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I
Project Overview & Recommendations

The Town of Greenburgh Reconnaissance-Level Survey was initiated in late 2005 with fieldwork and photography conducted during the spring and summer of 2006. Compilation of the survey data base and a draft report were completed in August 2006 and this final document was completed in December 2006. The data base details basic architectural information about every property identified to have been built on or before 1900 and on selected properties dating between 1901 and 1961 so that the town can begin to manage information about its historic resources, assemble intensive-level records on them, and track actions they have taken to protect them. This digital format will facilitate presenting survey data in geographic and Internet information systems.

The report also provides recommendations for local designations and other applications of the survey data, as well as for the registration of selected historic resources on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. No local historic districts have been designated in the town, although the Greenburgh Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board (HLPB) has a number of individual properties under consideration. The survey findings will allow the HLPB to develop a strategy for approaching the historic preservation needs in the community.

As would be expected in a Westchester County town, the range of historic resources in Greenburgh spans from before the Revolutionary War to after the Second World War. Greenburgh’s role in the War of Independence has been well documented. Still, there is much more to be understood about historic resources in the town dating from the 18th century. The rare houses that survive from this period are now disguised by additions and alterations from later eras. The survey attempted to locate and record as many as possible, but inevitably some were assigned later construction dates because of changes in appearance. The most distinguishable group of early historic dwellings is dated in first half of the 19th century because their Greek Revival-style features are easily identified. This also reflects the period when Greenburgh’s farms were enjoying prosperity.

The spread of suburbanization was felt early in Greenburgh. Its Hudson River location and proximity to the city invited the construction of country houses in its riverside areas by the first decade following the Revolution. The completion of the Hudson River Railroad in 1848 further increased the spread of suburban homes and made living outside the city limits affordable for more people. These landings also became popular with day tourists and summer boarders. The Harlem Railroad, which was built along the Bronx River in the same period, made the eastern farm section of the town a popular (and more economical) summer tourist destination. As
development in the four Hudson River towns intensified—Tarrytown, Irvington, Dobbs Ferry, and Hastings—they became distinct villages in the 1870s. Residential subdivisions began appearing on the eastern edges of these villages soon after. In the first quarter of the 20th century, Hartsdale was an active center of suburban development and, as a neighbor of White Plains and Scarsdale, became the location of some of the most significant examples of domestic and commercial architecture in the suburban “English” style popular in Westchester County.

Although not as active as the county’s more northern towns, Greenburgh also has a large number of Depression-Era and Post WWII subdivisions. Some from the Depression period, such as Fulton Park, have important historical associations with the complete reformulation of domestic architecture and building methods that began in the Depression and multiplied fiercely with the federal policy to provide returning war veterans with new homes. This phenomenon has created a large number of subdivisions and houses that have or are coming into the historic realm. These resources cannot be interpreted or evaluated in the same way those dating to the 18th and 19th century have been, which presents a special challenge to the HLPB. However, with so much of its history now encapsulated in the suburban era, these resources cannot be ignored. A separate approach to their preservation must be devised.

The Town of Greenburgh has no single center. Only Hartsdale retains a semblance of a hamlet character. Commercial development is aligned to two historic corridors, White Plains-Tarrytown Road and Central Avenue, and residential developments (old and new), e.g., Orchard Hill, Fort Hill, Cotswold, Parkway Gardens, etc., have come to define distinct neighborhoods, which indicates the great geographical and cultural diversity in the town. The HLPB will have to keep these sub-areas in mind as they make assessments, consider designations, and develop a long-term historic preservation plan for Greenburgh.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Conduct further research and analysis of existing conditions to determine the authenticity of historic buildings surviving from the 18th and early 19th centuries (pre-dating suburban development). Too much credibility is given to vague and unsubstantiated estimations of age. In addition, a broader historic context needs to be developed for these houses that carries them through their entire history of ownership and the changes that ensued.

- Research into Greenburgh’s 18th century buildings will also help broaden the currently very limited knowledge of the range and characteristics of domestic architecture in the town and county. A more detailed knowledge of the land use and tenant society in the town would begin developing a sense of house types, living conditions, and social relationships. Yet, very little is known about the early architectural history of Westchester County, and there are precious few sources where any understanding can be obtained. The HLPB might explore collaborating with historical agencies in other towns on a broader study of the county that would provide a context for Greenburgh’s early buildings that could be used for public education as well as preservation action.

- Greenburgh’s history as a suburb now encompasses a longer period than that which preceded it, and it should be as carefully documented as any earlier era. It is a varied and
evolutionary history and lends itself to being broken up into numerous geographical and thematic projects. It began right after the Civil War when affluent New Yorkers established summer residences on old farms and in elegant new country estates. Resources from this “country club” period are declining in number and would comprise a good starting point. After that, there is the Hartsdale area development during the first three decades of the 20th century and the emergence of Westchester’s trademark English (aka Tudor) style of suburban architecture. This is quite a significant event. Greenburgh’s Depression-Era developments document the introduction of New Deal economic and social policies and their effect on domestic architecture. The significance of model communities like Fulton Park should be assessed in the context of federal model town projects that are now attracting the interest of scholars. Finally, Greenburgh’s Post-WWII developments can be examined to show the range of housing options available and the hierarchy of costs for house types and neighborhoods. The town contains both low-cost and high-end developments, which would provide the basis for comparative economic and social analysis. Of course, these later houses are also compelling in the contrast they present between old and modern elements of domestic design and construction. In spite of the ambivalence surrounding it, this era is already one of Westchester County’s most historically important. Further documentation of Greenburgh’s subdivisions and the people associated with them (both builders and residents) will be important. Expanding public awareness regarding Post-WWII housing is particularly important and timely. The recent exhibit on the suburbs at the Hudson River Museum in Yonkers and its companion book of historical essays written by scholars from a number of county colleges indicates a high level of academic interest, and the town should explore opportunities to get these colleges involved in research and field work projects.

- There are certain historic property types or themes that can help focus the ongoing documentation and preservation efforts of the HLPB. Vulnerable groups of resources, i.e. property types such as schools, churches, commercial buildings, apartment houses, barns, or municipally-owned resources are important to understand and identify for designations. Historic themes can be derived from the Contexts for Evaluation (Chapter III) or can be more specific. For example, resources associated with the Revolutionary War would constitute a thematic group and include a variety of property types, such as houses, churches, roads, encampment areas, or other landmarks. Greenburgh’s suburban history contains many themes. One important example is the African American presence in the town, which would extend from their introduction in the town as slaves to their living conditions as domestics in white households and in communities, such as Manhattan Park. Another dimension of this theme is the movement of middle-class blacks into the suburbs as homeowners and the example of Parkway Gardens.

- In all instances, better documentation is critical so that the HLPB can make accurate and defensible assessments of significance, make appropriate designations, protect valuable landmarks, and promote historic preservation in the community.

- The HLPB should consider all historic resources in the town constructed prior to the Civil War as significant and eligible for designation because of their age, rarity, and potential
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to provide new information about the town’s history. It is recommended that the HLPB monitor projects involving these properties and request that documentation and, if warranted, local designation take place if any threats occur. (Documentation should follow the Secretary of Interior’s Standards.)

- The HLPB should use the list of significant resources to plan for local designations and National Register nominations. It should start with willing property owners and build public support for the program. At least one nomination and/or designation should be accomplished each year.

- The HLPB should begin to educate the public about the range of property types in Greenburgh and how their architectural characteristics can be maintained, even with alterations to meet current lifestyle demands.

- The Town of Greenburgh should provide the HLPB with annual funds sufficient to obtain CLG grants that will allow it to maintain an on-going program of documentation, designation, and public education projects.

- The Town of Greenburgh should set an example by designating town-owned properties that are historically significant as landmarks and working with the HLPB to institute preservation plans for them.

**HISTORIC RESOURCES WORTHY OF CONSIDERATION FOR DESIGNATION**

**POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

*Neighborhood association names are noted in parenthesis where different from district name.*

- Cotswold
- East Irvington/”Little Dublin”
- Edgemont
- Fulton Park
- Glenville (Greenridge GCC)
- Hartsdale – 3 sections:
  - Columbia Avenue and Wilson Street
  - Hartsdale Manor (Caterson Tract)
  - Scarsdale Estates (Greenridge Section)
- Orchard Hill (Orchard Hill, Hilltop Farms, Sky Meadow, Broadview)
- Parkway Gardens
- Scarsdale-Longview
- Wyndover Park (Hillside-Wyndover)

**INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES**

**Domestic**

- Carr House, 8 Azalea Court
- 5 Campus Place (part of orig. Fort Hill Village; off Central Park Avenue – see Sentry Pl. below)
- 445 Dobbs Ferry Road (Jerome J. Hanaur barn complex)
- 900 Dobbs Ferry Road (British Col. Bryce Metcalf House)
- 956 Dobbs Ferry Road (gatehouse for Col. Bryce Metcalf House)
- 6 Don Lane
- 99 Dromore Road (“Nantucks” Lewis Rutherford Morris House)
- 161 Fort Hill Road
- 169 Fort Hill Road (Jacob Stymus House)
- 250 Fort Hill Road (John A. Hammond House)
- 364 Fort Hill Road (John Wesley LeViness House)
- 450 Fort Hill Road (Theodor C. Ewen House)
- 51 Grasslands Road (Italianate house on Hebrew Hospital Home property)
- 9 Hearthstone Circle (1760 house)
- 79 Hillcrest Road
- 27-47 N. Central Avenue (Hartsdale Gardens apartments)
- 32 N. Washington Avenue
- 28A - 30 Old Army Road (Villa Borghese)
- 190 Old Army Road (John James LeViness House)
- 221 Old Army Road (Israel Hunt House)
- 350 Old Army Road
- 5 Old Knollwood Road (Abram Bare Farmhouse)
- 400 Old Tarrytown Road (J. O. Dickman House)
- 39 Penny Lane (Otto Doering House)
- 425 Ridge Road (Odell House; NR)
- 460 Ridge Road (Druiller House)
- 2121 Saw Mill River Road (Romer Van Tassell House; NR)
- Sentry Place (part of Fort Hill Village; off Central Park Avenue)
- 120 Underhill Road (A. Graham grist mill)
- 123 Underhill Road (Seymore Wright House)
- 19 Winding Road Farm (Jonathan Lefurgy House)
- 475 West Hartsdale Avenue (Warburg Estate)
- 500 West Hartsdale Avenue (Jerome J. Hanaur Estate)
- 75 Worthington Road (Henry and Sarah Worthington House)
- 225 Worthington Road
- 265 Worthington Road (William Corlett House)

**Country Clubs**
- Knollwood Country Club
- St. Andrews Golf Club
- Scarsdale Golf Club
- Metropolis Country Club
- Sunningdale Country Club, 300 Underhill Road
- Elmwood Country Club

**Commercial Buildings**
- 511 Benedict Avenue (former Techtron HQ; now Bayer Global HQ)
- 95 Central Park Avenue, Carvel Ice Cream Stand
- 728 Central Park Avenue, Curry Chevrolet Dealership
- 734-760 Central Park Avenue
- 223 Hartsdale Avenue [East] (Hartsdale Railroad Station)
- 116 North Central Park Avenue
- 7 Taxter Road, Brick store
- 599 White Plains Road (tavern, stage coach stop)

**Individual Properties – Schools**
- Greenburgh Public School/High School, 33 Hillside Avenue
- Hackley School, 293 Benedict Avenue
- Highview School, 200 Central Avenue
- NY School for the Deaf, 555 Knollwood Road
- Red Brick Schoolhouse, 2 Stadium Road
- Seely Place School, Seely Place
- E. Irvington School, 50 Taxter Road
- Westchester Community College, 71 Grasslands Road

**Individual Properties – Churches**
- Church of St. Joseph of Arimathea Episcopal, 2172 Saw Mill River Road
- St. Andrews Episcopal/Anglican Church, 101 Central Park Avenue
- Union Baptist Church, 31 Manhattan Avenue

**Individual Properties – Cemeteries**
- Hartsdale Canine [Pet] Cemetery, 75 North Central Park Avenue

**OTHER -Neighborhood Conservation Districts**
The following areas have been identified as “Neighborhood Conservation Districts” (NCDs) to reflect their potential to evolve into more standard historic districts within the foreseeable future. They all represent cohesive groups of buildings, built within similar timeframes and, in many cases, that have singular architectural styles no longer in vogue. A new legal mechanism would be required to gain any type of review authority such as prohibition of demolition, but in the short term these areas should be monitored and public outreach efforts made to owners to promote their overall design character. The neighborhood association names for these areas are noted in parentheses, where different than the proposed NCDs.)
- Biltom Road (Saw Mill Valley)
- Donald Park
- Fort Hill Estates (Longview)
- Hartsdale Lawns (Hartsdale Lawns & Manor)
- Knollwood Heights (Mayfair Knollwood)
- Knollwood Manor (Mayfair Knollwood)
- Mayfair Acres (Mayfair Knollwood)
- Mt. Joy Avenue-Dorchester Drive (Longview)
- Parkway Homes
- Sherman-Drisler-Finmore (Saw Mill Valley)
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II
Methodology & Selection Criteria

SURVEY OBJECTIVES

The goal of the survey was to compile a basic level of architectural data on notable buildings in the town constructed on or before 1960 and to associate them with periods and themes determined to have historic and/or architectural significance. In 1988 and 1989 the Westchester County Planning Department undertook surveys in accordance with the National Preservation Act and requirements for projects using federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. In that effort data was collected for approximately 118 properties in the town on standard “blue forms.” Although that survey information is not available in digital form, it has been largely updated and incorporated within the database of properties prepared as a result of this project. The digital format of the current survey will allow for continual updating over time as more intensive research is accomplished and more detailed information on historic resources is obtained. Text and image data is combined to create an information system that will aid research, education, and planning.

There are still no state or federal standards or models for digital survey projects, so a basic format developed by the consultant was used. It was designed to record descriptive building data and architectural classifications so that the historic resources in the town can be grouped and analyzed in terms of type, form, construction method, material, period, style, location, etc. It will be up to the town to annotate and apply this base data so that the model is tested and refined.

METHODOLOGY

- Tax parcel, address, account, and print key information obtained from the Town was associated to each entry to ensure that the survey data could be used in conjunction with other property information and data bases that may exist or be developed in the future. The survey data was also mapped using the Town’s Geographic Information System (GIS).

- To ensure that a suitable context was created for the assessment of 20th-century resources and that the “50-year rule” would be relevant a few years into the future, it was determined that the survey would include resources built in 1960 or earlier. Visual inspection was the initial method of establishing this cut, and reference to the Assessor’s online tax parcel
information provided verification of construction dates, particularly for 20th century resources. Since the Assessor was recording the construction dates of buildings as they were built and entered on the tax rolls, buildings from the 1920s were considered more accurate than the estimates made for houses built before official Town records were kept. Historic maps, local histories, and other primary sources were used to determine approximate construction dates for earlier structures.

- To create a data base that is comprehensive up to the 20th century, we attempted to individually survey every building in the town with a construction date of 1900 or earlier. Properties with structures constructed after 1900 were assessed in the field and recorded if they possess a high level of architectural distinction and physical integrity. In extensive subdivisions from this period, representative examples were selected and the tax parcel information recorded for the subdivision as a whole.

- Vacant parcels generally were not included in this survey as Greenburgh is considered to be “built out” and virtually all undeveloped parcels are within parks, conservation areas or otherwise used for recreational purposes (such as golf courses).

- Field and research data was entered and tabulated in a spreadsheet format (Microsoft Excel). This data base represents the substantive results of this reconnaissance-level survey.

- Each property entered in the data base is represented by one or more digital images and black and white archival photographs that will provide visual information about buildings and settings. Selected images were also used to illustrate sections of the report.

- Using a GIS application, the historic resource data collected in this survey has been mapped to illustrate the location and distribution of surveyed properties and potential historic districts. Further mapping can be done to illustrate historic resources representing various characteristics, such as date of construction, material, roof type, whether there are barns or garages, etc.

**SELECTION CRITERIA**

A number of historic resources have been selected for consideration of designation, for protection, or for future study. These selections were guided by the criteria established for evaluating eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. When applied at a local level of significance, the National Register criteria is a valuable tool for determining a property’s importance in the broader historic contexts and themes that are reflected in the community’s history.

It is important to maintain focus on the local perspective; otherwise notable properties may be overlooked. At a reconnaissance level of survey specific historic documentation is limited, condition assessment superficial, and contexts and themes only broadly developed; as a result these selections were made to be as inclusive as possible. Whereas not all of the selected properties will necessarily achieve State and National Register listings, it will be important for
the HLPB to be familiar with all of the town’s significant resources, including those at the margins. Even if a specific property does not appear eligible for listing on the National Register, it does not mean the historic resource is unimportant in Greenburgh. The National Register criteria will still provide the HLPB with the basis to make its own evaluations within a more flexible evaluative framework.

There are four fundamental criteria by which the significance of historic resources is determined by the National Register. Properties will be significant for (A) their relationship to a historic event or theme significant in American history, such as settlement, agriculture or the Revolutionary War; (B) their association with an individual who made a significant contribution to the history of the local community, state or nation; (C) their distinction as an example of a type, period or method of construction; and (D) their archeological potential to provide information about an important aspect of prehistory or history. Significance can be established based on one or more of these criteria. In addition, a property must be at least fifty years in age to establish a suitable context for the evaluation of significance (unless it can be demonstrated that it has achieved significance in less than fifty years); and the property must retain sufficient physical integrity from its period of significance to be authentic.

A. Historic Significance
Many properties in Greenburgh have associations with important events or have played roles that have had a measurable effect on local history. While the historic significance of many properties remains obscure at a reconnaissance level of survey, selections can be made by classifying properties in general areas of significance established in the criteria. Commerce, education, recreation, transportation, and architecture are areas of significance that will have particular relevance to Greenburgh. (See Areas of Significance section for greater elaboration of these contexts.)

B. Association with a Significant Person
A few properties in Greenburgh will have associations with individuals of state or national significance, but the Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board should be aware of buildings linked to persons important in local history. The dwellings of the original settlers or those people whose accomplishments in the 19th and 20th centuries made them prominent in local records apply to this category whether or not their homes also have architectural significance. Significant persons are not just those who had impact on the news. For example, the home of a known ex-slave or African American community leader will also have significance. It is important not to overlook this criterion, which often is applied only at the state level or higher.

C. Architectural Significance
Since the National Register of Historic Places was created to address the significance of the built environment, the architecture criterion is the most frequently applied of all, at times at the expense of the others. Architecture covers a wide range of historic resource types, and this criterion needs to be carefully tailored to address the particular historic and architectural contexts of the Town of Greenburgh. (See Part V for an overview of the architecture in the town.)
• **Farm houses.** Among the defining historic resources in the Town of Greenburgh, none are more significant than the 18th-century and early 19th-century than the multi-story, three- and five-bay wood frame farmhouses that are the basis of the architectural heritage of the town, as well as Westchester County, as a whole. They form the basis of a long architectural history extending from the mid-1700s to the late 1800s that includes the small, modest dwellings of tenant farmers and farm laborers at its earliest stages and the large, fancy houses built by prosperous farmers as time progressed. While some of the larger and more elaborate examples obviously will be eligible for the National Register, the criteria will also allow for the fair consideration of the architectural significance of middling and small houses at a local level if they are sufficiently intact and documented. As noted above, some of the smaller, older dwellings will be identified as components of later, larger farmhouses illustrating the course of development of farming in the town as well as the practice of the conservation and re-use of existing dwellings in new construction.

• **Barns and farm buildings.** Barns and farm buildings are distinctive representations of the agricultural heritage of the Town of Greenburgh. Like farmhouses, they are important landmarks of a historic rural landscape. Active farming is all but extinct in the town, and the rare examples of barns and farm buildings are very vulnerable. Historic barns and outbuildings have been prioritized in the selection process.

• **Hamlet dwellings.** This survey of Greenburgh covers an area outside of the incorporated villages—Tarrytown, Irvington, Ardsley, Dobbs Ferry, Hastings-on-Hudson, and Elmsford—which are contained within the town. One hamlet setting that remains intact within the survey area is Hartsdale, a railroad suburb that began to take form in the 1880s, although development greatly accelerated after 1900. There is a wide range of dwelling types and periods, built at various stages in the hamlet’s development. A small grid of streets is located north of East Hartsdale Avenue, and it contains some of the oldest houses in the hamlet. Later houses in English and Colonial styles are arranged along more serpentine streets. Partial hamlet areas also are located in Glenville and East Irvington.

• **Domestic outbuildings.** Many residential buildings have support buildings that may have significance. Notable among these are small barns, and, in later years, garages. The significance of these features will usually be considered in conjunction with the principal building on the property and assessed as contributing elements of the overall resource. There will be instances where an outbuilding will rival the major feature for significance. Early garages will often be significant in their own right and as barns and carriage houses become increasingly rare, they become significant individually.

• **Commercial buildings.** Without a central place, commercial development in Greenburgh is concentrated on two major arteries: White Plains-Tarrytown Road and Central Avenue. There also is a small commercial area near the Hartsdale train station. Storefronts of older businesses have changed over time to reflect changing products, shop design, and advertising. Increasing use of the automobile gradually altered shopping patterns along these routes and fostered changes in layout to accommodate parking and “drive-up” access. Highway development was a direct result of the growing use of the automobile, and the
design of roadside architecture reflected it. Diners, gas stations, and ice cream stands are resources whose significance needs to be considered.

- **Resort and recreational buildings.** Few resources remain with direct associations with Greenburgh’s history as a destination for summer tourists. Once the Harlem Railroad opened in 1848, small hotels and boarding houses in the Bronx River valley served as cool retreats from the city’s summer heat. (Hudson River towns of Tarrytown, Irvington, Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson also attracted tourism, but although they are technically still part of the Town of Greenburgh, they are not a part of the survey area.) Country houses, some built for that purpose and some created on older farmsteads, are distinctive residential types in this category. There are six historic country clubs in the town, which also are associated with this theme.

- **Corporate headquarters.** This is a category important in Westchester County where the growing population and suburban setting led many major corporations to establish research and office parks there. Greenburgh is home to two important architectural examples: the Union Carbide & Carbon Corporation headquarters in Eastview and the former Texitron facility (now occupied by the Bayer Corporation) in the historic Glenville area. (Both of these complexes are just less than 50 years old.) There is more office development along the White Plains-Tarrytown Road, one of the county’s primary corporate corridors.

- **Institutional buildings.** Educational and religious buildings are located throughout the town, and they are generally historically significant due to their community function. Many of them also are distinctive architecturally. Government facilities that are operated and maintained in the public trust often are historic and need to be evaluated and protected. The town can set a model for others by adopting a preservation plan for historic properties under its jurisdiction.

- **Buildings constructed prior to 1865.** All surviving resources dating from before the Civil War represent a period in local, state, and national history that is now remote enough to be of significance by reason of their survival. Clearly those resources with dates closer to the cusp are more common; yet, they are part of a closed and dwindling set. This condition should be recognized and widely promoted, and every effort should be made to prevent the loss of any of these irreplaceable resources.

- **Buildings constructed 1935-1960.** The most recent historic era also demands special attention, though for different reasons. Recent scholarship demonstrates that the subdivision and housing boom that occurred immediately following the Second World War – with the direct involvement of the U.S. government in its planning, design and financing structure – is indeed a historic event. More than another event, it has had an enduring effect on the growth of suburban communities like that which Town of Greenburgh has become. Only now have National Register authorities begun to address the significance of 20th-century resources and the implications their numbers and mass-produced, industrial features will have on the conventional ways the criteria have been applied since 1966 when the National Register was created. The entire range of 20th-century resources up to 1960 has been included in this survey so that there is a basis of architectural information on which to
build and base future assessments. In the meantime, this survey should assist the HLPB in developing an understanding of the historic and architectural characteristics that distinguish post-war housing.

- **Landscapes.** All historic properties have landscape components that should not be overlooked when assessments are made. Agricultural landscapes have a heightened significance because of their critical role in the definition of a farm and the image of the town. As open space becomes increasingly consumed by development, this land becomes more rare and more significant. Nevertheless, house yards are also important for providing appropriate settings for historic resources and residential environments overall. Any assessment of a historic property that does not address its landscape component is incomplete. Landscape features, such as stone walls, tree lines and hedgerows, roads and other structures, need to be enumerated when historic properties are documented. Greenburgh’s large golf courses are also historic landscapes to be evaluated.

D. Archeological sites, historic and prehistoric
Like landscape characteristics, the archeological potential of a historic property should be always a factor of an assessment of significance. A general assumption can be made that there is a good chance that evidence of the Native American presence can be found in just about any section of the town. Proposed development sites will require careful analysis. Any site that formerly contained buildings, such as mill sites, should be carefully recorded and protected. Revolutionary encampment areas also should be recorded and monitored.

E. Integrity
The National Register criteria contain an integrity test to ensure that only authentic buildings receive listings. At this reconnaissance level of survey selections of buildings constructed before 1900 were not based on physical integrity. Properties with the potential to meet one of the criteria have been recorded. The physical integrity of a particular resource will be considered only if it reaches the status of being considered for designation. Because of their greater number and many shared characteristics, the integrity test has been more strictly applied for buildings constructed in the 20th century. Only those buildings with intact design features: exterior materials, windows, doors, porches, etc., have been included in the survey unless they have been determined to be part of a development plan with potential historic significance.

**LOCATION OF SURVEY INFORMATION**
Copies of the survey report and data base (CD) is filed and accessible to the public at the New York State Historic Preservation Office, Peebles Island, Waterford, New York, and with the Town of Greenburgh’s Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board in the Community Development and Conservation Department at the Greenburgh Town Hall. In addition, the Excel historic resource data base has been provided to the Westchester County Planning Department.
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III
Contexts for Evaluation
Historic Periods

CONTEXTS FOR EVALUATION
Historic resources in Greenburgh have been classified in a number of historic contexts that allow for their assessment and interpretation. The following list identifies contexts that are reflected in the collected data. These categories have been taken from data categories from the National Register Information System (NRIS)

Agriculture
Although historic resources associated with agriculture are now scarce in the town, farming was the basis of the local economy and society for much of its history. Many houses once associated with farms survive, but their physical context comprised of barns, outbuildings, and working landscapes has changed. Properties with intact groupings of farm buildings in a rural setting are very rare resources. Houses representing the agricultural history of the town have a historical significance.

Architecture
Many historic resources—predominantly houses—have been included in the survey for their architectural design merit, that is, how they represent certain historic building forms, house plans, or stylistic periods. Distinctive characteristics have been identified that illustrate architectural forms and design expression particular to the town. Property types, construction materials and methods, and decorative ornament are noted.

Commerce
In the distant past, most commercial activity in the town was a function of its rural, agriculture-based society. Stores and trades principally serviced local farm families. Other commerce was a function of travel on regional roads and turnpikes that traversed the town, in particular the White Plains-Tarrytown Road. Inns, taverns, liveries, blacksmith, wagon and harness shops were located at important settlements along these routes. The character of these services changed in the 20th century as the automobile became the common mode of travel, as did the function and design of historic resources associated with them. Likewise, as suburban residential development increased in the last century, notably in the years following the Second World War, commercial activity expanded to meet the demand for services resulting in a majority of historic resources representing this period.
Community Planning & Development
Greenburgh’s community development and planning originated with the populating of the Philipse Manor in the 18th century. At that time, the plan was to develop a proprietorship populated with leaseholders. This gradually evolved into precinct or township plan containing independent farms networked into hamlet groupings for trade and commerce, as well as church affiliations. This system was effective into the 20th century, even as overlays of summer homes and resorts and early exurban residential development appeared. The construction of regional highways, parkways, and the New York water supply system in this period had significant effect on community planning and the development of the town. Suburban residential and commercial development increased as the 20th century progressed, and community planning shifted to other goals, primarily, transportation, education, recreation, and conservation.

Conservation
Conservation is a major theme in the town’s 20th-century history. The Westchester park and parkway system grew out of a movement for the conservation of water purity and the preservation of natural resources along the county’s interior rivers and aquifers. The construction of the Bronx River and Saw Mill River Parkways were outcomes of this conservation effort.

Education
Schools are important landmarks in any community, and examples of this category of historic resources have been identified in the survey.

Engineering
While no dams or reservoirs are contained in the town, the Croton, Catskill and Delaware aqueducts, as well as a pipeline from the Kensico Reservoir, traverse the Town of Greenburgh. The New York City water supply system is a significant historic example of engineering in the state (and has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places). At least one structure associated with it was identified in this survey. The parkway system also has significance in an engineering context.

Entertainment/Recreation
Historic parks and golf courses are significant in a recreation context. Historic resources associated with entertainment include theaters, movie houses, casino/dance halls, social clubs, music halls, ballparks, etc.

Landscape Architecture
Recreational parks, golf courses, and country houses often have landscapes that were designed in a conscious and artistic manner incorporating vegetative, water and built features to enhance the visual appreciation of the property.

Military
There are a number of historic resources in Greenburgh associated with events of the Revolutionary War. The significance of these properties pertains to this context.
Religion
Like schools, churches are important community landmarks. Religion played a significant role in the definition of rural communities in the 18th and 19th centuries, and Greenburgh was no exception. In the 20th century the diversity of religions and churches represents the growth and demographic shifts that occurred as sparsely-settled, homogeneous, rural towns transformed with suburbanization.

Transportation
Early roads, particularly those following the Saw Mill and Bronx rivers and those connecting White Plains with the Hudson River were important regional routes. They also played significant roles during the Revolutionary War. Railroads also had an impact on the history of the town. The New York & Harlem and Hudson River railroads pass through the eastern and western limits of the town, respectively. The New York City & Putnam Railroad, later built along the Saw Mill River, crosses through the center of the town. In the 1920s the Bronx River and Saw Mill River Parkways were opened by the Westchester County Park Commission. These became important automobile transportation corridors and remain so. The White Plains-Tarrytown Road travels east-west, intersecting the railroads and parkways, and has been as important as the rest. Central Park Avenue has its own distinctive history as a regional road. In the 1950s and 1960s the Thruway and the Cross-Westchester Expressway expanded the interstate network through the town. The Sprain Brook Parkway, a road planned by the Westchester County Park Commission but eventually built by New York State, was the last addition to this regional parkway/highway system. Greenburgh contains some of the most heavily used highways in the Northeast. Engineering features associated with these transportation structures, as well as the recreational, commercial, or residential developments that have occurred along them are significant in this context.
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IV.
Chronology of Historic Events

The following chronology lists historical information that relates to places and physical buildings within the Town of Greenburgh, as a reference for fieldwork conducted under Phase II of the project. Most information summarized in this section was obtained from the following sources, unless otherwise footnoted. Assertions about early buildings have not been verified.

- Census data (HeritageQuest)
- Most of the material post-1888 is cited from The New York Times which was digitally retrieved using the ProQuest search engine.

Prehistory

The town now known as Greenburgh was a part of the area controlled by the Weckquaesqueeks Tribe of the Mohegan Indians and part of the Algonquin nation.

1645
August 30, 1645: A peace treaty was entered into between the Director-General Kieft of the Dutch West India Company, which encouraged European settlement in the Hudson River Valley region. The first residence in what is now known as Tarrytown was reputedly built this year.¹

1649
Director-General Peter Stuyvesant (who had succeeded Kieft in 1647) acting on behalf of the Dutch West India Company purchased a large tract of lands from the Indians, which included a portion of the town of Greenburgh.

1665
Dutch-owned property was seized by the English and came under the control of His Royal Highness, James, Duke of York of Great Britain.

1681
December 10, 1681: Frederick Philipse purchased a tract of land along the “Pekantico” in present-day Greenburgh and Mount Pleasant, beginning on the north side of the creek “Bisightic” (now Sunnyside Brook).

¹ http://www.tarrytowngov.com/servlets/WebPage?actionid=950&eid=44501
April 12, 1682: Frederick Philipspe made a second purchase of land which included the areas now known as the villages of Tarrytown, Irvington, and Dobbs Ferry.

September 6, 1682: Frederick Philipspe purchased a third tract of land from the Indians.

By act of the English General Assembly in, Westchester County was established as one of the 10 original counties in New York.

Frederick Philipspe purchased his fourth and final tract of land from the Indians in Greenburgh, which lay east of the Sawmill and west of the Bronx River.

Frederick Philipspe built a house as part of a dowry for his daughter, located on what is now called Old Knollwood Rd.

Royal Charter granted by William and Mary, King and Queen of Great Britain constituting Van Cortlandt as “Lord of the Manor” of Phliipsburg, including confirmation of his claims to the lands, consolidating the tracts, and defining the boundaries of the property.

The minute book of the town clerk for the Manor of Philipsburgh documents a number of roads among which are the following: present Broadway running north from the Thomas Storm homestead to the old mill on the Pocantico; the King Road from Thomas Storms to “the Graet Rock Stone Sigghees” which marks the dividing line between Greenburgh and Yonkers. Other roads are listed in the minutes in years that follow.

The Paulding family settled in the East View area of town. John Paulding became famous for his role in the capture of Major Andre during the Revolutionary War.

About this year Joseph Youngs settled in the area; his farmhouse was located near the intersection of Rt. 100 and Rt. 100c in 1988,

**Revolutionary War Events relevant to Greenburgh**

The John Youngs farmhouse (see 1760 entry) was burned by the British.

All land claims by the English were extinguished by the Legislature of New York and those of Col. Frederick Philipspe, the original lord of the manor, were confiscated. The Legislature also enacted a law providing for the appointment of Commissioners of Forfeitures who would be responsible for selling the lands that had been confiscated.

In July the allied American and French armies formed a junction near Dobbs Ferry and occupied contiguous encampments. The French lined the hills to the
east extending as far as the Bronx River. The Jackson Odell house was used as the headquarters by the French commander, Count de Rochambeau. The remains of seven ovens used by Rochambeau’s men occupied a corner of this property.

During the summer General Washington was headquartered at Joseph Appleby’s farmhouse, which occupied a farm on high ground off Secor Road in the area now called Hartsdale.

1784
May 12, 1784: A supplementary act to the 1779 act that extinguished the land claims of the English and established Commissioners of Forfeitures appointed Isaac Stoutenburgh and General Philip Van Cortland as said commissioners and the following year they sold the lands in fee mostly to those who had been former tenants under the hereditary proprietor and lord. The deeds given by these commissioners were to operate as a warranty of the State against all future claims. The titles to all the tracts in Greenburgh are traceable back to these commissioners’ deeds.

1785
December 6, 1785: William Davids bought a farm on the northern border of Greenburgh from the Commissioners of Forfeitures (later owned by John R. Stephens) and by which to town’s northern boundary is demarcated. A part of these premises were purchased by Philo H. Perry and became the site of his stone mansion (later the Kingsland estate).

1788
March 7, 1788: Greenburgh was created and named by the State Legislature of New York; its boundaries were set out relative to the manor established by royal charter in the previous century. The name given it is most likely an English translation of the earlier Dutch moniker Groen Burg. At the time of its creation it included the settlements of Hastings-on-Hudson, Dobbs Ferry, Ardsley, Irvington, Tarrytown and Elmsford, all of which would eventually become incorporated villages.

1790
U.S. Census: 1,269 free whites
9 other free persons, 122 slaves

1800
U.S. Census: 1,456 free whites
16 other free persons, 109 slaves

1810
U.S. Census: 1,642 free whites,
24 other free persons, 115 slaves

1820
U.S. Census:
2,011 free whites
32 foreigners, not naturalized
25 slaves
72 free blacks
310 persons engaged in agriculture
31 persons engaged in commerce
108 persons engaged in manufacturing

1830  U.S. Census:
No population aggregates
  0 employed in mining
  445 employed in agriculture
  37 employed in commerce
  207 employed in manufacturing & trades
  4 employed in navigation of ocean
  17 employed in navigation of rivers, canals, etc.
  29 employed in learned professions
  10 schools and 1 academy
  339 scholars (15 in academy)
  12 illiterate persons over 20

1832  A Methodist Episcopal Church was built on a site called “Rock Scilly” at the
intersection of Hillcrest Avenue and Ridge Road.

1834  New York State Legislature authorized NYC to construct a water works system
(Croton Reservoir).

1835  Design and construction of the Croton Reservoir, which was routed through the
villages in the eastern portion of the town began in 1835, which resulted in an
influx of workers into the area.

1840  U.S. Census: 3,253 free whites, 110 free blacks

About this time the settlement now known as Hastings-on-Hudson was largely
laid out in small lots on land owned by Anthony Constant, and assumed the form
it was to retain.

1842  The Dutch Reformed Church at Greenville was built near intersection of Central
Park Avenue and Old Army Road.

1844  December 1, 1844: The New York and Harlem Railroad extended its service
northward along the eastern edge of Greenburgh to White Plains.²

1850  U.S. Census:
No population aggregates
651 dwellings (1,114 dwellings including villages)
approx. 700 households (1,362 households including villages)

(Westchester County, NY: the Historical Preservation Committee of Bicentennial Committee of Westchester,
Inc., 1977.)
1854 The name of the village known as Dearman, after Justus Dearman of New York City (who had bought one-half of the William Dutcher farm in 1817 and lived on it until 1848), was renamed Irvington after Washington Irving. Previously, on April 25, 1850, the land, bought by John Jay in 1848, had been laid out into building lots and named the village of Dearman, were sold at public auction.

1860 U.S. Census:
1,614 dwellings + 9 unoccupied (3,493 including villages)
1,616 households (3,612 including villages)

1870 U.S. Census:
(includes villages)
1,648 dwellings
1,921 households
5,175 white males
5,630 white females
62 black males
81 black females
10,948 total population
1,547 males foreign born
1,801 females foreign born
1 insane
1 blind

This year the Village of Tarrytown was incorporated as a separate municipality within the Town of Greenburgh.

1872 The Village of Irvington was incorporated.
The Hartsdale Methodist Church was constructed on East Hartsdale Ave.

1873 July 5, 1873: The Village of Dobbs Ferry was incorporated under the name of Greenburgh, which was a compromise amongst the residents, who disliked the name by which the settlement had historically been known. An act of the New York Legislature changed the name back to Dobbs Ferry a few years later.

1877 July 3, 1877: The New York, Westchester and Putnam Railroad was formed as a reorganization, and on March 1, 1878 was leased to the New York City and Northern Railroad (formed February 18, 1878). The line finally opened under the original plan, ending at Brewster, in April 1881. That same year, the New York and New England Railroad opened to the north, using some of the grade originally built for the Putnam and Dutchess Railroad.3

1878 The New York, Westchester & Putnam was formed to hold any assets of value, namely the unfinished railroad running from High Bridge in the Bronx, all the

way up to Carmel. The NYC & Northern Railroad was formed in 1879 to complete the railroad.\(^4\)

1879

The village of Hastings-on-Hudson was incorporated in 1879. At the same time its name was changed from Hastings-Upon-Hudson to its present name. The settlement supposedly received its name from an early resident named Saunders who reportedly had been born in the English town of Hastings, where William the Conqueror won a famous battle in 1066. Saunders operated one of the first factories in Hastings.\(^5\)

1880

Glenville, a hamlet in the northwestern corner of unincorporated Greenburgh was the location for stone quarrying and cutting in the last two decades of the 19\(^{th}\) century.

U.S. Census
(excludes villages; appears incomplete)
Election District #5
97 dwellings
103 households

1883

Sara Worthington, widow of Henry Worthington, had a private family chapel and mausoleum built of stone on her estate in the hamlet Worthington. Upon her death in 1899 the building was deeded to the Episcopal Church and consecrated as a chapel of the Parish of St. Mark’s Church. In 1931 the chapel was incorporated into the Diocese of New York as the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Joseph of Arimathea.

1886

The geographical center of the township 1886 was located about midway between the Hudson and the Bronx rivers, on a line drawn from an estate below the village of Irvington to the north side of the hamlet of Hart’s Corners (now Hartsdale) on the east, just north of a site designated as Washington’s Headquarters on the Bromley’s Town Atlas.

1890

Construction of the New Croton Aqueduct, which ran through the villages on the eastern side of the town, brought workers to the town in general, leading to an increase in population and residential and commercial development. A barrack, a cook house, and a gatehouse, which provided access to the subterranean aqueduct, were located in the hamlet of Glenville. At about the same time, a trolley line was built through the hamlet of Glenville and a station shelter for it was built near the intersection of Tarrytown Road and Benedict Ave.

1895

The Knollwood Country Club was designed as the centerpiece of an exclusive “tuxedo” development in the northern part of central Greenburgh, adjacent to


\(^5\) http://www.hastingshistorical.org/Hastingshistory.html#Beginnings4
Elmsford. The course laid out this year was a “short layout” with very small greens. However, it eventually matured into a par-69, 5,305-yard course that established lay of the land as important as length in determining the difficulty of a course. When two adjacent parcels of land became available in the 1920s, they were bought and a new course, designed by Seth Raynor and Charles Banks was opened there in 1927. This course was unusual in that it incorporated a 19th hole as a method of engaging the golfers returning to the clubhouse after finishing the standard 18 holes.6

1896 The settlement of Ardsley was incorporated as a Village within the town of Greenburgh. A Dec. 7, 1895 ballot was used to canvass the residents of the Village of Ashford, as Ardsley was then known, regarding its legal incorporation as a village. A new name was required since another “Ashford” already existed in New York State. Like so many Westchester communities at the turn of the 20th century, Ardsley was determined to obtain local control of its services.7

This same year the Ardsley Country Club, which was a part of the Ardsley Casino complex, opened. This development was conceived on a grand scale, intended to be comparable to Newport and Tuxedo as a summer playground for the fabulously wealthy.8 Indeed, its membership included the likes of J.P. Morgan, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Louis Tiffany, John D. Rockefeller, Henry Villard, and Chauncey Depew.

1897 In August of this year the St. Andrews Golf Course in the Mount Hope area of Greenburgh opened. It was comprised of 160 acres and a Dutch Colonial Revival-style clubhouse overlooking the 9-hole golf course. On November 14, 1888 the St. Andrews Golf Club was founded by a group of 6 men at a dinner party hosted by John Reid on this date. (The other men were: John Upman, Henry Tallmadge, Harry Holbrook, Kingman Putnam, and Alexander Kinnan.) Earlier that year, on Washington’s Birthday (coincidentally on the same day the infamous Blizzard of 1888 hit), they had played their first round of golf together in Yonkers, sharing one set of golf clubs. Thus, it is claimed that this is the oldest enduring golf club in the United States.9

1898 The Scarsdale Golf Club, located on the southern edge of Greenburgh adjacent to the Village of Scarsdale and the Scarsdale station on the New York and Harlem railroad line, opened its 9-hole golf course this year. The course was designed by Willie Dunn. Within two years the course was expanded to 18 holes, designed by Carl Fox, the first golf professional employed by the club. After two previous clubhouses burned down, the present clubhouse was christened in 1922.10

7 http://www.westchesterarchives.com/HT/muni/ardsley/incorp.html
9 ibid, pp. 208-211.
10 ibid, p. 273.
1900  
U.S. Census: (excludes villages; appears incomplete)
296 dwellings
296 households

1902  
Ferncliff Cemetery on Secor Road was organized by Lutherans from the Bronx.
A chapel was erected on the site for religious services.

1904  
The Century Country Club purchased a 100-acre property in central Greenburgh, along Landers Road (once belonging to J. W. Taggard?) where it constructed an 18-hole course designed by Herbert Strong. An existing farmhouse on the property, noted for its white columns and a marble terrace, was used as the clubhouse until it burned to the ground in 1969. 11

1907  
The Bronx River Commission was established to acquire the necessary lands, eliminate nuisance conditions, and build the Bronx River Parkway as a joint undertaking between New York City and Westchester County. The Bronx River Parkway Reservation, which parallels the parkway, was the first parkland in Westchester County. 12

1910  
The Village of Elmsford, known as Storm's Bridge in the early 1700's, as Greenburgh for a time, and then as Hall's Corners during the middle of the nineteenth century, was incorporated this year. Its present name was adopted in 1870 and inspired by a mammoth elm tree, nearly thirty feet in circumference that had been a landmark since revolutionary days.

1911  
Construction of an expanded NYC water works, the Catskill Aqueduct, resulted in a major construction project within the unincorporated portion of the town, and ultimately spawned a new wave of residential growth due to the numbers of laborers working in the area.

1916  
The Sunningdale Golf Club bought a 175-acre site above what is now the Sprain Brook Parkway and by 1918 had constructed an 18-hole golf course designed by Walter Travis. The course was reconfigured slightly in 1930 when a swimming pool was added and encroached on a few of the holes. The course is said to have retained its true park-like setting. 13

1916  
Dr. Lewis Rutherford Morris purchased a 33-acre tract of land along Central Park Avenue to build his country retreat. He was an explorer who conducted expeditions to Canada and Alaska and one of the founders of the New York Zoological Society. C. Grant La Farge was the architect for Morris’s country home, which was completed by 1918. Morris named it “Nunataks,” an Eskimo

word meaning “hill of stone.” In 1973 town residents passed a referendum to authorize a bond issue to purchase the property and create the Greenburgh Nature Center.

1920 U.S. Census: Town of Greenburgh outside of villages (approximate): 664 dwellings, 738 households

1922 The New York Legislature passed a law that established the Westchester County Park Commission (WCPC) and giving it the authority to acquire lands for parks and parkways.

1922 The Pelhamhurst Golf Club, located north of Dobbs Ferry Road and south of Elmsford was formed and opened its 9-hole golf course this year. By 1925 it was taken over by the Elmsford Country Club and the course redeveloped according to a design by A. W. Tillinghast. Lou Gehrig, the New York Yankee ballplayer, was a frequent guest in the years that followed. The club went bankrupt in 1943 and was reorganized under its present ownership as the Elmwood Country Club. The present clubhouse was dedicated in 1930. In 1954 additional land was bought and the course modified by Alfred Tull. A Japanese garden created in 1989 with a stone bridge on the course.14

1922 The Metropolis Country Club was formed and purchased the site of the former Century Club in central Greenburgh. At the end of the 1920s, additional land was acquired and A. W. Tillinghast was engaged to redesign the course. (See note regarding the Century Club under 1904 date.)15

1923 – 1933 During this decade the WCPC planned and built over a dozen parks and several new parkways; three of which run through Greenburgh and its villages: the Bronx River Parkway, the Saw Mill River Parkway, and the Sprain Brook Parkway. [The latter while planned by the WCPC was actually built by the State of New York in the 1960s.) These routes opened up large land tracts for residential and commercial development.

1925 America's first public-access parkway, the Bronx River Parkway, opened.

1926 A syndicate organized by M.S. Goodman and Monroe Goldwater purchased from A.H. Levy and Edward S. Schwartz, a plot of 86 acres from the Caterson Tract, between Hartsdale and White Plains, in the Town of Greenburgh.16

1926 Suburban property, which has been in strong demand throughout the Summer, is opening the Fall season with a high degree of activity. In Westchester County an important deal for future home development was closed in the purchase by a

15 ibid, p. 232.
16 “Sales Increase As Market Expands,” NYT, 12 February 1926, 34.
syndicate of a forty-acre tract fronting on Taxter Road, between Irvington and White Plains, in the Greenburgh section. The property is one of the picturesque parcels in Westchester, commanding an unobstructed view of the Hudson River, and includes a small lake. It was purchased from the Darwin Land Company through Prince & Ripley, as brokers.\(^{17}\)

1927 The Greenville Fire District purchased the old Edgemont School, located on Central Park Avenue for its fire headquarters.

1928 [The] Greenburgh Town Board approved plans of the Brouchoux Construction Company of Scarsdale for the erection of the first of a three-unit project on land overlooking the Scarsdale Golf Club at Hartsdale. The three units will house 235 families. Otto M. Kritz of New York is the architect.\(^{18}\)

1928 The Hartsdale Realty Company, James Forsey, President, sold a tract of forty-two acres known as Sprain Brook-Hartsdale, which lies just outside the village limits of Hartsdale. The buyer is Robert E. Pendergrast, who for the past twenty-five years has been developing properties in various sections of the county. George S. Blackwell was the broker. The parcel just purchased fronts 2,500 feet on the new Sprain Brook Parkway and also has a lengthy frontage on Secor Road, just off Hartsdale Road. It will be divided into about 500 lots, each 25 by 100 feet. The development will be known as Hartsdale Lawns.\(^{19}\)

1929 A broadcast tower was erected at the Schmidt’s Farm on Secor Road for the Westchester Broadcasting Corporation (WCOH; later WFAS).

1929 The properties making up the hamlet of East View were bought and the buildings removed by John D. Rockefeller who provided a right of way to the New York Central Railroad to accommodate its rerouting.

1929 Arthur Lehman of Lehman Brothers, bankers, has sold the former William H. Wickham homestead, in the hills west of White Plains, a 135-acre tract, to the Harmon National Real Estate Corporation, which intends to open the property to the public next month as a residential community to be known as Orchard Hill. The acreage is on a high plateau overlooking Elmsford and affording a view of the Kensico reservoir. It is between the Harlem and Putnam divisions of the New York Central Railroad and is served by two bus lines. The Harmon organization has developed numerous tracts in the metropolitan area. Home sites to be offered in Orchard Hill will have frontages of 50 feet and upward. The Robert E. Farley Organization and Bennett, Milnor & Co. were brokers.\(^{20}\)

\(^{17}\)“Realty in Suburbs Draws Purchasers,” NYT, 29 September 1926, 40.
\(^{18}\)“Westchester Draws Apartment Builders,” NYT, 11 March 1928, 160.
\(^{19}\)“Westchester Sales,” NYT, 20 June 1928, 48.
\(^{20}\)“Banker Sells Tract Near White Plains,” NYT, 29 August 1929, 45.
1930  
The Saw Mill Parkway was completed to Elmsford. It would take until 1954 to be completed to Katonah.\textsuperscript{21}

1930  
The WCOH/WFAS radio station erected a new broadcast tower/transmitter near Central Park Avenue in Greenville.

1930  
The Greenburgh Police Department moved into a wooden building located at 388 Tarrytown Road, which originally had been a gatehouse for the Fair Grounds.

1930  
Hartsdale Fells, the Westchester community being developed on the slope of Battle Hill, adjoining White Plains on the south, was enlarged last week by the annexation of the adjoining property known as Hartsdale Manor and now embraces all the vacant land between White Plains and Hartsdale from Central Park Avenue to Bronx River Parkway. Announcement of the annexation was made by Maurice S. Goodman, managing director of the “A” Holding Corporation, developer of Hartsdale Fells. The Hartsdale Manor property, comprising 226 residential plots, was purchased from the Hartsdale Manor Corporation by the Dalhart Realty Corporation, a group closely allied with the ownership of Hartsdale Fells. The new portion of Hartsdale Fells will be known as the “Manor” section, as distinguished from the “Ridge” section, and will be fully improved in keeping with the development already carried out in the older section of the Fells.\textsuperscript{22}

1932  
Everett and I. Randolph Jacobs, operators, of this city, were the buyers in Westchester. They bought from Robert E. Farley a plot of land fronting 530 feet on the Hartsdale Station Plaza at Hartsdale. It has a depth of 200 feet and will be improved with store buildings to care for motor shopping. The buyers announced that they planned to deed to the town of Greenburgh a part of the plot just purchased immediately in front of Hartsdale station for expansion of the plaza.\textsuperscript{23}

1935  
Twenty-three modern dwellings erected in the metropolitan district as the outgrowth of the $21,000 General Electric architectural competition will be thrown open for public inspection today. About 300 other houses built under the same program in various parts of the country also will be opened to visitors today... In the metropolitan district, Westchester leads with six of the houses... The houses are of varying size and design, but most of them are compact, featuring labor-saving devices. Some are in modern style and others follow more orthodox designs... [Among the Westchester dwellings is a house in] Mayfair Acres [at] Knollwood and Grasslands Road, Greenwood, designed and built by Homecrafters Service...\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} “Add to Hartsdale Fells,” *NYT*, 30 October 1930, RE1.
\textsuperscript{23} “Operators Buy in Westchester,” *NYT*, 8 September 1932, 37.
\textsuperscript{24} “300 Modern Homes ready for Exhibit,” *NYT*, 13 October 1935, RE3.
1935

Greenburgh—Improvements to Sprain Road, 2,600 feet--$17,095.50; excavating and grading on Evandale Road--$14,378.25

1935

Greenburgh—Improving and widening Long View Drive and Edgemont Road--$10,431.75.26

1936

Building construction in this city [White Plains] and in the near-by town of Greenburgh increased markedly in 1935 over 1934, according to reports made public today. The total value of construction work indicated on permits issued here during 1935 was $763,195, and increase if 111 per cent over the previous year, according to William Brennan, Commissioner of Public Safety. The value of dwelling houses constructed here during 1935 was $322,461, and increase of 125 per cent. The increase in value of new buildings represented by building permits in the unincorporated part of the town of Greenburgh during 1935 showed a rise of about $800,000 over the preceding year, according to Building Inspector William Van Dorn. The Value of the new Greenburgh building was $1,064,505, compared with $273,425 for 1934. Among the new buildings were seventy-seven one-family houses valued at $559,000.27

1937

Supreme Court Justice Raymond E. Aldrich refused today to grant a temporary injunction to restrain Mr. and Mrs. Joshua |Cockburn from occupying the $20,000 English style house which they recently purchased on Fort Hill Road in Greenburgh, Westchester County. Mrs. Marion A. |Ridgeway, a neighbor and widow of a New York physician, brought the suit to enforce a deed covenant which bars “Negroes or any persons of the Negro race or blood” from owning or occupying homes in the section known as Edgemont Hill. Mr. Cockburn, formerly master of the Yarmouth, of the Black star Line, and at present a real estate operator in Harlem, is black of color. His wife, Pauline, is almost white. She is reported to have said that her mother was Italian, and her father of the white race with a slight trace of Negro blood. The Cockburns were born in Nassau, B.W.L., and educated in England. Justice Aldrich, who took Mrs. Ridgeway’s petition under advisement on Feb. 1, when the Cockburns’ counsel raised the question of what legally constituted a person of the Negro race, said yesterday that granting an injunction might “very well be a gross injustice.” No date was set for the trial.28

1938

June 18, 1938 a plan and rendering by Fort Hill Terrace, Inc. was submitted for approval which proposed six substantial apartment dwellings, or “terraces” to be located in a semi-circular configuration off of Central Park Avenue. Wulff Engineering Co. of Tarrytown, NY drew up the plan.

1938

The New York School for the Deaf was established on a 77-acre site on Knollwood Road.

27 “Big Gain in Construction,” NYT, 9 January 1936, 16.
Anticipating an active home-buying market during 1938, Ray Craerin, president of the realty corporation owning the Fort Hills Estate development in the Greenville section of Greenburgh, Westchester County, announced yesterday that plans have been made for the erection this year of forty additional houses… Mr. Craerin points out that the work on the first six units of the contemplated forty has been started. Seven other homes are nearing completion, bringing to thirteen the number expected to be ready for the Spring market and to forty-four the number constructed in the development since its inception.

The houses will be principally of Colonial design. Plans for their construction are being drawn by the following architects: John S. Thornley of White Plains; Edmond N. Macelin, New Rochelle; Gerald S. Vibberts, Hartsdale, and Oscar A. deBogdan and F.L. Porter, Scarsdale. They will sell in the $20,000 to $35,000 price class and will be of seven and ten rooms on large plots up to three acres. The development is situated in hilly country at an elevation of 425 feet. It overlooks the Sprain Brook and the Bronx River valleys and is opposite the grounds of the Sunningdale Country Club.29

David Swope, son of Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Company, has gone into the realty development business. He is one of the chief sponsors of one of the largest new small-home colonies in Westchester County. Not only has he advanced half the cost of Fulton Park, residential project on a 200-acre site in Greenburgh, near White Plains, but he is also supervising construction work on the houses. His associate in the enterprise is Everett Jacobs.

The new community is being developed at Fulton Avenue and the County Center Road, adjoining the Bronx River Parkway. Seven of the first group of seventeen homes now going up already have been sold. Several of the dwellings in this initial unit already have been finished and opened for inspection. They are set on landscaped plots measuring about 60 by 100 feet. Eventually, according to young Mr. Swope, the project is expected to comprise at least 225 homes. The work is being carried out under the name of County Homes, Inc.

“Automobile assembly line” methods of production are being utilized to keep the cost of construction within reach of families of modest income, but individual designs for the homes are being used, Mr. Swope explained. The planning of the project was partly the result of several years of experiment and experience by him in the small house field, notably with Houses, Inc., now a General Electric subsidiary. The financial terms made available under the revised FHA program also were a spur to the enterprise, he said.

All of the homes are being offered at a standard price of less than $6,000, with the advantage of a 10 per cent down-payment. The exteriors are of Colonial, American farmhouse and other harmonizing designs. Each house contains five rooms and a garage.30

30 “Swope’s Son Now in Realty Business; Plan Group of 225 Westchester Homes,” NYT, 3 April 1938, 175.
1938 Reports from Several builders who have recently started extensive small home developments in Westchester County indicate that construction of houses of that type will be one of the major features in the residential building field in that county this year. On the formal opening day last week of the new Fulton park community in the Town of Greenburgh, north of the County Center at White Plains, David Swope, who is associated with Everett Jacobs in the development project, states that more than 5,000 visitors inspected many of the homes in the $6,000 price class now nearing completion.

1938 The above [pictured] dwelling recently completed in Mayfair Acres community near North White Plains, Westchester County, and purchased by William M. Terry, presents an interesting example of small-home possibilities erected on a good-sized plot. The house was built and designed by Homecraft Associates, developers of the property in Greenburgh Township. It occupies a landscaped plot of one-third of an acre on Plymouth Road. The house contains five rooms with tiled bathroom and complete cellar, rockwool insulation, oil-burner unit and steam heating system. The attic with dormer windows has been left unfinished to allow future improvement with two additional bedrooms and a second bath. The cost of the house with the landscaping was about $7,500, exclusive of the land.

1938 … One of the interesting announcements of the past week was that six of the proposed fourteen garden-type apartment houses in the Fort Hill Village community have been opened for inspection and rentals are being made for September occupancy. The project presents several novel features. The fourteen houses, when completed, will occupy a tract of seventeen acres in the town of Greenburgh about one mile west of Scarsdale. The buildings, however, will cover only one-fourth of the total space, the remaining ground being attractively landscaped to suggest the atmosphere of a dignified college campus.

The owning syndicate is headed by Ray Craerin and the houses have been designed by New York architects Sibley and Featherston. They are of the Georgian colonial type, three stories in height, and each unit contains sixteen suites ranging from three and one-half to four and one-half rooms. Each house has four entrances and community garages are provided for the individual groups.

The houses are being built by the Deval Construction Company of Scarsdale, according to FHA standards. The six structures just completed have been financed through the Marine Midland Trust Company of New York in the sum of $350,000 in FHA insured mortgages and the company has also granted a building mortgage loan of $275,000. Mr. Craerin states that the project has been designed to meet the needs of a small family desiring an artistic home in the country in pleasant surroundings at a moderate rental. The average rental is $18 a room.

The acreage under development was formerly the Carl Franck farm and had been held by that family since the days of the Revolution. The site is said to have been the scene of some of the conflict during the memorable battle of White Plains. Work on the six houses to be opened next month was started last April. Construction

31 “Home Planned in Westchester,” NYT, 17 April 1938, 163.
on the other additional units is about to be started and the owners expect that the entire fourteen buildings will be completed before the close of 1939.33

1938 2 October 1938 “Developing Tract in Port Chester” [NYT, 184] A 107-lot tract of land adjacent to Congress Park, Port Chester, Westchester County, will be improved with a group of homes by Colonial Park, Inc., developers of Mayfair Acres and Chappaqua Farms developments in Greenburgh and Chappaqua, respectively… Gustave A. Feuerstein, president of the building concern, said that the … new development will be similar in design to those at Greenburgh and Chappaqua and the houses will not sell for less than $6,900.

1939 Construction of a new Greenville fire house was begun on a site adjacent to its existing headquarters in the former Edgemont School on Central Park Avenue.

1941 A marked increase in residential construction in the central and southern parts of Westchester County, with the great majority of the new homes in the more moderate price range, was reported by Thomas G. Grace, State Director of the FHA… According to Mr. Grace, the resistance to moderate-priced housing in Westchester has disappeared and builders sponsoring projects with dwellings as low as $4,500 and $5,000 are receiving the cooperation of local officials. In many communities, he said, arrangements are underway to make available for residential construction large tracts of land acquired through tax delinquencies. These properties will be disposed of either by private sale or public auction, but in all cases there will be stipulations that the purchasers build on them within a reasonable time…

Smaller tracts being developed by builders aggregating about 400 acres, are located at Yonkers, Greenburgh, Eastchester, Mount Pleasant, Harrison, Rye, North Castle and Bedford. The homes in these communities will range in price from $4,000 upward. With few exceptions all of the houses now under construction run from five to six rooms. The prevailing architecture is Colonial, Cape Cod and English.

Mr. Grace said home building operations in Westchester under the insured plan now total 3,246 properties built and actually sold. Those represent values in excess of $22,000,000. More then $2,000,000 of completed transactions, he added, have been achieved in the last three months this year.34

1944 WFAS radio station purchased seven acres in Hartsdale off Secor Road. This land with its high elevation was the same noted on a French military map as the location of Joseph Appleby’s farmhouse where General Washington was headquartered during the summer of 1781.

1948 [The] Towney Construction Corporation announces the opening today of a model house in its Orchard Hill [Canterbury Rd. & vic.] project in the town of Greenburgh… The new house on display contains six and one-half rooms, two baths and a powder room. It is a two-story structure with attached garage. Unlike other buildings in the project which feature stone exteriors, this is entirely of frame

33 “Open Home Center In Westchester.” NYT, 14 August 1938, 147.
34 “1,000 Acres in Westchester Being Subdivided for Homes,” NYT, 22 June 1941, RE1.
construction. Prices for these houses range from $23,000 to $26,000, and include an automatic washing machine, automatic kitchen range and a built-in dinette. The buildings are on large plots, landscaped with lawn, trees and shrubbery.35

1951 May 2, 1951: The Tappan Zee Bridge was authorized by the Army Corps of Engineers when it issued a permit to construct a Hudson River Bridge between Tarrytown and Nyack.

1952 The movement of industry and executive offices to Westchester in recent months has served to emphasize the growing demand for small homes and apartments at moderate rents to provide housing for the white-collar group being brought into that county. Westchester long has been known as an estate center, and barely two decades ago boasted of little in the way of residential accommodations for the average family, except perhaps in Yonkers and the outlying section at the southern end of the county nearest to Manhattan.

With the influx of the new employees, particularly in the White Plains area, a new situation has arisen which has led planners to give serious consideration to the problem of providing adequate housing for all segments of the population. Many builders who would like to tap the market for low-priced houses, in the price class from $11,000 to $15,000, have been stymied not only by high construction costs but by zoning restrictions and community regulations outlawing the erection of dwellings with less than 1,000 or 1,100 square feet of floor space. Other restrictions, including those governing the maximum size of plots, also have made it impossible to reach the pocketbook of the average family in most neighborhoods there.

The restrictions mainly have been put in effect to protect the realty values in communities of costly residences and large estates, which always have feared the intrusion of little homes. Many planners, however, believe that more reasonable regulations in specified areas would result in a new wave of small-home building in the county which could be fostered without adverse effect on the estates. They point out that every region desiring to maintain a well-balanced economy must have shelter available at all price levels, and are convinced that this can be accomplished without upsetting established property values—even in traditional centers of wealthy suburbanites.36

1952 H.H. Fisher Associates have opened a ranch home colony known as Orchard Hill Estates on Whittington Road and Rockingchair Road in Orchard Hill in the Town of Greenburgh. The project is designed eventually to provide 100 houses in the $19,990 price class, with brick and clapboard exteriors, containing six rooms and two baths, basement and playroom, attached garage and two roofed patios. Plans for the initial homes have been drawn by George Foster. Home Specialists are the sales agents.37

1952 The Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation won a complete victory tonight on its application for a rezoning of the Mount Pleasant part of the old James Butler Estate,

37 “Housing Planned for Westchester,” NYT, 10 August 1952 W1.
which the company can now convert into a $12,500,000 to $17,000,000 headquarters… The Butler property straddles the Mount Pleasant-Greenburgh boundary, with two-thirds of the estate on the Greenburgh side and the remainder on the Mount Pleasant side in Eastview. Greenburgh had acted quickly in approving the rezoning but in Mount Pleasant the project met strong opposition at last night’s public hearing.

After the hearing, the Mount Pleasant Town Board conferred until 2:30 A.M. and then met again tonight and voted to permit the construction of office buildings on the overgrown and outmoded estate. The rezoning also will permit the construction of fifteen dwelling units on each acre so that the company can construct apartment type houses for its employees as well as stores and automobile parking areas… The new construction… would bring about $145,000 in taxation annually to the school district, which embraces both the Mount Pleasant and Greenburgh parts of the estate, and this additional money together with state aid would be sufficient to educate the [estimated maximum of 450] extra children.\textsuperscript{38}

Crestmont Estates is building seven ranch dwellings at Moorland Drive and Glendale Road in the Fort Hill section of Scarsdale. Ranging in price from $33,500 to $38,900, the houses are on plots of one-fourth to one-half acre. They have three and four bedrooms, two bathrooms, garages and mahogany-paneled kitchens.

Thirty homes have been sold in a new development of 100 ranch houses called Orchard Hill Estates on a thirty-acre tract at Whittington and Rockinchair Roads in the Orchard Hill section of the Town of Greenburgh. Home Specialists are the agents for the houses, which were designed by George Foster, architect. They are priced at $19,990 and have center halls, three bedrooms, two bathrooms, dining room, living room with fireplace, basement and garage. [see 10 August 1952 above]

The Carnoy-Wolter Corporation of White Plains is putting thirty-five houses on the market today in a project known as Knollwood Heights off Knollwood Road (Route 100-A) opposite the Knollwood Country Club. Sixteen units are expected to be ready for delivery on October and nineteen in the spring. All homes are planned on plots of one acre or more. A two-bedroom model with expansion attic is priced at $15,750. A four-bedroom unit with two bathrooms is selling for $21,490 and the three-bedroom models are offered at prices ranging from $16,950 to $17,450.\textsuperscript{39}

Development of a tract of twenty acres in the Hartsdale section of Westchester County has been started by Frank Tufaro, president of the New York State Home Builders Association. Mr Tufaro plans fifty-seven luxury-type ranch houses in a project to be known as Stephenville Homes, with four designs to range in price from $24,000 to $30,000. Display houses in each style will be shown today on Ridge Road, west of Hartsdale Avenue. Nat Matson and Stanley Wilson are the architects and Bert F. Buser, Inc. is the sales agent. Attached garages, large equipped kitchens and half-acre plots are among the features offered. The houses range in size from five to seven rooms, with one and two baths.

\textsuperscript{38} “Town Will Rezone for Union Carbide,” \textit{NYT}, 13 August 1952, 23.

\textsuperscript{39} “Westchester Gets Luxury Dwellings,” \textit{NYT}, 14 September 1952 R1.
A model home has been completed in the project known as Scarsdale Park on Inwood Road in the Fort Hill section of the Town of Greenburgh. A new community of thirty houses is planned there in ranch design. Prices start at $23,750, including garage. Among construction details are full basements, tile baths and fireplaces paneled in knotty pine. Ralph R. Ragette and Julian Silver of the Raybra Realty Company are the builders. George A Rusciana is the architect.

A model home has been opened at Tennyson Street and Secor Road, Hartsdale, where Bard Associates, Inc., builders, have construction work under way on the first section of forty units in a project called Hartsdale Manor. These dwellings are priced at $20,500 and are from plans by Alwin Cassens, architect… [These houses will] offer basic center-hall layout, twenty-nine foot living-dining area with wood-burning fireplace, tiled bathrooms, kitchens with full equipment, basement and attached garage.40

1953

All the houses in the first section and half of those in the second section have been sold in the new eighty-five-family colony being developed in the Fort Hill section of Greenburgh, N.Y., by Tanglewood Homes, Inc., of which Edwin Wolf is president. Sales are being handled by Farber-Wittman, Inc. Designed by Henry Moger, architect, the model house has been decorated by Edith Greenwood of Brooklyn. The dwelling is in split-level style and is priced at $19,990. The price is higher for a larger model with two baths. The site, formerly owned by the late Matthew Eyler, former chairman of the Greenburgh Planning Board, is near the Schmitts Farm.41

1954

The southern half of the county’s 4448 square miles is particularly changing into an office region. Coincidentally, the business rush is causing conversion of more woodland into roads, school sites and housing developments. Churches and hospitals are expanding.

… ‘We are not moving out of New York but just to the expanding rim of the community for more air and space,’ one executive remarked in bringing 1,200 office employees from central Manhattan. Sixty-nine corporations employing 20,867 persons are listed by the Westchester County Association as establishing new buildings in the county.

… Latest counts indicate that 2,923 private houses are under construction in the county and 5,719 are planned, while apartments for 4,343 families are being completed and others for 8,022 are planned. Leaders in home construction are New Rochelle, White Plains, Yonkers, Greenburgh and Valhalla. Leaders in apartment construction are Yonkers, White Plains, Eastchester, Dobbs Ferry, New Rochelle and Irvington.42

---

40 “Hartsdale Tract To Get 57 Homes,” NYT, 21 September 1952, R1.
1954 ...Scores of houses—some brand new this spring—are falling under wreckers’ hammers or being jockeyed to new sites… On Sheldon Avenue, off Tarrytown Road between Elmsford and Tarrytown, a wide swath has been cut through hillsides that recently sheltered small homes and large estates. The 7.3 miles of work through Greenburgh, along with 6.53 miles of work on access and connecting roads, is being performed by L.G. De Felice & Son and C. J. Langenfelder & Son of North Haven Conn. The contract is for $11,234,567. The job at the parkway, not included in the general Greenburgh contract, is being performed by the Raylin Construction Corporation of New York for $3,119,287.

At Ardsley workmen were felling trees today beside historic Saw Mill River road—Route 9A—for conversion of a strip of that highway into Thruway. Saw Mill River Road will be moved near by. Home and business owners are none too happy. John Gates, gasoline dealer, said his station was being absorbed and he had no place to go. Picnickers accustomed to using Woodlands Park at Ardsley will find it occupied by contractors’ sheds and machinery.

Especially unhappy was Miss Lisa Hein of 8 Fern Terrace, Yonkers. Houses on all sides of her three-story home have been demolished. Workmen with rock drills and sledge hammers are chaffing to start on her house, but she has refused to budge. “The Thruway people have been very mean to me and my sister, Margaret,” Miss Hein said. “They made one of our guests so nervous that he dropped dead. We have no place to move to. The Thruway people offered me $23,500 for the property, but I am too upset even to pack.”

1955 December 15, 1955: the Suffern-Yonkers section of the NYS Thruway, including three-mile Tappan Zee Bridge over the Hudson between Tarrytown and Nyack, opened to traffic with formal ceremonies.

1958 The Putnam Division of the New York Central Railroad ended passenger service in May 1958.

1960 December 27, 1960: The Cross-Westchester Expressway (I-287) was opened to traffic, providing a direct link between the Mainline and the New England Section of the NYS Thruway.
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V. Overview of Existing Historical Conditions

Part 1

COLONIAL PERIOD, 1693-1776

The Traditional Greenburgh House Type
Among the few 18th- and 19th-century dwellings surviving in Greenburgh, one-and-one-half- and two-story, wood frame houses with three-bay front facades and off-center or side entrances are the characteristic type (FIG.1). If larger houses with five or more bays on their facades are examined closely, it often can be discerned that many of them, indeed, originated as three-bay dwellings. In the broader context of historic Hudson Valley architecture, this house type reflects the domestic experience of people of British background, and the history of the town supports that connection. Although Greenburgh’s origins are associated with the Philipse, a Dutch family of great renown in New York colonial history, the town was settled largely by people of British origin coming from southern lower New York, Long Island and New England. In addition, the fact that Greenburgh began as a section of Philipse Manor indicates that the town’s first inhabitants were leasing farms and occupying more modest tenant houses. These cultural and socio-economic factors are critical to understanding Greenburgh’s early architectural heritage.

While Dutch houses in the Hudson Valley have been the subject of continued study over the past one-hundred years, the domestic architecture of British settlers has been largely overlooked.1 There is not a published source that addresses the architecture of this period either in Greenburgh, the Philipse Manor or Westchester County that is any more than cursory. The most complete compendium of local architecture, Frank Sanchis’s American Architecture Westchester County, New York, Colonial to Contemporary, devotes only nine of 157 pages on residential architecture to the Colonial period, and this may be the most ever pulled together on the subject.2

1 Books on Dutch houses and “Old New York” began appearing during the American Centennial in 1876 and the Hudson-Fulton Celebration in 1909. The most focused and enduring publication has been Helen Wilkinson Reynolds’s Dutch Houses in the Hudson Valley Before 1776 (1929), which remains the most important source even today. Recently, two new books have been published on Dutch-American architecture bringing the subject back into the limelight: Geoffrey Gross, et al., Dutch Colonial Homes in America (NY: Rizzoli, 2002) and John Stevens, Dutch Vernacular Architecture in North America 1640-1830. (West Hurley NY: Hudson Valley Vernacular Architecture, 2005).

2 (Harrison NY: Harbor Hill Books, 1977). Only the Odell House is included in his overview of this period.
It is remarkable that a county so rich in resources has been overlooked by architecture scholars (or old house buffs) to this extent. Evidently, for all the interest “historic homes” generated in the real estate market, Westchester has been long conceived as a suburban place. This reality is clear in the search for early houses in Greenburgh where virtually all buildings predating the Civil War have been enlarged, renovated and redesigned in Colonial Revival tastes that camouflage most clues to their authentic origins.

![Image](image.jpg)

**FIG.1:** Odell House, Ridge Road, Greenburgh. The center 2-bay section is reputed to have been built in 1732, the 3-bay section on the right was constructed in 1785, and the stone section on the left was added in 1855. As suggested by this example, the earliest tenant dwellings could have had only two-bay front facades (with a doorways where one of the windows is now located), but the more fully-developed three-bay form plan soon became the norm. Photo: Greenburgh, 12.

There are scores of images of multi-story, three-bay, side-entry houses, large and small, to be found in books about local history and regional architecture that provide ample evidence of an architectural tradition, although their authors fail to assess their architectural or cultural significance. Two thin volumes of “Old Orange Houses,” compiled by amateur enthusiast, Mildred Parker Seese, in the 1940s provide the best portrayal of this British architectural heritage in Orange County, New York.³

The William and Sarah Bull House in Hamptonburgh, Orange County may be the oldest example of this multi-story, three-bay facade house type surviving in the Hudson Valley, and it provides an instructive starting point for the history of these houses in Greenburgh (FIG.2). Reputedly

built in 1722, the Bulls’ house has many features that have come to define British architecture in the region. The principal rooms of the house are located on three levels: kitchen in a basement partially exposed at grade; hall or common room on the main floor; and a best room or bed chamber on the upper level. This “stacked” plan is the basis for the multi-story house form so common in Greenburgh, and it is quite different from the conventional Dutch house form, such as the Daniel Hasbrouck House in New Paltz, Ulster County, where the same three rooms are spread out end-to-end in a low, one-story linear plan (FIG.3). The off-center entrance at one side of the facade is another feature of British three-bay houses that has endured. It is balanced by a chimney on the opposite side of the house. How this cultural differentiation developed is still the subject of speculation. Some ideas will be explored below following a fuller description of the three-bay type.


Two window bays combine with a door to complete the characteristic three-bay front façade of British houses. Architectural historians have long theorized that three-bay houses were built with the anticipation of eventually expanding the size of the house with the addition of two more window bays to the other side of the door creating a symmetrical five-bay façade with a central entrance. While this occurred in many instances (hence the theory), many more houses exist where the three-bay façade has remained an intact unit. So, while there was always the option for householders to expand and aggrandize their dwellings, which is the case with any house form, for most of them the three-bay house was the limit of their domestic needs and architectural ambition. This was particularly the case in the 18th century where larger two-story houses with five-bay facades indicated a higher status of wealth and social position than most farmers and tradesmen represented. Class divisions were generally respected, and this is reflected in the architecture that has been left behind. And although it has not been precisely tabulated, it can be predicted that most of the additions creating five-bay houses occurred in the 19th century when these class distinctions, at least in architecture, had diminished.

Consequently, the three-bay dwelling was the house form favored by people of the middling and lesser sort, that is, the broad economically-independent, land-holding group that inhabited rural America in the 18th and 19th centuries. These people could be tenants as well as owners of land. Leaseholds were common in the Hudson Valley in the 18th century, and Greenburgh was located in the midst of the region’s more prominent proprietorship: Philipse Manor. There was quite a range in size and quality of three-bay dwellings with the most basic being a one-story, one-room house and the most elaborate bring a multi-story, multi-room plan house like the Bulls’ stone dwelling (FIG.2). The upper stories of this house each contain four rooms, one in each corner of the plan. Large front and back rooms heated by fireplaces occupy two-thirds of the plan on the chimney side of the house with two smaller unheated spaces in the remaining one-third on the entrance side. The front corner space in the entrance bay has a lobby and stairs on both levels. The house is sited on a sloping site so that the basement kitchen on the chimney side is exposed at grade level. Subterranean sections of the basement—under the entrance side of the house—were used for food storage. The Bulls’ house was also built over a spring so that basement larders were kept especially cool. The large end chimney is, perhaps, the building’s most prominent and complex feature. It contained hearths and flues for five fireplaces on three levels.

Few buildings in the Hudson Valley are comparable to the Bull House in either scale or age; yet lesser houses, which were generally of less permanent frame or log construction, have not survived to any significant degree, and those that were of a better sort and have lasted into the present have been enlarged and altered beyond easy recognition. The following illustrations, identified in the Greenburgh historic resource survey, have been selected to represent the archetypical plan forms for the three-bay, side entry house. Precise construction dates are not known, but this architectural hierarchy characterized Greenburgh’s building history throughout the 18th century and into the early 19th century.
FIG. 4: One-and-one-half-story, three-bay house type. Abram Bare Farm House, West Hartsdale Avenue. The section on the left has a three-bay façade (partially concealed by bush). The section on the right is said to contain remnants of a 17th-century house. Photo: Greenburgh, 99.

FIG. 5: One-and-one-half-story, three-bay house type enlarged to five bays. Romer-Van Tassell House, Sawmill River Road. Stone section on left, c.1750; wood frame part added in 19th century. Photo: Greenburgh, 18.


FIG. 7: One-and-one-half-story, five-bay house type with exposed basement. House on 79 Hillcrest Road. House appears to date from the early 19th century. Photo: Greenburgh Assessor web site.

FIG. 8: House at 190 Old Army Road, Greenburgh. One-story, five-bay 18th-century house raised to two-stories later in 19th century. Photo: LFA., 2006.
Sources of the Three-Bay House Type
The precise origin of the multi-story, three-bay house is unknown, yet it was built prolifically along the Atlantic seaboard from Pennsylvania to New England during the 18th and 19th centuries. It is clearly identifiable with British settlement areas along the coast, but it is not a house form found in the British Isles, although there are certain fundamental similarities with fortified Medieval houses in northern England and Scotland (from whence many Hudson Valley British settlers came) and British village and town house architecture in general. Where this zone intersects southeastern New York, the architecture gets blended with the Dutch in the same way the two cultures mingled in commerce, society, and marriage. Local construction methods and design tastes became hybridized, with Dutch families living in stacked plan houses and English families occupying one-story plan dwellings. The predominant cultural orientation of the household would be reflected in the choice of fireplace and chimney design (jambsless for the Dutch and multi-hearth chimney stacks for the British), ceiling beam finish, door design, cabinetry, and other decorative treatments.4

Although it doesn’t seem to be the case in Westchester County, a large number of German refugees made their way into many parts of this British zone in New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey during the first half of the 18th century.5 The German presence is made known by their manipulation of the multi-story three-bay house plan form. The classic Pennsylvania German house (flurkuchenhaus) has a three-bay façade and a side entrance that enters directly into a kitchen space. In German houses of a better sort, the kitchen was moved to the basement and the entry space formalized with a stair as in British three-bay houses. Either way, the basement was used for food storage and presented at least one side at grade. German houses were often built over springs, and in some cases, connected to large subterranean root cellars with vaulted ceilings.6 Some of these features can be found in Westchester County houses suggesting that the German influence on regional architecture may be discerned even in areas where they did not settle.

And where did the American model for the multi-story, three-bay house originate? Perhaps in Philadelphia where William Penn circulated a plan for a multi-story house with front and back rooms among those Europeans he recruited to populate Pennsylvania. Perhaps along Long Island Sound where multi-story houses with massive end chimneys (known as “stone-enders” in Rhode Island) were common. In both places, these small houses evidently developed as dwellings appropriate for people of middling and lesser sorts consistent with British class

---

4 In the past, this process of accommodation and reformulation has been considered to reflect the assimilation of the minority group into the dominant culture; however, the idea that the process is as much one of resistance as one of acquiescence lately has emerged. The persistence of Dutch and German characteristics in regional architecture can be construed as an active effort to preserve an alternative cultural identity in the face of English hegemony. Historians have begun to term this hybrid architecture as “creole” to indicate its multiple frames of reference. 5 Walter Allen Knittle, Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration (1937; rpt. Baltimore MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1982).
paradigms. Even though they were not necessarily designed to be expanded into larger and
greater houses, these dwellings were conspicuously but a fraction of a high-class house just as
their occupants were less than their social betters. The three-bay house was a product of the
English social hierarchy, and it reflected the limitations willingly accepted by lower-class people.
(Dutch architecture is a visible contradiction in this context since it was conceived in a more
egalitarian bourgeois culture. There was a wide range of house size and quality in the Hudson
Valley’s Dutch communities, but it reflected differences in wealth rather than class.)

Greenburgh’s multi-story three-bay houses can be interpreted in the context of the British
cultural zone extending north from Pennsylvania and into coastal New England. This zone
intersected New York in two areas and affected architecture in different ways. The first area was
located along the Atlantic coast and involved the growing English dominion in the region. Its
intersection with the existing and quietly defiant Dutch culture firmly established in New
Amsterdam resulted in a creole architecture that reflected the peculiar dichotomous composition
of the community.

Architecture & Social Class
European settlement did not begin in Greenburgh until the early 1700s, well after England had
assumed control of the colony from the Dutch. The town was part of a large land patent granted
to Frederick Philipse in 1693, which extended more then 20 miles along the east shore of the
Hudson and east to the Bronx River. It was a model example of the “manors” his peers would
create throughout the region. The economic basis of such developments was to produce wheat
flour, which, at that time, was replacing furs as the principal commodity of New York’s
international and inter-colonial trade. Philipse chose the location of his plantations carefully for
this purpose. Containing the valleys of three substantial creeks: Saw Mill (Nepperhan), Sprain
and Bronx rivers, Greenburgh developed amid well-watered, low-lying conditions considered
advantageous to growing winter wheat. The Nepperhan and Pocantico creeks provided plentiful
water flows to power “upper” and “lower” grist mills. Both had wide mouths at the Hudson that
allowed ships to load directly at the mills.

In typical English aristocratic fashion, Frederick Philipse leased farms to settlers in return for a
significant share of their wheat production. He charged them further fees for grinding their grain
and sold them other necessities from his store. Philipse maintained a wharf and storehouse to
facilitate the transportation of his and his tenants’ flour to the New York City port. (Tenants
gave up another portion of their produce for this service.) The local storehouse contained both
flour awaiting shipment down river and store goods brought to the manor on the return trip. He
presumed to govern his leaseholders and reserved the privilege to put them to work on building
and maintaining roads and other jobs on the estate. He could have paid them to work on his own
harvests, but Philipse also owned a crew of African slaves for that purpose.

Social class distinctions are manifest in the architecture that developed in Philipse Manor. Its
most renowned house, the Philipse Manor Hall situated where the Neperhan River met the
Hudson, was there to remind the town’s middling farmers of the power and prestige of the ruling
class (FIG.9). Although the house did not achieve its present proportions and appearance until
the mid-18th century, it would have always been recognizable as the best house in the locality

---

7 Thomas Scharf, History of Westchester County, New York (1886), I: facing 30.
and the seat of power on the manor. A two-story masonry house with a symmetrical five-bay, center-entrance façade was the standard abode of the colonial gentry, and it established the high end of the architectural hierarchy on Westchester County proprietorships as well as those in the rest of the English colonies in America. The interior plan typical to early elite houses contained two large rooms on each of two floors divided by a central passage with two chimneys were located on the back wall, venting fireplaces in each of the four principal rooms. Fireplace walls were embellished with wood paneling comprising a central chimneybreast and flanking cupboards. Kitchens were located in basements, rear ells or outbuildings. Four living rooms were a great luxury in those days, and the remote kitchens indicated the presence of enslaved Africans.

![Image: View of Philipse Manor House & Lower Mills, Yonkers, New York, c.1784. Painting in collections of Historic Hudson Valley.]

The manor house was standard by which all others were compared and ranked. Tenants’ and middling freeholders’ lower status was reflected in the smaller dwellings they occupied. Their relative economic success can be recorded in the scale and quality of their houses, but even the wealthiest farmers refrained from building a full-scale gentry house. Some may have stretched out their one-story houses to five or more bays; others built houses two stories in height, but limited the size of the plan to two-thirds of the elite whole and presented an unbalanced, three-bay façade.

It is probably fair to say that most of the three-bay houses built on Philipse Manor prior to the Revolution were no more than a single story with a basement. Many houses would have been embanked with the basement exposed on the front to create a two-story façade. The hilly topography lent itself to this kind of site, and it required less excavation in the rocky soil. Chimneys were located on end walls with corner fireplaces heating front and back rooms in larger houses. Sometimes, in better dwellings, chimneys were positioned in the interior of the
plan where they vented fireplaces centered in the partition separating front and back rooms. This 
would have allowed for fireplace walls to be paneled and decorated more fully. Unheated 
lobbies with stairs were enclosed inside the entrances. Through passages were uncommon as 
they wasted space in small houses; small unheated chambers were created behind the lobby. 
Houses that utilized basement as ground floors usually had food storage areas in the subterranean 
rear sections. In these cases, there were often two-story front porches (as with the manor house) 
with exterior stairs allowing entrance directly into upper-story rooms. Attic spaces were not 
used for habitation initially, but bed chambers were created there as the 18\textsuperscript{th} century progressed. 
Unlike elite houses, neat symmetry and architectural ornament were not factors in the 
development or the appreciation of middling domestic design. Rather it was the size, 
commodiousness, and permanence that conveyed its value and significance.

At the lower end of the spectrum would have been small, one-room plan wood-frame and log 
dwellings, of which all but a few fragments survive in larger, later houses. They conformed to 
the overall house model including side entries, end chimneys, and in some cases, basement 
kitchens. Some of the larger one-room dwellings would have had board partitions separating 
entrance lobbies and bed chambers from the single heated room. These dwellings were 
impermanent, and no intact examples survive. Those that have been photographed are of 
questionable date. However, small as they were, they were still respectable houses constructed 
in a competent manner by professional builders. Likewise, tenants were provided with reputable 
housing. Sub-standard housing did not become a component of the rural landscape until after 
American Independence (and slave emancipation) when a laboring class became a prominent 
part of farm communities.

About log houses
Local historians in the Hudson Valley have long assumed that early settlers first lived in log 
dwellings until they were able to establish their farms and build more permanent houses. 
However, there is no physical or documentary evidence that effectively confirms this 
assumption. The log houses that are recorded in historic photographs are unlikely to have 
survived from in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. These images simply indicate that there were families living 
in log houses in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century. In the context of the local architectural heritage, log 
dwellings were the lowest echelon of homes, and they were occupied by the poorest people in 
the town, whether in the 18\textsuperscript{th} or 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Families of the middling sort would not have been 
inclined to reside in such primitive accommodations. Log dwellings became more common in 
the Hudson Valley after the Revolutionary War when increasing numbers of unskilled laborers 
and farm workers migrated into the region and occupied less desirable land on the fringe of 
established farm communities and in hill sections, which was all that was available to them. 
Families who were able to afford farms with good arable land and favorable locations were also 
able to afford to have a decent house built for them when they arrived.

The theory that log dwellings were common also assumes that the subsequent, better houses 
were built by their owners over a period of time. Yet even in the early 18\textsuperscript{th}-century houses were 
built by skilled masons and carpenters, and craft and material supply systems were already in 
place in a number of Hudson valley communities. Land speculators and patent proprietors often 
built saw mills to produce building materials in another attempt to capitalize on the spread of 
settlement. House builders commanded high wages and were well-known. Stone for basements
was readily available in the landscape, and bricks for chimneys could be manufactured from clay mined on or near the construction site. Limestone or oyster shells were burned to produce lime for mortar and plaster. Timber for framing was generally available on farmsteads, and men with the tools and experience of squaring beams and making joints were not uncommon. Paints, glass, nails, and hardware were available in the city, although the latter was also produced in local forges. As demand for house building increased, the numbers of craftsmen and journeymen increased to meet it. Greenburgh’s first settlers did not enter an architectural vacuum.

Barns
Farm buildings were limited to barns in the 18th century. Animals generally grazed untended in pastures (cattle and sheep), forests (swine) and farmyards (poultry). Horses and milk cows were the exception; special accommodations were made for them in the barn, although there was only one or two of each. Specialized buildings for the shelter and feeding of livestock developed later in the 19th century.

Early barns were of two kinds. Like domestic architecture, barn forms can be linked to British and Dutch ethnic divisions. The Dutch established a distinctive aisle barn tradition in New York, and by the end of the 18th century, it was recorded as “Dutch barn” in property descriptions.\(^8\) Hundreds of these barns survive in Dutch, German, and Huguenot communities in New York and New Jersey and represent the character of the 18th-century agricultural landscape. None survive in Greenburgh, but it is presumed that wheat plantations in Westchester would have had them (FIG.10).

![FIG.10: Jansen House & Dutch Barn, Napanoch, Ulster Co., NY, c. 1780. Dutch barns would have been a common feature of the 18th-century Yorktown landscape. The example is appropriate as the house has a three-bay façade and kitchen ell. Photo: Neil Larson, 1985.]

---

\(^8\) In a tax assessment made in New Paltz in 1798, “Dutch barn” was a frequent notation, but the alternative English barn was recorded simply as “barn.” Perhaps the assessors, who were Huguenots in origin (Huguenots and Germans are considered Dutch), cared little to distinguish the association.
With a voluminous loft under a tall and wide gable roof and large doors on the gable end opening into a broad center aisle, the Dutch barn was an efficient wheat processing center. Cut stalks of grain were piled above large “anchor beams” spanning the center aisle where the wheat kernels dried and cured. When ready, the wheat was dropped to the aisle floor where it was threshed and winnowed with the help of drafts moving through the end doors. The kernels were bagged or barreled and stored in a tight, rodent-proof granary constructed in one of the side aisles until ready for transport to the mill. The long, low aisles under the eaves were used for stabling houses and milk cows and storage. The straw left over from the threshing was stored above these aisles for their feed and bedding.

Farmers from British communities built a barn with a different orientation, although inside it had the same tripartite divisions of center and side sections (FIG.11). In addition to being smaller in size than their Dutch counterparts, English barns had a much flatter gable roof. The entrance was in the center of a side wall rather than the gable end. Inside, the English barn was more multi-purpose and animal-oriented. In fact, the barn most likely developed in response to the mixed agricultural practices that developed on New England farms, which combined a crop production and animal husbandry. While it appears that there was a decided cultural division in the choice of barn type, British wheat farmers could have crossed that ethnic boundary and built Dutch barns as an expedient agricultural measure.

![Image](image-url)  

**FIG.11**: Haines Farm English barn and cow house, Montgomery, Orange County, New York, c. 1800. The cow house (left) was a common addition to both English and Dutch barns beginning in the late 18th century as dairy farming became an important agricultural product in the region. Photo: Neil Larson, 2006.
The Dutch also built another farm structure—the barrack—to protect their hay stacks from the weather. Hay was not stored in barns initially. It was harvested from natural meadows and marsh grass and used to feed cattle, of which there were a limited number. Barracks were moveable roofs hung from four or five earth-fast posts that could be adjusted based on the size of the hay stack. These structures were probably in common use in Greenburgh during the 18th century. (Hay was stored in mows on one side of English barns).

New farm buildings were not introduced until the beginning of the 19th century as the cow population on farms increased. After the Revolution wheat production in the Hudson Valley decreased as the result of blights and economic competition from new farm areas in central New York. Farmers in the region shifted their attention to the production of dairy products, cattle for meat, sheep for wool, fruit and vegetables, and hay for the New York City market and this began to change the characteristics of farmsteads and their landscapes. The first change to occur was the construction of separate cow houses and hay houses to provide shelter for greater numbers of animals and their winter feed. In both cases, they were long, narrow, one-and-one-half-story, gable roof buildings with animal stalls and work areas on the ground level and lofts for storing hay. Very few of these buildings survive since the evolving practice of dairy farming long ago replaced these buildings with more modern facilities.

By 1760, the multi-story, three-bay façade house had become well-defined in the landscape. The one-story and basement house predominated, although those that have survived have been altered by expansion as their size made them obsolete. The majority of two-story and basement houses that survive in the town were constructed after the Revolutionary War, many incorporating parts of older, smaller dwellings. The chimney was an elaborate exercise in masonry, using stone and brick, and it was the predominant structural and design feature of the building. This is a distinguishing characteristic of 18th-century domestic architecture in the British colonies from Virginia to New England, and it was very different from the jambless fireplace type identified with the Dutch in the Hudson Valley. The single central stack with multiple hearths has a direct association with the center chimney houses of New England. One important difference in New York is the prevalence of fireplaces located in the corners of rooms, which is uncommon in New England, although popular in the Middle and Southern Colonies.

Exteriors were decidedly plain. Wood frames were covered with clapboards or shingles; entrances were simple with roofed and unroofed porch decks at the doorways; and rooflines were embellished on only the best houses. Windows were made of pairs of sashes with either three or four columns of lights or panes. Doors were paneled; often they were divided into two sections so that the top half could be opened to ventilate the interior while preventing direct physical access. This has been popularly characterized as a Dutch door, although it is found on houses built for British families as well.

The popularity of basement kitchens waned at the end of the 18th century, in part because the changing composition of farm households and the decline of slavery. As middling farms multiplied and improved, the kitchen became an active work center for both domestic and agricultural realms. Too remote and limited in its basement location, the kitchen was relocated to a one-and-one-half-story, ground-level ell with easy access to and from interior and exterior areas of the house (FIG.4). The ell connected to basement storage areas and contained attic
sleeping space for domestic servants and farm laborers, who had replaced slaves in the household. As in its previous basement location, the ell kitchen was dominated by a large cooking hearth and bake oven, which had its own prominent chimney stack. Ells were attached either to the passage side or the rear of the main houses, and their chimneys had to be very tall to extend above the two-story dwellings. Kitchen ells create a distinctive asymmetry in the outward appearance of farmhouses, which draws attention to them as a separate and dependent, but visible and important component of the building.

The onset of the American Revolution provided a watershed for architecture in the region. First of all, it created a hiatus in house construction for a number of years. Also, many dwellings and barns were destroyed in Westchester County as a result of the terrorism waged in the Neutral Ground. But, once the war ended, virtually all Americans participated in the reformulation of political and social institutions at the national, state and local levels. At no other time in the history of the United States (with the possible exception of the New Deal) had all citizens been so focused on a national ideal. This would have dramatic and far-reaching effects on the way people thought about the character their public and private lives, and it would be enthusiastically expressed in architecture and domestic design.
Part 2

EARLY NATIONAL PERIOD (1776-1840)

The Revolution in Greenburgh
Greenburgh was involved in the American Revolution, although no battle ever took place within its present confines. During 1776 it was the location of movements and encampments of American army and militia troops as they retreated from the Battle of New York, reorganized for the Battle of White Plains, and retreated from the region afterwards. Numerous other events occurred there as the town was in the core of the Neutral Ground and its residents were drawn into the struggle between British and rebel sympathies. Towards the end of the war, Greenburgh once again served as a encampment area for French and American soldiers as they prepared to meet the British in battle in Virginia (FIG.12). Frederick Philipse was a Loyalist and fled to England at the outset of the war. His property was confiscated by the State of New York and sold to his former tenants and other land seekers.

FIG.12: Map showing the positions of the American and French armies at Philipsburgh, 1781. Map in New-York Historical Society Collections, photo: Greenburgh, 10.
The sites of Revolutionary Encampments have been loosely identified in the town, as well as routes by which the militaries moved through it. Most of the sites have been compromised by more recent development, but there is still some open space with Revolutionary associations. Earthworks and other landscape features have not survived above ground. The small number of 18th-century dwellings extant in the town all have an relationship to the American movement for independence. For some there direct connections to documented event, such as the Odell House, which the commandant of the French Army, General Compte de Rochambeau, used briefly as his headquarters (FIG.1). But even the most modest house shares a relationship with the event simply because its occupants were involved, either actively or passively, in the day-to-day struggles of living in the Neutral Ground.

The Federal Period in Greenburgh
After a hiatus during the Revolutionary War, house construction was actively resumed in the remaining years of the 18th century. Greenburgh was officially incorporated 7 March 1788, and made the transition from a community of leaseholders of Philipse Manor to a new town of independent freeholders. The optimism of the period and the modernizing impulse inherent in the creation of a new republic is reflected in the architecture. The multi-story, three-bay house continued to be built in the traditional manner. While their forms and plans remained the same, changes in the decoration of rooflines, doorways and windows reflected the growing influence of Neo-classical design in post-war architecture (FIG.1). Interior plans also showed the effect of the new taste. Room dimensions were taller and more cube-like; entries were larger with many evolving into a through passage along one side of the house. (These houses have become known as “side-passage plans.”)


In many of these new houses the central chimney mass moved to the end wall where one or two separate chimney stacks emerged from the roof flanking the ridge line. The modern taste for vertical attenuation is aptly expressed in these tall, twin brick stacks. In wood frame buildings, the ground floor fireplaces were recessed into the walls and their masonry backs were exposed
on the exterior. The carefully finished brick or stone masonry provided an ornamental feature on the exterior while flattening the chimney breast on the interior. Fireplaces and door and window trim were embellished with elegant Neo-classical motifs. Two-story houses with five-bay facades became more numerous as class distinctions waned and prosperous, ambitious farmers desired to express their stake in the new democratic order (FIG.13).

One of the most distinctive Federal Period buildings in the historic Town of Greenburgh is the Elmsford Reformed Church, which was built about 1783 (FIG.14). Even though the building was erected following the Revolutionary War, the church and its adjacent cemetery has been an important landmark for Greenburgh’s role in the struggle for independence. The building contains large arched windows in the Roman or Neoclassical style, but it is otherwise very austere with wood shingle siding, eave-less roof edge, and absence of ornament. Unusual for Dutch Reformed churches, the building reflects the pious plainness of “old school” or orthodox New England Protestant sects, such as Quakers, Baptists and Presbyterians.

![Elmsford Reformed Church](image)

**FIG.14: Elmsford Reformed Church, Saw Mill River Road, c. 1793. Photo: American Architecture: Westchester County, 184.**

The Spread of the Plain Style of Rural Communities
At the end of the Revolution, the old established farm families of the Hudson Valley enjoyed the supreme economic and political position in New York State. The agrarian society had built up and matured in the years leading up to the rebellion, and when the English merchants and landlords were stripped of their authority, the old “rural aristocracy” filled the vacuum of power. This status is embodied in the architecture of the period; a conscious mix of tradition and
progress, of restraint and ostentation, and of piety and pride. Even in the 18th century, prosperous and influential farmers did not approve of the excessive lifestyle of the merchant class. In the early 19th century, these differences were hardened by harsh political rhetoric, as the era witnessed the gradual and contentious decline of the rural influence in the state’s politics and economy.

Events following the Revolution positioned New York City in the forefront of economic growth, and merchants and financiers gradually reclaimed their control of the state. This conflict aggravated city-country relations and energized a whole generation of farmers in defiance of the merchant take-over. By 1820, the traditional two-story, three-bay farmhouse had become a billboard of rural opposition. Its proportions and decoration were distorted and abstracted in an expression of political solidarity. The plain style of art, architecture, decoration, and material things that has become the benchmark of 20th-century “folk art” studies emerges in the Hudson Valley in this period.

With so few examples, it is difficult to identify the energy that distinguishes this rural architecture in many other parts of the region. Greenburgh experienced slow but persistent growth in the early decades of the United States. It may have been slower here and in other Westchester towns because they were making the transition from a tenant to a democratic society. According to first U.S. census in 1790, there were 1,269 free whites and 122 slaves residing in Greenburgh in 1790. (At this time and until the 1870s, town population statistics included the Hudson River villages where most of the people were concentrated.) In 1800 the number of free white inhabitants increased to 1,456 (15%), while that of slaves decreased to 109 (11%). There were 1,642 whites and 72 slaves (72 African Americans were recorded as being free) in 1810. The town experienced slow but deliberate growth, with newcomers moving in mostly from New England which was overpopulated. This same phenomenon occurred in other old proprietorships in the region.9 The result was that there is little architectural development to measure and assess in this period. (More study of this transitional period would be useful.)

The Greek Revival Style
By 1830, based on the scale and quality of domestic architecture in this period, independent landowners in Greenburgh had begun to prosper, and a town identity was coming into focus. Census data is incomplete for 1830, and it is impossible to tally population aggregates, but some comparisons with 1820 are possible. For example, there were 310 persons engaged in agriculture in 1820 and 445 in 1830, an increase of almost 44 percent. Persons engaged in manufacturing and trades nearly doubled from 108 in 1820 to 207 in 1830, suggesting that the growth of village-based occupations were increasing faster than farms. However, this conclusion is somewhat contradicted by the fact that the number of people employed in commercial jobs did not change by any significant degree (31 in 1820 and 37 in 1830). In addition there were 21 persons employed in river or ocean navigation in 1830 and 29 in the “learned professions,”

9 Ellis, David M. Landlords and Farmers in the Hudson-Mohawk Region 1790-1850. (1946; rpt. NY: Octagon Books, 1967). Novelist James Fenimore Cooper published a trilogy of books on the evolution of a Colonial Westchester County family and their land-based wealth in which he followed the decline of land-based wealth and the tenure system from 1750 to 1850 (Satanstoe, The Chainbearer, and The Red Men). Cooper was the son of the proprietor of a large land grant (Cooperstown), and he lamented the decline of the Colonial land-owning system as well as disparaged the homesteaders who eventually undermined it. Among other things, these stories reveal the longevity and persistence of the leasehold system into the 19th century.
classifications not used ten years earlier. Importantly, there were 11 schools with 339 scholars and one academy with 15 students. Only 12 illiterate persons over 20 were counted.

Population had made a significant leap, and a local government had been organized. By 1840, the free white population had reached 3,253, an increase of 1,242 souls (62%) over 1820. This was a greater increase than most of the county’s rural towns, which again reflects the factor of Greenburgh’s river towns. The number of African Americans in Greenburgh increased, from 97 (including 25 slaves) in 1820 to 110 free blacks in 1840, where other towns saw marked decreases. With their freedom, blacks opted to leave the rural towns where they had been enslaved for better job opportunities and living conditions in the city.

There are a notable number of farmhouses decorated in a Greek Revival style documenting that they were built or renovated in the 1830s and 1840s. In the context of Greenburgh’s antebellum architecture, these are most prominent. The Greek Revival style used broad post and beam trim elements to elaborate roof lines, wall corners, doorways, windows, and mantelpieces in designs derived from archiological sources in ancient Greece. Greek design was popular in the United States because of its historic democratic associations, but the style was also another instance of a global Romantic or nostalgic architectural impulse exerting an influence in the region during the years following the American Revolution. The Greek Revival style was one of many decorative motifs that were grafted to traditional buildings in the mid-19th century. It also illustrates the gradual broadening of the architectural context. It was the first style that did not reflect the traditions and characteristics of the local community. It was simply decorative. (Its reference to Greek stone post-and-beam structures was purely illusionary.)

Churches and public landmarks were appropriate vehicles for the monumental Greek temple form with its colossal colonnades and porticos (FIG.15). However, none of these buildings, nor any dwellings with Greek temple facades, remain within the present Greenburgh limits, at least since the villages were separated in the 1870s. Surely, the river towns have a number of examples, as they were pretentious and avant garde residences popular with merchants, traders, and ship captains who seem to have been attracted to the showy design. These houses were meant to be seen, and in most cases, surviving examples are located on the main roads and on prominent sites overlooking the Hudson River.

FIG.15: First Presbyterian Church, Yorktown, 1840. Photo: LFA, 2006
FIG.16: Greek revival style house, 10 West Hartsdale Ave. Photo: LFA, 2006.
The Greek Revival style is most evident in the modernizing of the decoration of traditional farmhouses in Greenburgh (FIG.16). Like the more elaborate churches and temple-form houses representing the higher levels of the taste, the prominent feature of farmhouse design is a massive entablature along the roof edge, which is supported (only figuratively) at the corners by wide pilasters. In most rural examples, the Greek elements are greatly economized and stripped of all historical ornament. They are constructed with wide boards the broad expanse of which are enlivened by horizontal molded trim dividing friezes, paneling within pilasters, and rudimentary capitals. Where half-story attics are present, small windows are spaced in the frieze, although these are rare in Greenburgh (FIG.17).

Entrances were focal points composed of a doorway and sidelights outlined and separated by pilasters with simplified capitals and a wide board header spanning the opening. None of these elements are structural as they were in the stone Greek architecture they imitate; rather they are trim pieces concealing conventional wood framing. Sometimes, porches were created at entrances to convey the sense of a Greek portico using the same imitative method of carpentry (FIG.18). But in other cases, the porch, or piazza, extended across the entire façade reflecting the growing taste for these outside “rooms.” Faithful to the overall Greek style of the house, the piazza and porch pictured here are supported by columns or pillars supporting entablatures at the roof line. Piazzas with Gothic elements seen on Greek Revival-style houses were likely added at a later time.

**Farm Buildings**

By the mid-19th century, older homesteads were showing their age, that is, diminishing in their condition and usefulness. With the need to improve domestic and agricultural buildings, most of Greenburgh 18th-century buildings were replaced or renovated in this period. The farm economy in Greenburgh changed dramatically in the 19th century. Agricultural statistics from the 1855 New York State Census show that Greenburgh ranked seventh among 24 Westchester County towns in acres of improved agricultural land. The town ranked second only to the Village of Yonkers in assessed value of real estate, which was probably more a factor of its suburban potential than its agricultural production. It ranked eleventh in number of cows and pounds of butter (858 & 48,952), fifth in numbers of swine (1,449), and last in numbers of sheep (17). The town ranked sixth and seventh in the production of winter and spring wheat (5,750½
bu. & 34,362 ½ bu., respectively), eighth in bushels potatoes (14,400), and, surprisingly, 18\textsuperscript{th} in bushels of apples (430).\textsuperscript{10} The statistics show that although wheat continued to be grown in this historic region, dairy farming was becoming the principal agricultural occupation in Greenburgh in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, supplying the constant and growing demand for fresh butter in the city. (The number of swine correlates with the number of cows because swine were raised to consume the detritus of the butter-making process.) Potatoes was another market product, and so were apples and cider, which is why it is surprising that orchards were uncommon.

Farm buildings originally designed to store wheat were adapted to meet the requirements of maintaining dairy herds and processing milk into butter. Financial success also prompted the upgrading of farm buildings as well as houses. The transformation was so complete that most 18\textsuperscript{th}-century buildings were replaced, although typical of rural conservatism, fragments of earlier buildings can be found re-used and incorporated into newer ones. Dutch barns, in particular, became obsolete. Later improved barns were designed on the English barn model.

![Barns barn, Central Park Avenue & Dromore Road, in c. 1895. Photo: Greenburgh, 31.](image)

By the 1830s, farm manuals were promoting basement barns that provided shelter for milk cows in a semi-subterranean stone masonry level. Like basement kitchens in many of Greenburgh farmhouses, this lower level was exposed at grade on one side to provide access and ventilation. With the animals housed in the basement, the upper, wood frame portion of the barn was used for the storage of feed and bedding, which could be easily dropped down to the animals as a labor-saving method (FIG.19). Cows fed primarily on hay, and this crop was stockpiled in the barns for winter use. The center aisle of the English barn was retained for unloading hay; it also continued to serve as a threshing floor for grains that augmented the feed of cows and work animals. As cow herds increased (most farms milked between five and ten cows), the demand

\textsuperscript{10} J.H. French, Gazetteer of the State of New York (1860), 709.
for hay increased, and more buildings were constructed for storage. Sheep houses, pig houses, and poultry houses gradually appeared along with workshops, equipment sheds, and other utility buildings.

This traditional regional architecture met with significant design shifts in the 1840s when new style tastes and progressive ideas of domestic space were introduced and promoted by books and periodicals. This change coincided with the growth of village and suburban communities, the ascendancy of the urban middle class and the decline of the agrarian society. The transition is particularly evident in Westchester County where middle-class suburban development began early. The regional vernacular persisted in rural architecture, although it, too, utilized modern construction methods and decoration. The image of the 18th-century three-bay house form would survive for many more years in lower-class dwellings, which remained small and plain.