad museum to educate the community about the history of the community. For a more complete description of this proposal, please refer to Appendix IV: Design Charrette.

Funding initiatives for this project could include the Federal Historic Tax Incentives Program with a 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit, Community Partners (from which a variety of funds could be chosen), New York State Department of Transportation's TEA-21 (for the renovation of historic transportation structures), the New York City funded Community Development Block Grant (for the creation of green space and community gardens), and Local Initiatives Support Corporations (for resident-led community-based improvements). For more information on these funding possibilities, please refer to Appendix VI: Financial Tools.

Recommendations for new design in the Mott Haven Historic District would emphasize a sensitive response to the industrial context. New building development should be regulated by uniform design guidelines governing height, bulk, set backs, and materials, while also maintaining façade vocabulary and historic viewscales. Building facades with large outdoor signage should be regulated according to standards established by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, the New York State Office Historic Preservation Office, and the National Register. Because much of the historical signage has become a recognizable and distinguishing feature of the area for city residents, it is worth noting that they will be protected as grandfathered features of the district.

Adaptive Reuse and Rezoning for Greater Economic Opportunities

Allied with the plan for the Mott Haven Historic Industrial District is the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. In order for this industrial district to function as an economically viable area once again, former industrial and transportation buildings that no longer serve their original functions must incorporate new purposes. However, special considerations must be made to those businesses that still operate in Mott Haven as they create sources of revenue and labor markets.

One recommendation that would serve the community is conversion of industrial buildings to residential complexes that would benefit low to moderate-income families. The demand for affordable housing in this section of the South Bronx makes loft conversions a necessary and feasible method of reuse. Associated tax incentives make such redevelopment extremely

attractive to owners. Funding opportunities can be garnered from the Federal Historic Tax Incentives Program with the 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit coupled with the Low-Income Rental Housing Tax Credit that can provide a property tax credit of either 30% or 70%.^{xxii}

Row houses and tenement buildings also provide low to moderate-income housing. The implementation of New York City's Housing Preservation and Development Tax Incentive Program, particularly the J-51 for multiple dwellings, would allow for the rehabilitation and development of buildings with tax abatement and exemptions.^{xxiii} The City-funded Community Development Block Grant for financial and directoral support is another source for rehabilitating housing in low to moderate-income communities.^{xxiv} (For more detailed information on all these funding programs, please see Appendix VI: Financial Tools.)

Existing businesses located in historic properties can take advantage of federal tax incentives put in place by the Federal Historic Tax Incentives Program; this can allow the rehabilitation of buildings without a significant economic burden.^{xxv} Meanwhile, the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Development Corporation offers technical and economic advice along with the use of multiple federal, state, and local tax benefits.^{xxvi} These funding opportunities allow for business growth while preserving existing historic fabric.

In order to expand the possibilities for development, Mott Haven should be largely rezoned from the predominant heavy industrial (M3-1) and medium industrial (M2-1) zoning to MX-1 zoning. MX-1 is a mixed zoning that allows for a combination of M2-1 and R6 uses. This category has already proven successful in the blocks that line the northern edge of Bruckner Boulevard, from Third Avenue to Brown Place; in this portion of the community, manufacturing, commercial, and residential functions coexist. This rezoning is appropriate as heavy industrial manufacturing is no longer a factor of Mott Haven. However, the rail yards will likely remain predominantly M3-1, and as a result of this zoning a buffer of M2-1 zoning must be created between the rail yards and the mixed usage zone. Accounting for this buffer, the MX-1 zoning would extend roughly from Canal Street to Brown Place and from 132nd to 134th Street. It may also include the most northern parts of the Harlem River Rail Yards, which are currently being used as parking lots.

Preservation-Friendly Redevelopment Plans and Other Community Outreach

Education for the community is a major priority in ensuring the success of the Mott Haven Historic District. Ongoing community workshops should be developed and geared towards property owners as a means of providing hands-on demonstrations of properly performed, sensitive interventions. Detailed booklets could be distributed to these individuals for later reference. Additionally, courses could provide information about funding resources that may be available. An accessible community conservation coordinator could aid in research concerning proper intervention techniques, and a financial expert could help facilitate the application for funds. Additionally, these individuals could mine for more funding where applicable.

Research workshops should be offered to the entire community so that they can discover the history of buildings within their neighborhood. Themed walking tours and community meetings could be held under the auspices of the Bronx Community Board 1. Community meetings with Bronx Community Board 1 would also allow the Mott Haven Industrial Historic District to interface with the already established East Mott Haven Historic District for problem solving advice and recommendations.

Educational programs for area students can also be developed in the area. The New York Historical Society and the Museum of the City of New York offer teacher training and a wide array of education programs that are associated with local history. Thousands of children participate in these programs yearly and integrating Mott Haven into the discourse of local history would give students the opportunity to broaden their understanding of manufacturing in New York City during the last two centuries. For more information on these programs, please see Appendix IX: Related Initiatives.

A system of signage would be another valuable element in retelling the history of the area; signs should be placed on important historic resources such as factories, housing, warehouses, and railroad stations. Places of historical importance that are now vacant can be called out with signs that provide a physical description (site plans, elevations) of the former structure and site. All signs would have historic illustrations of the structure, a short history of its function, and its significance to Mott Haven.

Funding opportunities for the signage include the Grant Program of the Preservation League of New York State.^{xxvii} This funding program offers financial support for projects that recognize and preserve historically significant sites. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation could also contribute to the funding of the signage.^{xxviii} They are involved on the community level and would recognize the importance of signage as an expression of cultural heritage. (For detailed information on funding initiatives, please see the Appendix IV: Financial Tools).

Recommendations for individual building conservation will be varied, since the building typologies represented in Mott Haven cover about one hundred years of history. In this period, we see the transition from load-bearing masonry walls, to the hybrids of cage construction and portal-braced building types, to the concrete building with steel casement windows. (Recommendations for the sensitive repair of failures for these buildings types can be found in Appendix I: Conservation.)

Although industrial areas are frequently associated with pollution, Mott Haven contains only one area that is designated as a Brownfield; it is located under the Mott Iron Works site. As an important historical site for the Mott Haven Industrial Historic District, a clean-up of this site is recommended. Funding initiatives such as the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, the Small Business Liability Relief, and Brownfields Revitalization Act can be used to mitigate the expense for cleanup.^{xxix}

Bronx Terminal Market:

Landmark Designation for New Uses and Protection

We are proposing the designation of The Bronx Terminal Market District as a local, state, and national landmark district through the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Register for Historic Places (**please see Map**). This district consists of the market piers and slips (ca. 1890), the Wholesale Market and Storage Building and Refrigeration Plant (1925), and the Market Stalls, Restaurant, Bank, and Hotel (1935). In addition to creating this district, the Lehigh-Bronx Daylight Factory (1928) and the Cashman Laundry Building (1932) are recommended for designation as individual city and national landmarks for their aesthetic and historic contributions to the area and the city as a whole. These historically and architecturally significant structures have an integrity that renders each of them viable for new uses.

Related Companies, a development corporation, recently purchased a lease to develop the city-owned Terminal Market site. Although Related plans dramatic changes to the Bronx Terminal Market, including razing the existing market buildings, new ownership may provide an opportunity to reconsider the importance of the historic structures. Integration of the historic structures with new development can yield an increased understanding of the history of the area and the role it played in the growth of New York City. Landmark designation of the historic buildings will protect these resources, provide context, and facilitate a greater understanding of the development of the area and the city as a whole.

The original decision to locate the Bronx Terminal Market in the south Bronx was guided by access to transportation infrastructure, including local access roads, freight rail lines, the subway, and the piers and slips along the Harlem River. Presently, the industries in this area still take

advantage of the easy access to these transportation resources, which have been enhanced by the addition of the Major Deegan Expressway.

Beyond designation, we propose a comprehensive design program that includes new construction to maximum allowable FAR of over two million square feet while simultaneously preserving the existing buildings and taking advantage of the present transportation infrastructure. This design proposal includes re-programming the existing historic site and structures according to sympathetic use, such as food-related industries and supermarkets, combined with retail, office, restaurant space, necessary parking space for offices, and a Metro-North station to connect the Market to Manhattan and out-lying suburbs. This plan would revitalize the area, which has suffered from decades of neglect; it would also build upon proximity to Yankee Stadium and surrounding residential areas to benefit tourists and residents alike.

Maintaining the market site as a historic district would also allow for the preservation of the historic resources while promoting education about their contribution to the growth of New York City. We propose the utilization of one of these buildings as a Museum of New York City Restaurants and Food. This museum would build off growing interest in all aspects of the food trade, from production to consumption. Providing interpretation of the historic resources of the market would also be within the scope of this museum, which could provide walking tours of the market and educational seminars on historic methods of food production and storage. Based on the condition of the buildings, adaptive reuse combined with new design would not only protect the complex, but would also bring the site to its full zoning allowance, maximizing revenue for the city and assisting an underserved neighborhood. (For a more detailed summary of this design proposal please see Appendix IV: Charrette Design.)

The new design program takes into account the existing buildings' massing, materials, and ornamentation. The historic buildings' use of reinforced concrete, masonry, and limestone facades would be consistent with current development trends. Some original decorative elements could be carried over into the new buildings, such as the Lombard strip detail. The installation of a large, neon "Bronx Terminal Market" sign facing the river and Manhattan could announce the presence of this revitalized area, sympathetically accommodated within a historic context.

Our proposed plan focuses on preservation and re-use of the Bronx Terminal Market buildings, along with long term protection of their integrity through revived attention, new occupants, and a built-to-bulk site. New amenities and attractions at the Bronx Terminal Market site will draw traffic across the bridges from Manhattan as well as serving neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the Market and elsewhere in the Bronx. Furthermore, the new buildings and restored old buildings will combine for a revived, year-round center of activity, much as the area was in the past. The community will take once again take full advantage of its nearby transportation links, Yankee Stadium, and waterfront vistas.

Funding Options

The designation of the Terminal Market site, the Lehigh-Bronx Factory, and the Cashman Laundry Building would make these structures eligible for the Federal Historic Tax Incentives Program, which offers a 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit for the rehabilitation of historic structures listed on the National Register, provided they adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.^{xxx}

These buildings and other industrial buildings in the area can take advantage of the Industrial and Commercial Incentive Program through the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Development Corporation, which also applies to boroughs outside of Manhattan. This program offers property owners of manufacturing and commercial properties a partial twenty-five year exemption on real property taxes.^{xxxi}

Conservation and Reintegration of Underused Historic Built Fabric

The primary historic building materials in the Bronx Terminal Market area are masonry and reinforced concrete. As such, conservation issues and remedies run consistently throughout the area. Due to poor maintenance, many buildings have suffered damage from water infiltration. The reinforced concrete structures from the 1920s to the 1940s have suffered damage at wall joints and through roofs, which has resulted in oxide jacking, cracking, and/or spalling. Improper repairs and insensitive alterations have exacerbated these conditions.

Fortunately for conservationists, the industrial buildings were of a relatively simple construction and built to last. Therefore, remedies are straightforward, albeit extensive. If the historic industrial buildings of the Bronx Terminal Market area are to be reused as office or commercial structures, they will require considerable improvements and conservation measures, such as repointing, stabilization, window replacements, roof and flashing replacements, concrete patches, and repair of cracks in masonry walls. The scale of many of these buildings will call for the application of considerable resources, but the buildings themselves frequently have far more to offer new tenants than replacement modern construction could. (Detailed information can be found in Appendix I: Conservation and Appendix IV: Design Charrette)

Community Education

In order to garner community support for the Bronx Terminal Market area, a widespread education initiative will be necessary. We propose the creation of a not-for-profit group, the "Friends of the Bronx Terminal Market," which would engage in promotional campaigning to educate the community about landmark designation opportunities, stimulate private investment, and improve the general perception of the site. Establishment of a weekend farmer's market, attracting merchants from inside and outside the city, would revive a historic use of the market, help raise public awareness, funds, and sympathy for the neglected market buildings.

ⁱ History of Bronx New York. World Travel Gate. 2004.

http://www.americatravelling.net/usa/new_york/bronx/bronx_history.htm. 1 March 2004.

ⁱⁱ US Census, 1900.

ⁱⁱⁱ Caro, Robert A. *The Power Broker*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1975), 337.

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Reier, Sharon. *The Bridges of New York*. (New York: Dover, 2000) 85.

^{iv} Reier, 85.

^v Dolkart, Andrew S. *Guide to New York City Landmarks*. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1998) 170.

^{vi} Dolkart, 167.

^{vii} Rochefort, David A. *American Social Welfare Policy*. (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1986), 102.

^{viii} Reier, 82.

^{ix} Reier, 85.

^x Reier, 68.

^{xi} Reier, 85.

^{xii} Dolkart, 245.

^{xiii} Dolkart, 245.

^{xiv} Bagli, Charles V. Developer Buys Faded Market In the Bronx. *New York Times*. April 3, 2004. B1.

^{xv} Article from local Bronx paper

^{xvi} Department of Planning of New York City, *Zoning Handbook: A Guide to New York City's Zoning Resolution*, NYC DCP 90-37, New York, 1990, 38.

^{xvii} National Trust for Historic Preservation. "A Guide to Tax-Advantaged Rehabilitation." 9.

^{xviii} Housing Preservation and Development. *Tax Incentives: J-51*. (New York: Housing Preservation and Development/City of New York, 2004). <http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-developers/j51.html>.

-
- ^{xix} Housing Preservation and Development. Tax Incentives: 421-a. (New York: Housing Preservation and Development/City of New York, 2004). <http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-developers/421a.html>.
- ^{xx} *Proposed Consolidated Plan: Annual Performance Report 2003*. (New York: Department of City Planning/City of New York, 2004). <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/pub/prop2003apr.pdf>.
- ^{xxi} Local Initiatives Support Corporation. (New York: 2000-2004). <http://www.liscet.org>.
- ^{xxii} National Trust for Historic Preservation. "A Guide to Tax-Advantaged Rehabilitation," 9.
- ^{xxiii} Housing Preservation and Development. Tax Incentives: J-51. (New York: Housing Preservation and Development/City of New York, 2004). <http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-developers/j51.html>.
- ^{xxiv} *Proposed Consolidated Plan: Annual Performance Report 2003*. (New York: Department of City Planning/City of New York, 2004). <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/pub/prop2003apr.pdf>.
- ^{xxv} National Trust for Historic Preservation. "A Guide to Tax-Advantaged Rehabilitation." 9.
- ^{xxvi} Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Corporation. *Tax Benefits*. New York: Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Corporation, 1996-2003. http://www.umez.org/business_info_taxbenefits.htm.
- ^{xxvii} Preservation League of New York State. *A Grant Program of the Preservation League of New York State and the New York State Council on the Arts*. (New York: Preservation League of New York State). <http://www.preservenys.org/fundinghome.htm>.
- ^{xxviii} Local Initiatives Support Corporation. (New York: 2000-2004). <http://www.liscet.org>.
- ^{xxix} United States Environmental Protection Agency. "Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act." (Washington D.C.: 2002). <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/html-doc/2869ben.htm>
- ^{xxx} 36 CFR 67, *Historic Preservation Certifications Pursuant to Section 48(g) and Section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986*. Section 67.2. Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives. (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1986). <http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/tax/taxregs.htm>. 3.
- ^{xxxi} Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Corporation. *Tax Benefits*. New York: Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Corporation, 1996-2003. http://www.umez.org/business_info_taxbenefits.htm.