

**PHASE 1 HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY AND
PHASE 2 SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS
WARD D, CITY OF JERSEY CITY
HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**

Prepared for:

**Division of City Planning, City of Jersey City
1 Jackson Square
Jersey City, NJ 07305**

Prepared by:

**Rachel Craft, M.A., Architectural Historian
Patrick Harshbarger, M.A., M.P.A., Principal Architectural Historian
Evan Mydlowski, M.A., GIS Specialist
Adrian Trevisan, M.S., Architectural Historian**

MARCH 2022

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary technical report and accompanying detailed digital documentation presents the results of a Phase 1 Historic Architectural Resources survey of 6,682 tax parcels, the entirety of Ward D in the City of Jersey City, Hudson County, New Jersey. Hunter Research, Inc. undertook this work under contract to the Division of City Planning.

The results are intended for use by the Division of City Planning's historic preservation specialists and planners and members of the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board in performance of planning, determining historical significance, reviewing demolitions and other historic preservation-related work undertaken per City zoning and land-use ordinances. The data may also be of interest to residents, the general public, preservationists and scholars who wish to have a greater understanding of the historical development and architectural characteristics of Ward D. It may also be of use to federal, state or local agencies and their consultants for use in compliance with historic preservation laws and reviews associated with various funding sources and permits.

During the performance of this work, architectural historians collected Phase 1 screening data on every parcel containing a building or structure judged to have been built prior to 1981. The collected data includes information on historic uses, architectural age and style, historical integrity and potential associations with patterns of historical development including residential, commercial, industrial, historic transportation systems, government services such as schools, firehouses, libraries and police stations, and religious and civic organizations. Additional data was gathered on groups of buildings that might represent intact historic streetscapes or smaller groups of buildings or structures with shared history, referred to herein as historic "assemblages."

Phase 1 survey was undertaken mostly via pedestrian reconnaissance from the public right-of-way using handheld digital devices to populate an Arc-GIS (Geographic Information System) database. Pedestrian survey was supplemented by windshield and desktop survey techniques. The GIS database is one of the principal deliverables to the City. It offers myriad ways to view and sort the collected data. A selection of maps and tables generated from this GIS data are presented in this report but they by no means represent the full capabilities of the GIS data.

The Ward D Phase 1 survey is intended to update and replace the architectural survey completed for the City in 1984-85 (referred to as the Brooks survey). The information in this 35-plus-year-old survey has become outdated and is minimally useful; however, all extant properties that the Brooks survey identified as potentially eligible for historic designation have been so noted in the Phase 1 GIS data and new recommendations made for Phase 2 evaluation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

One of the primary goals of a Phase 1 survey is to screen for properties that may merit further consideration in a Phase 2 survey. The Ward D properties recommended for Phase 2 have been judged to retain sufficient architectural character or historic associations to proceed to the next level. Properties surveyed at the Phase 2 level would be researched using archival materials, field investigated including detailed itemization of historic exterior architectural features and the taking of high-quality digital photographs, and the completion of a survey form that compiles the data and offers an assessment as to eligibility for historic landmark designation.

The Phase 1 survey of Ward D identified 1,144 parcels and three (3) potential historic district study areas that have sufficient architectural and historical qualities to merit a closer look at the Phase 2 level. Conversely, this means that 5,538 parcels were screened and should not require any further assessment because their potential for historical and architectural significance has been evaluated as minimal to none.

The three architecturally strongest areas of Ward D are 1). the Sherman Place Residential Historic Study Area, west of Central Avenue, north of Manhattan Avenue and east of John F. Kennedy Boulevard, in the neighborhood referred to as Hudson City South; 2). the Washington Village Historic District Study Area on Palisade and Ogden Avenues north of Griffith Street; and 3). the Central Avenue Commercial Historic District Study Area, a historic corridor on Central Avenue from Manhattan Avenue north to the Paterson Plank Road.

Sherman Place has the ward's greatest concentration of larger Queen Anne-style houses, as well as many other representative styles of the 1870s to the 1920s. It is Ward D's "highest" style residential neighborhood of the streetcar era. Washington Village is located on the eastern edge of the Bergen Heights and is Ward D's oldest neighborhood. Its residential and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings, mostly aligned to Palisade and Ogden Avenue, skew toward the 1860s to the 1890s. The Central Avenue Historic District Study Area is identified as Ward D's historic "main street," with a concentration of corner stores, office blocks, and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings with first-story storefronts. There are also a fair number of supporting buildings mixed throughout the ward including churches, schools, firehouses and civic buildings, also with interesting stylistic qualities including Gothic Revival and Romanesque Revival. That said, intact and visually interesting individual examples of common architectural forms and styles of the 1870s to the 1960s are present in every neighborhood, excepting the Meadowlands in far western Ward D. The latter developed around four main line railroads of the 1860s and the 1870s. These railroads have been previously evaluated by the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO) as historic rail corridors extending east to the Port of New York and west beyond Hudson County.

As next steps, this report recommends that a Ward D Phase 2 survey be conducted to undertake detailed analysis and evaluation of the properties that have met Phase 1 screening criteria. This work would be inclusive of the total of 1,144 individual parcels and three historic districts. The actual number, however, will be slightly less

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

since an evaluation of the Sherman Place Residential Historic District Study Area is being undertaken under a separate private contract and is nearing completion at this time. This Sherman Place survey will reduce the total by 125 individual parcels and one historic district study area.

It is recommended that the first step in the Phase 2 survey will be research using the City's tax cards of 1938, which are useful in determining a building's historical integrity of design, materials and workmanship. This tax card research is likely to eliminate some properties from further consideration before the Phase 2 additional archival research and fieldwork task commences. This will make that effort more targeted and efficient.

The City may also wish to consider undertaking Phase 1 surveys of other wards, employing the methodology used for Ward D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	v
List of Maps (Digital Submission Only)	vii
List of Tables (Digital Submission Only).....	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
2. METHODOLOGY	2-1
A. Definition of Historic Property	2-1
C. Review and Incorporation of Existing Survey Data	2-5
D. Survey Design	2-8
E. Fieldwork	2-8
F. Post-Fieldwork Analysis of Phase 1 Data.....	2-9
3. SUMMARY OF PHASE 1 SURVEY RESULTS	3-1
A. Hudson City North.....	3-1
B. Hudson City South.....	3-5
C. Meadowlands	3-9
D. Mount Pleasant.....	3-12
E. Sparrow Hill	3-15
F. Washington Village	3-17
G. Western Slope.....	3-21
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	4-1
A. Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Individual Intensive-Level Survey	4-1
B. Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey as Potential Historic Districts	4-2
C. Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes	4-4
D. Historic Places of Worship and Burial Grounds.....	4-6
E. Historic Parks and Designed Landscapes	4-8
F. Historic Transportation Routes, Utilities and Industries	4-9
G. Historic Schools, Libraries, Firehouses and Other Types of Civic Buildings.....	4-11
H. Next Steps	4-13
5. LIST OF DIGITAL ATTACHMENTS	5-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<i>page</i>
References.....	R-1

ATTACHMENTS

A. Kick-off Meeting Minutes	A-1
B. Phase 1 Screening methodology and screening questions.....	B-1
C. Digital Historic Maps, 1841-1928 (Digital only)	C-1
D. Tables (Digital only)	D-1
E. Ward D Survey GIS Data Package (Digital Submission in Arc-GIS).....	E-1

LIST OF MAPS (DIGITAL ONLY - PDFS)

- 2.1. Ward D and Surveyed Neighborhoods
 - 3.1.a. Ward D, Hudson City North Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.b. Ward D, Hudson City South Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.c. Ward D, Meadowlands Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.d. Ward D, Mount Pleasant Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.e. Ward D, Sparrow Hill Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.f. Ward D, Washington Village Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 3.1.g. Ward D, Western Slope Neighborhood, Architectural Periods of Development
 - 4.1.a. Ward D, Hudson City North Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.b. Ward D, Hudson City South Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.c. Ward D, Meadowlands Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.d. Ward D, Mount Pleasant Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.e. Ward D, Sparrow Hill Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.f. Ward D, Washington Village Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.1.g. Ward D, Western Slope Neighborhood, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
- 4.2. Central Avenue Commercial Historic District, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
- 4.3. Sherman Place Residential Historic District, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
- 4.4. Washington Village Historic District, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey
 - 4.5.a. Ward D, Hudson City North Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.b. Ward D, Hudson City South Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.c. Ward D, Meadowlands Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.d. Ward D, Mount Pleasant Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.e. Ward D, Sparrow Hill Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.f. Ward D, Washington Village Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
 - 4.5.g. Ward D, Western Slope Neighborhood, Historic Assemblages and Streetscapes
- 4.6. Ward D, Historic Places of Worship and Cemeteries
- 4.7. Ward D, Historic Parks
- 4.8. Ward D, Historic Transportation Routes and Industries
- 4.9. Ward D, Historic Schools, Libraries, Firehouses and Civic Buildings

ATTACHMENT D

LIST OF TABLES (DIGITAL ONLY)

- 4.1. Individual Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
- 4.2. Central Avenue Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
- 4.3. Sherman Place Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
- 4.4. Washington Village Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
- 4.5. Master Table of All Phase 1 Surveyed Properties (Excel only)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This report represents the results of a Phase 1 historic architectural survey of Ward D in the City of Jersey City, Hudson County, New Jersey. The purpose of this screening and reconnaissance-level survey is to provide up-to-date data on the historic architectural characteristics of the properties within Ward D based on the assessments of architectural historians who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR 61). These data will be used by the City of Jersey City in its land-use planning and zoning processes, including review and issuance of demolition permits, certificates of appropriateness, etc. Specifically, these data should be useful to the City's Historic Preservation Specialists, Division of City Planning and members of the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board in making historic preservation-related decisions and fulfilling their duties including but not limited to City Ordinance Sections 345-9, 345-30 and 345-71.

The City of Jersey City last undertook a Phase 1 historic architectural survey in 1984-85. Due to the passage of time and changing needs and standards, this 35-plus-year-old survey is increasingly out-of-date and no longer fulfilling the City's planning needs. Among the issues identified by the City are the impacts of rapid development growth and demolition, the historic status of mid-20th-century buildings that have reached the minimum evaluation age of 50 years, evolving understanding of the historical significance of Jersey City's built landscape, very little inclusion of wood-frame buildings and lack of buildings within majority minority neighborhoods. Rather than re-examining the existing survey of 1984-85, the City has determined that it would be desirable to engage a professional consultant to undertake a resurvey of the City, beginning with Ward D located in the northwest section of the City.

The proposed work was separated into two phases with distinct tasks. The Phase 1 screening consisted of five tasks, including a kick-off meeting and mobilization, background research, screening field investigations and the submission of survey data, mostly in GIS database format, and summarized in this report.

The City provided Hunter Research with the property data for a total of 6,682 tax block/lots (parcels) in Ward D. Architectural historians collected screening data and evaluated each parcel through a combination of field-work and desktop techniques. This report presents the culmination of the Phase 1 investigations that will inform the selection of properties for more in-depth Phase 2 surveys, which will be decided by the City in coordination with, and based on recommendations provided by, Hunter Research. Phase 2 surveys will gather detailed architectural descriptions of properties and make eligibility recommendations for Jersey City historic landmark status based on additional research and evaluation.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

A. DEFINITION OF HISTORIC PROPERTY

The City of Jersey City provides definitions of what constitute historic properties in Chapter 345-6 of the Code of Ordinances:

“HISTORIC — A building, structure, object, site or landscape feature having a degree of significance or importance over or at a period of time.

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES — Architectural features installed or built at the time of construction of the building; architectural features of a type installed or built at the time of construction of similar buildings in similar periods and styles; or architectural features installed or built at the time of a major façade alteration thirty (30) or more years ago.

HISTORIC/CULTURAL RESOURCE — Those buildings, objects, sites, structures or landscape features of historical, cultural, architectural or archaeological importance and the demolition, destruction or alteration of which would constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of Jersey City; inventoried interior spaces designed or intended to be occupied as part of the structure or which are accessible to the public; such buildings, objects, sites, structures or landscape features, their appurtenances and the property on which they are located are considered historic as defined in this Chapter.

HISTORIC DISTRICT — An area defined as a historic district by City Council, state or federal authority and which may contain within definable geographic boundaries one or more landmarks or clusters, including their accessory buildings, fences and other appurtenances, and natural resources having historical, cultural and archaeological significance and which district may have within its boundaries other buildings or structures, that while not of such historical, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance as to be designated landmarks, nevertheless contribute to the overall visual characteristics of the landmark or landmarks located within the district.

HISTORIC SITE — Any real property, man-made structure, natural object or configuration or any portion or group of the foregoing of historical, archaeological, cultural, scenic or architectural significance.

HISTORIC STRUCTURE — Any structure that is:

- 1) Listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places (a listing maintained by the Department of Interior), or preliminarily determined by the Secretary of the Interior as meeting the requirements for individual listing on the National Register;

(2) Certified or preliminarily determined by the Secretary of the Interior as contributing to the historical significance of a registered historic district, or one preliminarily determined by the Secretary to qualify as a registered historic district;

(3) Individually listed on a State inventory of historic places in States with historic preservation programs which have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior; or

(4) Individually listed on the local inventory of historic places in communities with historic preservation programs that have been certified either: (a) By an approved State program as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; or (b) Directly by the Secretary of the Interior in States without approved programs.

LANDMARK — Any building, object, site, structure or landscape feature, any part of which is fifty (50) years old or older, which has a special character or special historic or aesthetic interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, state or nation and which has been designated as a “landmark” pursuant to the provisions of this Chapter.”

In several locations in the Jersey City Code of Ordinances reference is made to properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, which was established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This program, administered by the Keeper of the National Register within the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, uses Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR 60.4) to guide decisions regarding which properties have historical significance and integrity and which do not.

“National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

(a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations. Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties

that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria of if they fall within the following categories:

- (a) A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- (b) A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- (c) A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his productive life.
- (d) A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- (e) A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- (f) A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
- (g) A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.”

Furthermore, in order to maintain its historical significance as defined above by the Criteria for Evaluation, a historic property must maintain the Aspects of Integrity. The National Register defines integrity as:

“Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.

Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.

To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant.”

The seven Aspects of Integrity are incorporated in Chapter 105-7 of the City Code of Ordinances.

- “i. Location: the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred; and/or
- ii. Design: the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property; and/or
- iii. Setting: the physical environment of a historic property; and/or
- iv. Materials: the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property; and/or
- v. Workmanship: the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory; and/or
- vi. Feeling: the property’s expression of the historic sense of a particular period of time; and/or
- vii. Association: the property’s direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.”

It is important to keep in mind that the Jersey City Code of Ordinances uses its own set of definitions and procedures grounded in the Municipal Land Use Law of the State of New Jersey (Chapter 40:55D-25) and is aligned with but not identical to those processes defined in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places Act (N.J.A.C. 7:4) governing state agencies and the implementing procedures of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 60 and 36 CFR 800) governing federal agencies. Generally speaking, except as incorporated specifically into the Code, the National Register Criteria for Evaluation serve as “best professional practices” used by officials, staff and consultants when making evaluations for planning or zoning purposes in Jersey City.

Furthermore, the Jersey City Code of Ordinances provides for Historic Preservation Review Procedures in Chapters 105-1 to 15, 18-036 and 345-30 including designating city landmarks and historic districts, Certificates of Appropriateness for designated historic districts and landmark buildings and Demolition Permits pertaining to properties that may meet definitions of historic, historic architectural feature, historic/cultural resource, historic district, historic site, historic structure and landmark. Data collected by this Phase 1 Survey are intended to be useful in assisting staff employed by the Division of City Planning and members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Board and City Council in performing the duties, responsibilities and procedures spelled out in these and related City ordinances.

B. KICK-OFF MEETING

In March 2021, Hunter Research staff met with Division of City Planning and Historic Preservation Commission staff to discuss and plan for the Phase 1 work. Meeting minutes were distributed to all parties (Attachment A). The following initiation steps were outlined for completion prior to the start of fieldwork:

- 1). Hunter Research staff received the City's GIS property/parcel data for Ward D from the department's GIS personnel. The data was then used to coordinate the creation of an ArcGIS Survey123 survey for all properties within Ward D by street address and tax block/lot.
- 2). Hunter Research developed property screening questions prior to beginning fieldwork and sent the questions to the Division of City Planning and Historic Preservation Commission staff for approval (Attachment B). These questions were focused on determining each parcel's historic architectural character, remaining historical integrity, contribution to its surrounding streetscape and potential historical significance to narrow the list of properties to be carried over to the Phase 2 survey.
- 3). The Division of City Planning notified Jersey City public safety of the survey team's presence in Ward D prior to the start of fieldwork. Hunter Research and Division of City Planning staff worked together to develop a letter to distribute to community organizations and neighborhood associations to notify them of the upcoming survey work. A similar letter was produced for the survey team to carry and distribute to residents who had further questions regarding the survey.

C. REVIEW AND INCORPORATION OF EXISTING SURVEY DATA

Ward D had never previously been subjected to a parcel-by-parcel historic architectural survey; however, there were several sets of existing background research and data that contained useful information, which was reviewed and noted in the Phase 1 GIS data.

Digital Historic Maps, 1841-1928 – At the outset of Phase 1, Hunter Research created a digital “library” of historic maps that could be referenced by architectural historians to analyze the periods of development of Ward D. These maps are excellent guides for establishing the age and historic associations of buildings with their past uses and owners. The maps were referenced throughout Phase 1 to confirm screening data and will be particularly useful in Phase 2 when more detailed assessments and research is conducted on individual properties. Among the most useful maps are Douglas (1841), Wood (1855), Hopkins (1873, 1908-10, 1919, 1928), Fowler and Bromley (1887) and Sanborn (1896, 1910). The historic map library is included as a digital submission (Attachment C).

Joseph C. Brooks and Associates Survey, 1985 – The Brooks survey is the prior Phase 1 survey that undertook a citywide identification of potential historic architectural resources in all wards. The Brooks survey employed teams of field workers, many Columbia University historic preservation graduate students, moving street-by-street and collecting data on buildings selected as having potential significant architectural characteristics. This

survey reflected survey practices of the time but was not comprehensive and predated the use of databases and digital photograph and data collection techniques. Over the years, the Brooks survey has shown to contain some biases and inconsistencies. For example, the thousands of buildings not selected for inclusion in the Brook survey were not itemized, so it is not possible to tell whether they were actually assessed or why they were excluded.

The Brooks survey evaluated approximately 930 buildings in Ward D, judged to be about 10 to 20% of the buildings over 50 years of age in 1985 (the exact percentage is difficult to judge since the boundaries of Ward D in 1985 included part of what is now Ward C). Brooks identified resources as not eligible (“N”), potentially eligible (“P”) or eligible (“Y”). Properties identified as potentially eligible were often grouped thematically based on historic architectural style (i.e., Greek Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Renaissance Revival, etc.) or property type (i.e., apartments, churches, firehouses, etc.). The Brooks survey identified 65 individually eligible “Y” properties in Ward D, as well as six potentially eligible (“P”) historic districts at Central Avenue, Manhattan Avenue, Ogden Avenue, Palisade Avenue, Sherman Place and Summit Avenue. The identified districts were not mapped and did not specify contributing and non-contributing buildings. Baseline eligibility data from the Brooks survey were entered into the Phase 1 GIS data by matching the tax parcel data and street addresses to the data acquired from Jersey City. This now serves as a digital geospatial record of the Brooks survey in Ward D.

In reviewing the data collected for the Brook survey of 1985 against current Phase 1 survey data in 2021, surveyors found a preference in the prior survey for masonry buildings or buildings with masonry ornamentation. Frame buildings were surveyed, particularly if they were stylized or retained much of their original ornamentation; however, the population size was noticeably smaller.

Mary B. Dierickx, Architectural Preservation Consultants Survey, 1986 – The Dierickx survey is the prior Phase 2 survey that undertook intensive-level survey of the buildings identified as “Y” eligible by the Brooks survey of 1985. Sixty-five (65) of the Dierickx Phase 2 properties are within the current boundaries of Ward D. Dierickx completed a one-page architectural description and short research summary for each eligible property. Baseline eligibility data from the Dierickx survey were entered into the Phase 1 GIS data. This now serves as a digital geospatial record of the Dierickx survey in Ward D. An estimated 29 of the 65 properties (45%) evaluated as eligible in 1986 have been demolished in the intervening 35 years based on a comparison with the Phase 1 Survey GIS data. Most of these demolitions are located in the Hudson City North neighborhood of Ward D.

Jersey City Master Plan Historic Preservation Element, 2000 – The Master Plan incorporated the Dierickx Phase 2 list of eligible properties. Several sites on the list are no longer within the current boundaries of Ward D as the Waverly neighborhood and part of the Sparrow Hill neighborhood have been moved to Ward C. The Historic Preservation Element of the Master Plan is in the process of being updated and it is assumed that the lists of eligible resources will be updated to reflect the new ward boundaries.

Jersey City Landmark Listings, 2021 – The current list of Jersey City Landmarks, those individual properties and historic districts officially designated by the City, was reviewed for listings in Ward D. The only listed property in Ward D is Holland Street, which received a local landmark designation in April 2003 and a New Jersey

Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO) Certification of Eligibility to the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places in November 2018. This resource is a historic road, noted for its Belgian block paving, and is not associated with tax blocks/lots in the Phase 1 GIS survey data.

New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO) Survey Data, 2021 – The NJHPO cultural resources GIS (CRGIS/LUCY) was consulted to identify previously surveyed and designated properties in Ward D. Properties with NJHPO Opinions of Eligibility, inactive National Register nomination files (National Register nominations that were not completed and are on file at the NJHPO office), and eligible survey recommendations were matched to their corresponding property/parcels in the Phase 1 GIS data.

The following New Jersey and National Register-eligible/listed individual resources in Ward D were noted in the NJHPO Survey Data:

- 269-271 Ogden Avenue (NJHPO Opinion 2/27/1991)
- 266-271 Ogden Avenue (NJHPO Opinion 2/27/1991)
- Engine Company Number 11 Firehouse, 152 Lincoln Street (NJHPO Opinion 6/11/1980)
- Engine Company Number 14 Firehouse, 46 Irving Street (NJHPO Opinion 6/11/1980)
- Roben Company Office Buildings, 737 Tonelle Avenue (NJHPO Opinion, 8/21/1989)
- St. Peter's Cemetery (NJHPO Opinion 6/17/1996)

The following New Jersey and National Register-eligible/listed historic districts in Ward D were also noted in the NJHPO Survey Data:

- Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Boonton Line Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 6/11/2013)
- Erie Railroad Main Line Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 2/19/2003)
- Holland Street (COE 11/23/2018)
- Jersey City Waterworks Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 4/11/2013)
- New Jersey Midland Railway/New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 7/17/2016)
- Old Main Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Historic District (NJHPO Opinion, 9/23/1996)
- Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) Kearny-Essex-Marion Interconnection (NJHPO Opinion 12/30/2013)

The survey data that is mapped in CRGIS/LUCY is limited primarily to cultural resources management survey data gathered prior to the start of transit or utility projects along the transportation corridors that pass through or near Ward D. It does not include any of Jersey City's identification planning studies, i.e. Brooks 1985, Dierickx 1986 or Master Plan 2000. Some cities share their cultural resources survey planning data with SHPO, which then enters it into the CRGIS/LUCY as geospatial data for federal, state and municipal planning and regulatory purposes. This might be a consideration for future historic architectural survey efforts sponsored by the City of Jersey City.

D. SURVEY DESIGN

In order to efficiently evaluate the more than 6,500 parcels in Ward D during Phase 1, Hunter Research used a Cloud-based, on-line GIS remote data-collection system and handheld devices using an application known as Survey123. Based on visual inspection via pedestrian or windshield survey, architectural historians completed a basic digital short form and answered questions that assessed whether a property/parcel met a minimum threshold for later completion of a more in-depth survey form during Phase 2.

Hunter Research designed Phase 1 Screening questions that were approved by the City for use in the field (Attachment B). They were incorporated into ArcGIS's Survey123 application via an easily fillable survey form. These questions, with "yes" and "no" fields for answers, and pull down values for historic period of development, architectural style, historic use, etc., were intended to quickly evaluate each parcel while offering a variety of methods to manipulate the data for displaying via GIS.

The questions prompted surveyors to estimate each property's period of development if it was constructed prior to 1981, its historical use, its elements of architectural style (if any), its level of integrity, the property's overall streetscape, and whether or not the parcel is part of an assemblage with potential historic significance. These questions provided answers that allowed Hunter Research staff to filter through properties that are not only eligible for consideration based on their age (50 years or older by 2030), but that have significant style and integrity for further evaluation as individual properties, historic districts or historic streetscapes/assemblages that have historic architectural features. These answers were intended to provide the City's Historic Preservation staff with additional data to inform determination of significance and demolition decisions on a property-by-property basis.

Attachment B is the "meat" of the Phase 1 survey methodology and the guide to understanding the value of the GIS data that was collected by the architectural historians on all 6,682 tax block/lots (parcels) in Ward D. Attachment B is "must reading" for anyone using the data. It should be noted that what follows in this report is a summary and analysis derived from the Phase 1 data, which should be viewed in detail using an ArcGIS application (Attachment D).

E. FIELDWORK

Upon receipt of the property tax block/lot data, Hunter Research staff divided the data into smaller, manageable data groupings by neighborhood. These neighborhoods were: Hudson City North, Hudson City South, Meadowlands, Mount Pleasant, Sparrow Hill, Washington Village and Western Slope (Map 2.1). Fieldwork was conducted on neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis, and within each neighborhood block-by-block, from June 2021 to November 2021. Qualified architectural historians, working teams of two, completed the fieldwork collecting data on the historic architectural characteristics of each tax block/lot (parcel).

Surveyors used the ArcGIS Survey123 application on iPads to complete each property/parcel's screening questionnaire. No photographs were collected during Phase 1; however, photographs of buildings and architectural details will be collected for those properties carried into Phase 2. All neighborhoods were screened in their entirety prior to beginning survey in another neighborhood. Surveyors began with the Hudson City South neighborhood, followed by the Washington Village neighborhood, Mount Pleasant neighborhood, Sparrow Hill neighborhood, Western Slope neighborhood, Hudson City North neighborhood and ending with the Meadowlands neighborhood.

For Hudson City North, Hudson City South, Mount Pleasant, Sparrow Hill, Washington Village and Western Slope, surveyors examined each property/parcel from the public right-of-way and answered the screening survey questions based on each parcel's appearance. Very few limitations were encountered since most streets are walkable and data could be collected from the sidewalks. Due to limited public right-of-way access to the large, private properties and transportation corridors in the Meadowlands neighborhood, surveyors performed a desktop survey using Google Earth to determine which properties/parcels developed prior to 1981 and warranted further field investigation.

Hunter Research surveyors carried letters explaining the purpose of the survey for residents who had further questions. These letters contained contact information for both Hunter Research staff and City of Jersey City staff. Surveyors worked exclusively from the public right-of-way; no private property access was necessary to complete the screening-level survey. No tax blocks/lots were left unevaluated at the Phase 1 level.

F. POST-FIELDWORK ANALYSIS OF PHASE 1 DATA

Following the completion of fieldwork in November 2021, the architectural historians and GIS specialist coordinated to review the collected data and ensure its accuracy, completeness and consistency. This included spot-checking selected data and resolving any questions or discrepancies in data that had been noted in the field.

Although of minor consequence to the analysis of the Phase 1 data, an area of discrepancy was considered worth bringing to the attention of staff of the Division of City Planning.

Mapping Errors in City GIS Tax Parcel Data. Surveyors identified six properties/parcels in the Hudson City North neighborhood with GIS mapping and parcel data that did not correspond with the correct property/parcel locations. The six properties are comprised of three groups that are direct inverses of each other. These properties' GIS and parcel data need to be corrected in the Jersey City Planning Department's data. They have been flagged in the master GIS database as well, and the polygons for each pair were switched. These properties/parcels are:

- 10 Graham Street (Block 1505/Lot 33) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 107 North Street (Block 1505/19)
- 107 North Street (Block 1505/19) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 10 Graham Street (Block 1505/Lot 33)

- 30 Irving Street (Block 803/Lot 39) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 29 Poplar Street (Block 803/Lot 11)
- 29 Poplar Street (Block 803/Lot 11) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 30 Irving Street (Block 803/Lot 39)
- 46 Irving Street (Block 803/Lot 49) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 45 Poplar Street (Block 803/Lot 4)
- 45 Poplar Street (Block 803/Lot 4) is mapped as and assigned the parcel data of 46 Irving Street (Block 803/Lot 49)
- In the Meadowlands neighborhood, a middle section of a linear parcel does not have any assigned data. It is bookended by pieces of the same parcel (Block 3101/ Lot 2_HM)

Analysis and Recommendations for Phase 2 Survey – Following verification of the data, architectural historians used the GIS application to sort and filter data on the historic characteristics of the properties/parcels in each neighborhood. The purpose of this exercise was to identify individual properties that merited Phase 2 survey, as well as large trends in historical and architectural development and character that might lend them to study as historic districts or assemblages of older properties and streetscapes that retained some basic level of historic architectural features of distinctions. Many hours were spent drilling down into the data. What follows in Chapters 3 and 4 of this report is a summary of this analysis. Chapter 3 discusses the historic architectural analysis of each of the seven neighborhoods, with a general historical overview and summary of the architectural property types present in the neighborhood. Building on this analysis, Chapter 4 makes specific recommendations for the properties/parcels worthy of further survey and consideration of eligibility in Phase 2.

Chapter 3

SUMMARY OF PHASE 1 SURVEY RESULTS

A. HUDSON CITY NORTH

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – Development within the Hudson City North neighborhood was sparse prior to the mid-19th century. Hudson City formed as a municipality in 1855, encompassing the Heights area from south of Communipaw Avenue north to the present-day Union City boundary, an area that had previously been the southwestern section of North Bergen Township, which included present-day Hoboken. Hudson City as formed included all of Ward D. Although referred to as a city, settlement patterns were actually relatively sparse and strung out along the older roads that crossed the Heights, a reflection of older Dutch Colonial farms and early suburban “country homes” of the 1820s to the 1850s. According to the Wood’s *Map of Jersey City, Hoboken & Hudson City* of 1855, dwellings in Hudson City North were found mostly on generous-sized suburban lots to either side of the older roads, including present-day Palisade Avenue and Paterson Street.

By the 1870s, Hudson City North’s street grid had been established and was being subdivided into a familiar pattern of rectangular parcels with narrow street frontages conducive to maximizing the number of lots available for residential construction. As of 1873, new homes began to fill a small section of the neighborhood, roughly bounded by Summit Avenue to the east, present-day John F. Kennedy Boulevard to the west, Graham Street to the north and Charles Street to the south. More commercial and residential development began to appear in the neighborhood’s eastern extension with concentrations on Central, Hancock, New York, Palisade and Webster Avenues. Throughout the 1890s to the 1910s, new construction continued apace in Hudson City North, filling nearly all of the vacant lots with residential, commercial or residential/commercial mixed-use properties, the latter mostly two to four-story buildings with retail shops on the first floor and apartments on the upper floors.. There was a very limited industrial presence in the neighborhood, the largest manufacturer being the Poidebard Silk Manufacturing Company (demolished) at the neighborhood’s northern tip. Apartment buildings, schools, churches and other property types completed the neighborhood’s essential needs by the middle decades of the 20th century.

Survey Findings – Hudson City North has 1,649 parcels, of which 1,328 (81%) have property types more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.a).

Surveyed Parcels in Hudson City North	
Properties Built Before 1981	1,328
Properties Built After 1981	321
Total Number of Properties	1,649

The majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 1,086 of 1,328 (82%) are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types characteristic of Hudson City North's historic development as Jersey City neighborhood between 1870 and 1914. At present, the number of buildings pre-dating 1870 are only five (5) in number, with the balance made up buildings constructed after 1914. The oldest building in the neighborhood, and one of the oldest in Jersey City, is the Van Vorst House at 531 Palisade Avenue (Block 2305/Lot 35). This Dutch farmhouse was reportedly built *circa* 1780 or earlier and had a Greek Revival-style makeover during the second-quarter of the 19th century.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Early National Architectural Type (c. 1780-1830)	1
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c.1830-1870)	5
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c.1870-1914)	1,086
Interwar Architectural Type (c.1915-1944)	92
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c.1945-1980)	100
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	44

Historical property usage is also a reflection of Late Victorian development with the majority of parcels with dwellings, 968 of 1,286 (75%), being single-family homes with the balance made of duplexes, multi-family apartment buildings or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The number of historically single-use commercial parcels is very small, 30 in total, representing only about 2% of the buildings of historic age. Other historic property types including seven (7) churches, two (2) firehouses and one (1) school are distributed throughout the Hudson City North neighborhood, mostly of an architectural scale that blends with the neighborhood's historically strong residential character.

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	968
Residential – Duplex	20
Residential – Multi-Family	165
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	133
Commercial	30
Church	7
School	1
Firehouse	2
Transportation	2

Hudson City North has a high proportion of older buildings but the number of those buildings surviving with strong elements of architectural style is relatively low. Only 359 of 1,328 parcels with building (27%) exhibit sufficient architectural detail to attribute a style. This is both a reflection of original vernacular construction, which might not have applied many stylized details to a building, as well as the loss of historical integrity of

design, materials and workmanship due to later alterations. Buildings with Italianate-style characteristics, and their close cousin the late Renaissance Revival-style, account for 185 of the 359 buildings (52%). This style remained a prominent choice for architects, builders and homeowners throughout Jersey City into the early decades of the 20th century, so it is far from distinctive in the Jersey City context. Given the neighborhood's development into the early 20th century, multi-family residential buildings (i.e., apartments and condominiums) are the next highest historic use, with many of these buildings exhibiting historic architectural styles of the late Victorian and interwar periods. With Central Avenue and Summit Avenue included within the neighborhood's boundaries, a relatively small segment of the building population in Hudson City North was at one point commercial in function. These buildings, particularly those on 400 and 500 blocks of Central Avenue and the 1100 Block of Summit Avenue, provide the neighborhood a deeper architectural texture, especially with the interspersing of interwar commercial architectural styles such as Art Deco.

Parcels with Properties of Discernable Architectural Style	
Early National Architectural Type (c. 1780-1830)	
Greek Revival	1
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Beaux Arts	2
Gothic Revival	8
Italianate	123
Queen Anne	44
Renaissance Revival	62
Romanesque Revival	5
Second Empire	4
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	28
Art Moderne	1
Colonial Revival	2
Craftsman	1
Modernistic	1
Neo-Classical	3
Other	6
Tudor Revival	2
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	65

Slightly more than half of properties in Hudson City North exist within streetscapes that retain a historic architectural character. Streets considered as having intact historic streetscapes include the north side of Bower Street, particularly between Central Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard, and Central Avenue from Bower

Street to the Union City line. The Central Avenue corridor continues south into the Hudson City South neighborhood and is a strong candidate as a potential historic district (see Chapter 4.B.1). The far eastern edge of the Hudson City North neighborhood along Palisade Avenue between South and Bower Streets is also a strong intact streetscape. It is on the border of the Washington Village neighborhood and may be within a potential historic district centered on the village (see Chapter 4.B.3). There is also a concentration of intact streetscapes on Summit Avenue and the three neighboring east-to-west streets of North, Irving and Popular between Central Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard in the northernmost tip of the neighborhood. The block of Sherman Street between Bower Street and South Street also remains intact anchored about mid-block by the Gothic Revival-style St. Paul of the Cross Church complex (Block 2205/Lots 13-15, 30). These latter streetscapes, however, tend to lack the overall consistency of character and historical integrity to currently rank as part of potentially larger historic districts.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	692
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	636

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Commercial – Commercial buildings within the Hudson City North neighborhood are concentrated on the Central Avenue axis. A variety of developmental periods and architectural styles were identified as potentially significant examples of their types including 359 Central Avenue (Block 2803/Lot 29) (Neo-Classical) and 391-403 Central Avenue (Block 2804/Lots 27-30) (Romanesque Revival), both of which exhibit architectural styles that are uncommon to the neighborhood and Ward D. Other mixed-use buildings are located on the northern blocks of Summit Avenue and present a variety of architectural styles, including 1138 Summit Avenue (Block 803/Lot 50) (Renaissance Revival). The Central Avenue corridor, which extends into the Hudson City South and Mount Pleasant neighborhoods, has historic district potential.

Firehouses – Two firehouses are located in Hudson City North at 46 Irving Street (Block 803/Lot 49) (currently Hook & Ladder No. 7, historically Engine Company No. 14) and 137 South Street (Block 2805/Lot 19) (Engine Company No. 11). 46 Irving Street retains historical of integrity of its architectural style (Renaissance Revival) and is considered individually eligible for listing on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places.

Religious – Hudson City North's churches show a preference for the ecclesiastical Gothic Revival style, made popular in the 19th-century by church architects in the New York City region, particularly the prolific Upjohn family of Richard, Richard M. and Hobart. Those churches of note include the Saint Paul of the Cross Roman Catholic Church of 1868 (Gothic Revival, 156-166 Hancock Avenue (Block 2205/Lots 13-15)), All Souls English Lutheran Church (aka La Luz del Mundo) of *circa* 1898 (Gothic Revival, 9-11 Paterson Street (Block 1507/Lot 16)), German Seventh-Day Adventist Church of *circa* 1922 (Romanesque Revival, 158-160 Congress Street (Block 1504/Lot 50)), Saint John's Lutheran Church and Parish House of *circa* 1960 (Modernistic, 155 North Street (Block 1401/Lot 7)) and Saint Trinitatis Kirche of *circa* 1890 (Gothic Revival, 66 Bowers Street (Block 2301/Lot 56)).

B. HUDSON CITY SOUTH

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – By 1873, when the G.M. Hopkins Company published its *Atlas of the County of Hudson, and the State of New Jersey*, the Hudson City South neighborhood had been platted, and developers had built a small number of houses. Many streets were completely empty, including stretches of Central Avenue and the blocks between Griffith and Bowers Streets. Horse streetcar lines operated on Central Avenue and New York Avenue. By 1896, the neighborhood had become much more built up. Very few vacant lots remained on the blocks between Palisade and Central Avenues and south of Griffith Street. Most of the properties were houses, but they shared space with two factories, belonging to the John Mehle & Co Leather Goods and F. G. Otto & Sons surgical instruments, a police station, fire station and several smaller businesses such as bakeries. In contrast, several large stretches on New York, Sherman, and Hancock Avenues north of Griffith Street were still unbuilt. West of Central Avenue this pattern reversed, with the northern end of the neighborhood almost completely filled with buildings, and large stretches of vacant lots on streets to the south of Griffith Street. Central Avenue was almost completely filled with buildings from end to end, most of them wood-framed. About twenty years later, around 1919, only a handful of empty lots remained in Hudson City South. Many brick buildings occupied Central Avenue, having replaced earlier wood-frame structures, among them a new police station near the corner of Hutton Street. F. G. Otto & Sons had become the Alaska Chemical Company. Churches of many denominations – Baptist, Dutch Reformed, Jewish, Lutheran, Methodist and Seventh Day Adventist – reflected the diverse cultural make-up of Ward D.

Survey Findings – Hudson City South has 1,530 parcels, of which 1,309 (86%) have properties more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.b).

Surveyed Parcels in Hudson City South	
Properties Built Before 1981	1309
Properties Built After 1981	221
Total Number of Properties	1530

The majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 1,136 of 1,309 (87%) are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types characteristic of Hudson City South's historic development as a Jersey City neighborhood between 1870 and 1914. At present, the number of buildings pre-dating 1870 are only 18 in number, many associated with the early suburban "country houses" of well-off businessmen and merchants who located to the Heights in the mid-19th century prior to the more dense development of the post-1870 period. The balance is made up of buildings constructed after 1914, many of these later residential in-fill into vacant lots or commercial buildings.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	19
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	1136
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	71
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	38
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	47

Historical property usage is also a reflection of Late Victorian development with the majority of parcels with dwellings, 943 of 1,233 (76%), being single-family homes with the balance made of duplexes, multi-family apartment buildings or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The number of historically single-use commercial properties is very small, 38 parcels in total, representing only about 3% of the buildings of historic age. Other historic property types including ten (10) industrial buildings, eight (8) churches, two (2) schools and one (1) library, are distributed throughout the Hudson City South neighborhood, mostly of an architectural scale that blends with the neighborhood's historically strong residential character.

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	948
Residential – Duplex	42
Residential – Multi-Family	142
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	105
Commercial	38
Church	8
Firehouse	1
Industrial	10
School	2
Library	1
Civic	4
Transportation	8

About one-third, 507 of 1,309 (39%) of Hudson City South's parcels with properties of historical age can be assigned an architectural style based on surviving details such as roof patterns, cornices and window and door shapes, patterns and trim. The two most prevalent residential styles are Italianate (164 buildings) and Queen Anne (144 buildings), which each account for about one-third of the buildings with assignable styles built between 1870 and 1914. The next two largest stylistic groups are Renaissance Revival (46 buildings) and Art Deco (23 buildings), most of which date from *circa* 1914 to 1940 and are associated with commercial or mixed-use properties on Central Avenue, Summit Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard.

Properties with Discernable Architectural Style	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	
Greek Revival	2
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Gothic Revival	6
Italianate	164
Other	16
Queen Anne	144
Renaissance Revival	46
Romanesque Revival	2
Second Empire	6
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	23
Colonial Revival	5
Craftsman	1
Other	25
Spanish Colonial Revival	1
Tudor Revival	1
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	22
International	1

Streetscapes that retain a historic architectural character account for less than half of properties in Hudson City North. The two most intact streetscapes are found on Central Avenue, Palisade Avenue and Sherman Place, all of which are candidates for potential historic districts (see Chapter 4.B).

The Central Avenue commercial corridor is noted for its mix of Italianate, Renaissance Revival and Art Deco buildings dating from the 1870s to the 1930s. This corridor continues north into the Hudson City North neighborhood (see Chapter 4.B.1).

Sherman Place, between Summit Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard, offers a concentration of Queen Anne-style dwellings intermixed with Italianate, as well as a small handful of Craftsman, Colonial Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival/Mission-style dwellings dating from the 1870s to the 1920s. Intersecting and adjacent streets, including nearby blocks of Manhattan Avenue, Sanford Place, Sherman Place east of Summit Avenue, Summit Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard share some of Sherman Place's architectural characteristics. Sherman Place is Ward D's "high" style residential neighborhood with some of its most distinctive period housing (see Chapter 4.B.2).

Palisade Avenue between Bowers Street and Griffith Street is on the eastern edge of the Hudson City South neighborhood bordering the Washington Village neighborhood. Palisade Avenue, with its eclectic mix of Italianate, Renaissance Revival and Queen Anne-style residential and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings forms the spine of a potential Washington Village Historic District Study Area. (see Chapter 4.B.3).

Some other streets in Hudson City North have intact streetscapes but do not currently rise to the level of consistency or historical integrity of design, materials and workmanship necessary for historic district consideration. These streetscapes include Hancock Avenue and Sherman Avenue between Bowers and Griffith Streets, and Hutton Street and Zabriskie Street between Central Avenue and Summit Avenue.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	591
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	718

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Commercial – The portion of the Central Avenue business district that runs down the middle of the neighborhood contains the former First National Bank building at 286 Central Avenue (Block 4404/Lot 18), one of the most distinctive of the Renaissance Revival-style buildings in the neighborhood. Other noteworthy commercial buildings are a pair of Italianate-style storefronts at 367-69 Palisade Avenue (Block 3901/Lots 35-36).

Industrial – A handful of late-19th-century industrial facilities are interspersed on the streets located to the east of Central Avenue, marking this as a more working-class blue-collar area than the area to the west of Central Avenue with its slightly larger and higher style residences. Former factories include the John Mehle & Company Leather Goods Factory at 187 New York Avenue/126 Webster Avenue (Block 4503/Lots 17-18) and the Grossenbach & Fimple silk mill at 120 Sherman Avenue (Block 2904/Lot 29). These brick industrial buildings added an important architectural texture to this area of Hudson City South.

Religious – Churches of architectural note include the Central Avenue Reformed Church at 141 Bowers Street (Block 2802/Lot 24) (Romanesque Revival, *circa* 1871), Congregation Mount Sinai Hudson City Synagogue at 128 Sherman Avenue (Block 2904/Lot 31) (Renaissance Revival, *circa* 1900), Grace Chapel at 877 Summit Avenue (Block 4302/Lot 17) (Gothic Revival, *circa* 1900), Second Dutch Reformed Church at 940 Summit Avenue (Block 3703/Lot 4) (Gothic Revival, *circa* 1910), Trinity Baptist Church at 159 Bowers Street (Block 2802/Lot 14) (Gothic Revival, *circa* 1900), and Trinity United Methodist Church at 987 Summit Avenue (Block 2703/Lot 17) (International style, *circa* 1960).

Civic – Notable civic buildings include the Renaissance Revival-style police station at 282 Central Avenue (Block 4404/Lot 17), the International-style Charles E. Trefurt School (Public School No. 8) at 96 Franklin Street (Block 4406/Lot 1), and the Heights Branch Jersey City Free Public Library at 14-16 Zabriskie Street (Block 3704/Lot 38), one of only five Colonial Revival-style buildings in the neighborhood. 81-83 Hutton Avenue (Block 4404/Lot 22) was constructed as the meeting space for the Jersey City chapter of the Arion Society, a German singing social organization founded 1854. This building is closely associated with the

German-American immigrant community that came to the United States and concentrated in Hoboken, Hudson City and Union City after the failure of the German revolutions of 1848-50. The adjoining building at 85-87 (Block 4404/Lot 21) was constructed later to provide additional meeting space for the Arion Society and included a performance stage. After the closure of the Arion Society, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks (BPOE), a fraternal organization, occupied the building. Another building with German immigrant associations is the Turn Verein at 156-158 Webster Avenue (Block 3805/Lot 34), which was built as a gymnasium and recreational center.

C. MEADOWLANDS

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – The Meadowlands neighborhood is unlike the others in Ward D in that it was never developed as a residential area with supporting businesses and services. Well into the 19th century, most of this land was on the eastern edge of expansive tidal wetlands drained by the Hackensack River. It was referred to as the Meadowlands because it was diked and harvested for salt hay used to feed livestock. Members of Saint Peter’s Roman Catholic Church purchased five acres on the edge of the meadows in 1849 for use as a cemetery. Saint Peter’s Cemetery at 301 Tonnele Avenue (Block 5301/Lot 36) is reportedly the oldest Catholic cemetery in the Newark diocese. Beginning in the third quarter of the 19th century, railroads building westward across the Meadowlands and tunneling under the Bergen Ridge purchased large chunks of the Meadowlands. This was prime real estate for several competing railroad companies because it was on a direct line connecting Newark, Paterson and other points west to the Port of New York and ferry terminals providing passage across the Hudson River to Manhattan. The Erie Railroad completed its line in 1861, followed by the Morris and Essex Railroad Boonton Line in 1870 (later known as the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western (DL&W) Boonton Branch), the Morris and Essex Railroad Main Line (later known as the DL&W Old Main Line) in 1873, and the New Jersey Midlands/New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad, (NYS&WRR) also in 1873. The Meadowlands in Ward D were at the “chokepoint” just west of where the railroads passed through the tunnels under the Bergen Ridge. Just west of the tunnels in the Meadowlands, the railroad companies constructed multiple tracks and sidings for passing and waiting trains. In 1906, PSE&G built the Marion Generating Station against the Hackensack River in the southwest corner of the Ward D Meadowlands neighborhood, in part due to the access the railroads and the river provided to coal. This plant was retired in 1961 and replaced at the same location by the larger PSE&G Hudson Generating Station, which came online in 1964. By the 1960s, with railroads in decline, the empty land associated with former rail yards, and the proximity to regional highway, sea and air transportation, made the Meadowlands neighborhood an attractive location for warehousing. Old Dominion Freight Line Company built a complex at 120-136 Duffield Avenue/75 Van Keuren Avenue (Block 7404/Lots 3, 7-12) *circa* 1960, and the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) built a National Distribution and Bulk Mail Center at 80 New County Road (Block 101/Lots 8-9, 14 and Block 1001/Lots 11-13, 17-19, 21, 25) *circa* 1975.

Survey Findings – The Meadowlands has 149 parcels, of which 114 (77%) have architectural or engineered resources that are more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.c).

Surveyed Parcels in the Meadowlands	
Properties Built Before 1981	114
Properties Built After 1981	35
Total Number of Properties	149

The oldest extant historic resource in the Meadowlands is Saint Peter's Roman Catholic Cemetery. The historic railroad corridors, which survive as earthen grades and alignments, are the next oldest resource originally dating from the 1860s and 1870s. All buildings and engineered structures in the Meadowlands date to the 20th century, with most having been built after 1945.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	6
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	50
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	2
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	56

Nearly three-quarters of parcels with resources of historic age, (83 of 114, 73%), are parcels associated with railroad right-of-way, railroad yard operations or motor freight warehouses and truck services. Many of the railroads remain active, although there are far fewer tracks and sidings than existed during the railroading heyday. Many parcels appear "vacant" but they do retain vestiges of historic railroad grade, particularly the fill materials and ballast used to support the tracks or archaeological resources such as the remains of the foundations of the large Erie Railroad roundhouse and other supporting buildings. The remainder of historic uses are mostly in the public service/utility sector and related to the PSE&G Hudson Generating Plant or the USPS National Distribution and Bulk Mail Center.

Historical Uses	
Cemetery	1
Industrial	2
Public Service/Utility	28
Transportation	83

There are no buildings or other resources with discernible architectural styles in the Meadowlands. This is a utilitarian landscape dominated by engineered structures and buildings with none of the elements of architectural style or ornament. The only historic railroad building of note is the DL&WRR West End Interlocking Tower, which was built in 1922 with pneumatic systems for controlling the switches and signals controlling the complex crossing of trains entering the tunnels to the west and the bridges to the east.

There are no intact historic streetscapes in the Meadowlands. There are very few public roads or streets and most properties are oriented to, or bounded by, the railroad corridors.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	0
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	114

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Religious – Saint Peter’s Roman Catholic Cemetery at 301 Tonnele Avenue (Block 5301/Lot 36), today bounded by active railroads and busy highways, is among the oldest Catholic cemeteries in the region and offers a diverse selection of gravestones and monuments. Its associations with the cultural and religious history of Jersey City make it a location of potential historic significance.

Transportation – Historically significant associations with main line railroading defines the Meadowlands neighborhood. Four major railroad lines – the Erie Railroad Main Line, the Morris and Essex Railroad (DL&WRR) Old Main Line, the DL&WRR Boonton Line and the New Jersey Midlands/NYS&WRR, which crisscross here – have been recognized by the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office as New Jersey and National Register-eligible railroad historic districts, i.e. historic corridors of railroad grades and related resources such as bridges, stations, towers, etc. In all instances, these railroad corridors extend beyond the Meadowlands to neighboring municipalities and counties. Within the Meadowlands neighborhood of Ward D, contributing railroad resources including the DL&W’s West End Interlocking Tower of 1922, the approach to the Hackensack Drawbridge and several shorter bridges spanning railroads and small drainages. Although all of these railroad lines trace their origins to the third quarter of the 19th century, most of the surviving resources are later in age. The railroad corridors have lengthy periods of historical significance, usually beginning in the 1860s or the 1870s and ending in the 1970s when the financially struggling railroad companies were taken over by Conrail and New Jersey Transit.

Public Service/Utility – PSE&G’s Hudson Generating Station is a coal-fired plant that is in the process of being decommissioned and demolished. Today, the station lacks the aspects of historical integrity, although it does contain one resource of significance, a steel lattice electrical transmission tower, which was constructed in 1927 as part of the Kearney-Essex-Marion Interlocking Transmission, one of the nation’s oldest and most historic transmission lines/towers because of its importance in creating a regional electrical grid. This tower has been recognized by the NJHPO as a contributing historic resource to a westward-extending transmission line historic district.

The U.S. Postal Service’s National Distribution and Bulk Mail Center, with its 1.1-million square feet of indoor space, is the largest building under one roof in Ward D. It was constructed *circa* 1975 to handle mail entering and leaving the New York City metro area. When new, the facility was the technological forefront of mail handling and was among the first such centralized facilities that was not located in a city center near a passenger railroad terminal since passenger trains carried the bulk of the nation’s long-haul domestic mail. This one-story facility marked a reorientation in multi-modal transport of the mail, relying heavily on automatic sorting equipment and transport of the mail by motor trucks. It is among the first fully automated facilities designed to sort mail based on zip code, which had become mandatory on U.S. mail in 1967.

D. MOUNT PLEASANT

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – Development within the Mount Pleasant neighborhood was sparse prior to the mid-19th century. According to the Wood’s *Map of Jersey City, Hoboken & Hudson City* of 1855, a small concentration of suburban “country houses” existed on the western side of Palisade Avenue between Paterson Plank Road and South Street. Most of the ground to the west remained in agricultural use as pasture and woodlot, much as it had since the colonial period. By 1873, dwellings began to fill lots platted within a 12-square-block street grid bound by North Street to the north, South Street to the south, Palisade Avenue to the east, and Central Avenue to the west. This area soon became known as Mount Pleasant, a middle-class suburban neighborhood of detached and attached single-family homes, convenient to the streetcar line on Paterson Plank Road. This was an almost entirely residential neighborhood, except for the mixed-use and commercial properties on the east side of Central Avenue. By 1910, there was little developable land left in Mount Pleasant, except north of North Street where a coal yard and a few houses occupied a triangular piece of land bound by the Paterson Plank Road to the north and east, and Central Avenue to the west. Less than a decade later, the coal yard and surrounding properties were acquired by Hudson County for North Hudson Park (later renamed Washington Park), which extends north of Paterson Plank Road into Union City.

Survey Findings – Mount Pleasant has 569 parcels, of which 497 (87%) are more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.d).

Surveyed Parcels in Mount Pleasant	
Properties Built Before 1981	497
Properties Built After 1981	72
Total Number of Properties	569

The majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 452 of 497 (91%), are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types characteristic of Mount Pleasant’s historic development as a Jersey City neighborhood between 1870 and 1914. At present, the number of buildings pre-dating 1870 are only three (3) in number, two of which are highly altered Greek Revival-style gable-front cottages at 63-65 Congress Avenue (Block 2302/ Lots 23-24). The balance is made up of buildings constructed after 1914, many of these later residential in-fill into vacant lots or commercial buildings.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	3
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	452
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	10
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	21
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	11

Historical property usage is also a reflection of Late Victorian development with the majority of parcels with dwellings, 402 of 486 (83%), being single-family homes with the balance made of duplexes, multi-family apartment buildings or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The number of historically single-use

commercial properties is very small, nine (9) properties in total, mostly located on Central Avenue. Other historic property types include one (1) park and one (1) school. Mount Pleasant is above all else a residential neighborhood of the streetcar era.

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	402
Residential – Duplex	15
Residential – Multi-Family	38
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	31
Commercial	9
Park or Designed Landscape	1
School	1

About one-quarter, 126 of 497 (25%) of Mount Pleasant's parcels with properties of historical age can be assigned an architectural style based on surviving details such as roof patterns, cornices and window and door shapes, patterns and trim. The most prevalent residential style is Italianate (62 buildings), followed by Queen Anne (25 buildings) and Renaissance Revival (21 buildings). Multi-story apartment buildings exhibit a wider range of style, although they are relatively few in number and date to the first half of the 20th century. Notable examples are at 78 Congress Street (Block 1603/Lot 24) (Gothic Revival), 226 Hancock Avenue (Block 2204/Lot 18) (Colonial Revival), 228 Hancock Avenue (Block 1603/Lot 25) (Art Deco) and 432 New York Avenue (Block 1704/Lot 43) (Renaissance Revival). Most buildings in this neighborhood retain their historic forms and massing, but decorative elements of style, which in this period and in this neighborhood would have been mostly wood architectural millwork used in cornices, windows, doors and porches, has been for the most part lost.

Properties with Discernable Architectural Style	
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Italianate	62
Queen Anne	25
Renaissance Revival	21
Second Empire	3
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	2
Colonial Revival	1
Gothic Revival	1
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	9

Mount Pleasant has experienced very little demolition or replacement of its housing stock of the 1870s to the 1900s. For this reason, it has a relatively high proportion of intact historic streetscapes with many blocks featuring uninterrupted views of houses of roughly the same age and orientation to the street. The most notable is the west side of Palisade Avenue south of Paterson Plank Road, which features several very strong residential buildings in the Queen Anne and Italianate styles. Palisade Avenue is the boundary between the Mount Pleasant and Washington Village neighborhoods. Palisade Avenue appears to form the north-south spine of a potential Washington Village historic district (see Chapter 4.B.3) that continues south of Mount Pleasant neighborhood.

Other streetscapes in Mount Pleasant, however, rarely extend beyond one block since the east-west streets of North, Congress and South typically interrupt the architectural rhythm and pattern of the buildings. North of Congress Street and south of North Street, the intact streetscapes are on Hancock, Sherman and Webster Avenues. South of Congress Street and north of South Street, the intact streetscapes are on New York and Webster Avenues.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	295
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	202

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Assemblages – Assemblages in Mount Pleasant were mostly residential and mixed-use properties identified by their cohesive stylistic elements. Stand-out examples of residential assemblages include the properties at 268-272 Hancock Avenue (Block 1603/Lots 1, 44-45) (Renaissance Revival-style, multi-family buildings), 42-44 South Street (Block 2303/Lots 46-48) (Italianate-style, single-family dwellings), 86-88 South Street (Block 2203/Lots 41-42) (Italianate) and 339-343 Webster Avenue (Block 1604/Lots 16-18) (Italianate-style, single-family dwellings). Assemblages of dwellings with Queen Anne and Italianate style-influenced form and massing are located at 649-671 Palisade Avenue (Block 1702/Lots 2-13), 306-310 Webster Avenue (Block 2303/Lot 10-12), 316-322 Webster Avenue (Block 2303/Lot 15-20) and 376-396 Webster Avenue (Block 1701/Lots 1, 7-16).

Commercial – Commercial and mixed-use properties within the Mount Pleasant neighborhood area concentrated along Central Avenue between Paterson Plank Road and South Street. Individually notable buildings include 462 Central Avenue (Block 2202/Lot 14) (Renaissance Revival-style), 472 Central Avenue (Block 1601/Lot 25) (Italianate-style), 476 Central Avenue (Block 1601/Lot 23) (Renaissance Revival-style) and 516-520 Central Avenue (Block 1601/Lots 2-4) (Renaissance Revival-style). The Central Avenue commercial corridor extends into the Hudson City North and Hudson City South neighborhoods and has historic district potential (see Chapter 4.B.1).

Schools – A former school (Public School No. 7), located at 464-70 Central Avenue (Block 2202/Lot 15), was constructed in 1876 according to its date plaque. The building now serves as condominiums, with elements of the school's original Italianate style evident.

Parks – Washington Park (Block 901/Lot 1), located partly within Jersey City and partly in Union City, is a landscape that has evolved over the past century and retains very little historical integrity except for its location and general plan. Its original design featured tree-lined paths, lawns, a formal garden and a swimming pool and pool house at the corner of North Street and Webster Avenue. The pool and pool house were demolished in the 1970s and since then lawns and green spaces on the Jersey City side of the park have been converted into baseball fields and tennis courts. Very little of the park's historic character remains intact.

E. SPARROW HILL

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – The Sparrow Hill neighborhood is located on the western slope of the Bergen Hill, bounded to the north by Manhattan Avenue, to the south and west by railroad lines approaching Jersey City from the Meadowlands to the west, and to the east by John F. Kennedy Boulevard, except for a leg that extends two blocks eastward to Summit Avenue between Manhattan Avenue and Beach Street. This neighborhood is middle-class residential in character except for its western extent at the foot of the Bergen Hill, which is more industrial and commercial in character owing to the historical proximity of the railroads. Land developers platted Sparrow Hill during the late 1850s to the early 1870s, although some of the far western blocks were not fully developed until the 1920s. Yet, only a few dozen houses had been built in 1873, when the G.M. Hopkins Company published its *Atlas of the County of Hudson, and the State of New Jersey*. This early development clustered east of present-day Liberty Avenue between Stagg and Cliff Streets, and some near the intersection of Montrose Avenue and Beach Street. Sparrow Hill grew slowly over the next several decades. The Sanborn map of 1896, for instance, shows mostly wood-frame single-family dwellings scattered within the blocks east of Summit Avenue and west of Hudson Boulevard (John F. Kennedy Boulevard), but not much denser than the development of over two decades earlier. A large commercial steam laundry and a mineral ore processing plant had been built on the western edges of the neighborhood next to the tracks and roundhouse of the Erie Railroad. Neither of those late-19th-century industrial complexes survives; they were later replaced by a fertilizer plant and asphalt-mixing plant in the early 1900s, and by commercial strip development in the 1950s and later. This land-use pattern has continued to this day with commercial and light-industrial activities dominating the far western edge of the neighborhood in proximity to Tonnele Avenue. New residential construction in the eastern parts of Sparrow Hill reached its peak during the 1910s and 1920s. By 1919, almost all of the parcels east of Liberty Avenue had been occupied. The streets west of Liberty Avenue, however, still remained empty, with exception of the north side of Beach Street, filled by a row of sixteen wood-frame two-story houses. Manhattan Avenue witnessed change during the late 1910s and 1920s with the construction of several stylish multi-story apartment buildings, including those named the Manhattan (121-125 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4303/Lots 12-13)), Park Lane (169-171 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4301/Lot 13)) and Royal Arms (179 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4301/Lot 11)). The area west of Liberty Avenue developed with single-family homes in the 1920s and experienced even later in-fill in the 1950s and the 1960s, the latter mostly in the form of “Bayonne Box” houses.

Survey Findings – Sparrow Hill has 522 parcels, of which 399 (76%) have properties that are more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.e).

Surveyed Parcels in Sparrow Hill	
Properties Built Before 1981	399
Properties Built After 1981	123
Total Number of Properties	522

The majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 262 of 399 (66%), are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types characteristic of Sparrow Hill's historic development as a Jersey City neighborhood between 1870 and 1914. The percentage of Late Victorian architecture, however, is not as dominant as in the other Ward D neighborhoods to the east and north. Interwar architectural types are represented by 93 of 399 parcels (23%), which is the highest percentage of any Ward D residential neighborhood. This is a measurement of a somewhat uneven pattern of slow development from the 1870s to the 1930s.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	1
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	262
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	94
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	25
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	17

Historical property usage is also a reflection of Late Victorian development with the majority of parcels with dwellings, 330 of 383 (86%), being single-family homes with the balance made of duplexes, multi-family apartment buildings or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The number of historically single-use commercial properties is very small, 12 parcels in total, mostly located on Tonnele Avenue, John F. Kennedy Boulevard and Manhattan Avenue at the edges of the neighborhood. Other historic property types include two (2) industrial buildings dating to the interwar period. The two (2) transportation properties are parcels associated with the Meadowlands historic railroad corridors that clip the southwestern edge of the neighborhood's boundary.

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	330
Residential – Duplex	13
Residential – Multi-Family	25
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	15
Commercial	12
Industrial	2
Transportation	2

About one-third, 126 of 399 (30%) of Mount Pleasant's properties of historical age can be assigned an architectural style based on surviving details such as roof patterns, cornices and window and door shapes, patterns and trim. The most prevalent residential style is Queen Anne (43 buildings), followed by Renaissance Revival

(25 buildings) and Italianate (21 buildings). Sparrow Hill has 15 buildings (4%) that can be categorized as Art Deco, a relatively large number as compared to other Ward D neighborhoods. These buildings, most of which are relatively modest, multi-story apartments, are likely a reflection of Sparrow Hill's slightly later period of development and the popularity of Art Deco by the time the neighborhood was experiencing a late surge of residential in-fill in the 1920s and the 1930s. Two of the standout Art Deco-style buildings are the Manhattan Apartments at 121-125 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4303/Lots 12-13) and the Park Place Apartments at 169-171 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4301/Lot 13). Other standout buildings of the interwar period include a block of three, four-story Gothic Revival-style apartment buildings at 3139-3149 John F. Kennedy Boulevard (Block 5403/Lots 14-16), and the similarly styled Royal Arms apartments at 179 Manhattan Avenue (Block 4301/Lot 11).

Properties with Discernable Architectural Style	
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Gothic Revival	5
Italianate	19
Queen Anne	43
Renaissance Revival	23
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	15
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	13

Sparrow Hill's streetscapes are for the most part choppy and uneven. The streets with a strongest historic character are in the north end of the neighborhood on Manhattan Avenue, Beach Street and Carlton Avenue. The most architecturally elaborate buildings are the apartment blocks of the 1920s and the 1930s, intermixed with some clusters of Queen Anne and Renaissance Revival-style dwellings. Still, none of these streets has the cohesiveness or consistency that would be typically required of a potential historic district. Most buildings have some degree of alterations that impacts historical integrity of design, materials and workmanship.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	176
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	223

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

F. WASHINGTON VILLAGE

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – Development within the Washington Village neighborhood was sparse prior to the mid-19th century. According to the Wood's *Map of the Five Cities of New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Hoboken & Hudson City* of 1855, early suburban "country houses" were constructed

along Palisade Avenue north of South Street. This would have been a very attractive location for Jersey City's up-and-coming business elites with the views offered of the Port of New York and New York City beyond. By 1873, development along Palisade Avenue extended from Paterson Plank Road to Franklin Street. Residential development along Ogden Avenue also grew during this period, with a concentration of dwellings located between Congress and South Streets and Griffith and Franklin Streets. This mid-19th-century growth marks Washington Village as the oldest developed neighborhood of Ward D. The name Washington Village also appears to originate in this period, and, although unconfirmed by available sources, seems likely to have been associated with German immigrants who settled there in the late 1850s and 1860s. The post-1850 German community was known to admire George Washington and be fervent in their belief in the founding principles of American democracy. During the 1880s and the 1890s, the Washington Village neighborhood rapidly filled. Palisade and Ogden Avenues became lined with commercial, mixed-use and residential buildings. Riverview Park (Block 3002/Lot 1 and Block 3003/Lot 1) (now Riverview-Fisk Park), was established as a city park *circa* 1901, capitalizing on a scenic overlook of Hoboken and Manhattan. Although principally a residential setting, one of Ward D's largest industrial works was at the eastern foot of Washington Village. L.O. Koven & Brothers, a three-story brick mill, was built *circa* 1897, occupying a long, narrow, sloping strip of land lying against the east face of the Bergen Hill between Mountain Road and Paterson Plank Road. Koven, founded by a family of second-generation German immigrants, manufactured iron-range boilers and a range of other galvanized sheet metal products. The factory has been rehabilitated for residential use and is currently known as the Cliff Lofts (100 Paterson Plank Road (Block 4001/Lot 1)).

Survey Findings – Washington Village has 343 parcels, of which 275 (80%) have properties more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.f).

Surveyed Parcels in Washington Village	
Properties Built Before 1981	275
Properties Built After 1981	67
Total Number of Properties	343

The majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 209 of 275 (76%), are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types characteristic of Washington Village's historic development as a Jersey City neighborhood between 1870 and 1914. There are at least eight (8) earlier properties, mostly dwellings or mixed-use properties with first-story storefronts dating to the 1850s or 1860s when the village was first forming. The house at 624-626 Palisade Avenue (Block 1703/Lot 51) is likely a highly altered Greek Revival-style "country house" of the 1830s, and is distinct from its neighbors in that it is set back into the rear of its lot, likely to take advantage of what was once an unobstructed view eastward across the Hudson River.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	8
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	209
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	29
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	11
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	18

Historical property usage is also a reflection of Late Victorian development with the majority of dwellings 205 of 264 (78%) being single-family homes with the balance made of duplexes, multi-family apartment buildings or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The number of non-residential properties is quite small, and includes three commercial buildings, one industrial building, a firehouse and a park.

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	205
Residential – Duplex	14
Residential – Multi-Family	35
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	10
Commercial	6
Industrial	1
Park or Designed Landscape	2
Firehouse	1
Transportation	1

Less than one-half, 119 of 276 (43%), of Washington Village’s properties of historical age can be assigned an architectural style based on surviving details such as roof patterns, cornices and window and door shapes, patterns and trim. This makes Washington Village one of the more architecturally expressive Ward D neighborhoods since most neighborhoods range from one-quarter to one-third of the buildings of age having an assignable style. The most prevalent style is Italianate (43 buildings), followed by Queen Anne (26 buildings). Some architecturally interesting groupings of these styles include 252-260 Ogden Avenue (Block 3904/Lots 24-28) (Italianate-style, single-family dwellings), 374-380 Ogden Avenue (Block 2404/Lots 18-21) (Italianate-style, duplex dwellings), 546-552 Palisade Avenue (Block 2401/Lots 19-23) (Italianate-style, single-family dwellings) and 268-272 Ogden Avenue (Block 3904/Lots 32-34) (Queen Anne-style, single-family and duplex dwellings). Somewhat surprising is the relatively large number of Art Deco-style properties (18 buildings). Nearly half of these are single or multi-family residential buildings located on the 200 to 400 blocks of Ogden Avenue, which seem to represent a “mini” redevelopment period in the 1920s and 1930s when older, smaller properties were demolished to make way for more modern and, generally, denser residential development.

Properties with Discernable Architectural Style*	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	
Italianate	2
Gothic Revival	1
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Italianate	43
Queen Anne	26
Renaissance Revival	14
Second Empire	3
Other	1
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	17
Gothic Revival	4
Tudor Revival	2
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	9

Washington Village is located on a narrow strip of land, measuring about 300 feet to 500 feet east-to-west, bounded to the west by Palisade Avenue and to the east by the Palisades cliff and Paterson Plank Road. South-to-north, the village is approximately 4,000 feet long from Franklin Street to Paterson Plank Road. Palisade Avenue and Ogden Avenue form the north-to-south spines of the village and for almost their entire lengths feature very architecturally intact streetscapes, particularly north of Riverview-Fisk Park. This, combined with Washington Village's distinction as the oldest of Ward D's neighborhoods and its strong German heritage, make it a strong contender as a potential historic district. The district is oriented to Palisade Avenue from Griffith Street north to Paterson Plank Road, and Ogden Avenue from about one-half block south of Griffith Street north to Congress Street. The Washington Village Historic District study area includes the buildings on the west side of Palisade Avenue, which are in the Hudson City South, Hudson City North and Mount Pleasant neighborhoods (see Chapter 4.B.3).

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	198
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	78

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Firehouse – The former Ladder Company No. 10 Firehouse at 520 Palisade Avenue (Block 2401/Lot 9) is a handsome Renaissance Revival-style building constructed in 1917 according to a date stone. It anchors the center of the avenue's 500 block.

Industrial – The previously mentioned L.O. Koven & Brothers factory at 100 Paterson Plank Road (Block 4001/Lot 1) is a singular type of architectural resource in the Washington Village neighborhood. It is physically segregated because of its location on the steep section on the Paterson Plank Road below the elevation of the village, and, apart from the Meadowlands, one of the few locations in Ward D that speaks to the heavy industry that drove the regional urban economy of the 1800s to the 1950s. Industrialists of the 19th century often relied on a form of brick mill architecture that had long, rectangular-plan side-gabled buildings with multiple segmental arched windows and patterned brick cornices on their long sides. This form of construction allowed for heavy timber or iron internal framing for strength and fireproofing, generous windows for natural light, and a layout of floors suitable for transmission of power using pulleys, gears and shafts. This was the case with the Koven mill, although the Koven mill received three additional floors when it was converted to condominiums.

Park – Riverview-Fisk Park (Block 3002/Lot 1 and Block 3003/Lot 1) is situated in the middle section of the neighborhood, providing green and recreational space for Washington Village. It maintains the casual landscape and a system of winding pathways reflective of its Late Victorian period of development, although many new amenities have been added, including a splash park, playground and tennis courts. The WPA undertook work in the park during the mid- to late 1930s, which likely involved some of the masonry wall construction and pathways.

G. WESTERN SLOPE

Historical Overview of Neighborhood Development – In 1873, when the G.M. Hopkins Company published its *Atlas of the County of Hudson, and the State of New Jersey*, the Western Slope neighborhood had been platted, and was occupied by scattered houses. Large parcels between Nelson and Tonnele Avenues along Thorne, North and Leonard Streets remained undivided and vacant. By 1896 groups of rowhouses had joined the individual ones, but most lots remained vacant. The northwest corner of the neighborhood remained completely empty. A few small industries — a silk factory on Irving Street, a bird food factory on the corner of Nelson Avenue and Poplar Street, an embroidery factory on the corner of Columbia Avenue and Lincoln Street, and a skin dresser and dryer on present-day Liberty Avenue — dotted the otherwise residential neighborhood. Children attend the school at the large new Public School 25, on the corner of Zabriskie Street and Columbia Avenue (Block 3402/Lot 12). As the First World War ended, the northeastern side of the neighborhood between Nelson Avenue and present-day John F. Kennedy Boulevard was almost completely filled with houses. Other areas, notably the entire length of Nelson Avenue, and the southern end of the neighborhood were built up, but the northwestern portion remained comparatively empty with long stretches vacant along Terrace and Liberty Avenues. Reflecting this population growth, Public School 25 had doubled in size and had been joined by Public School 27 at the corner of Graham Street and John F. Kennedy Boulevard (Block 1302/Lots 14-15). The neighborhood had also gained the Leonard J. Gordon Park at its southeastern corner (Block 3501/Lot 14), and St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church on the corner of Congress Street and John F. Kennedy Boulevard (Block 1304/Lot 5). The 1920s saw little change, leaving a still large number of empty lots to be built upon later as Western Slope continued to grow in population. A last spurt of new residential development occurred from the late 1940s to the 1960s, often with a preference for the Bayonne Box style of house.

Survey Findings – Western Slope has 1,878 parcels, of which 1,401 (75%) have properties that are more than 40 years of age (Map 3.1.g).

Surveyed Parcels in Western Slope	
Properties Built Before 1981	1401
Properties Built After 1981	477
Total Number of Properties	1878

A slight majority of parcels with buildings of historic age, 723 of 1,401 (52%), are examples of Late Victorian architectural property types, making this neighborhood the least “Victorian” of any in Ward D. It has by far the largest proportion of interwar architectural types with 289 buildings (21%) and post-WWII architectural types with 344 buildings (25%). Generally speaking, the older properties are located in the eastern and southern sections of the neighborhood, with the neighborhood then grading toward the early to mid-20th-century periods of development the further the blocks are to the north and west. This likely reflects that the less desirable, and last developed, lots were those furthest removed from the old centers of population to the east, as well as closer to the industrial railroad corridors at the western foot of the Western Slope.

Periodization of Parcels with Properties Built Before 1981	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	1
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	723
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	289
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	344
Age Not Evident From Physical Characteristics	44

The Western Slope, like other Ward D neighborhoods except the Meadowlands, is principally residential in character. Of the 1,401 parcels with properties over 40 years of age, 1,312 parcels (94%) are residential. Reflecting a period of development of the 1890s to the 1920s, most of these properties were built as single-family homes (1,205 of 1,312 properties, 92%). Although the Western Slope has 62 commercial properties and 6 industrial properties, these tend to be concentrated on Tonnele Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard, which are north-south arterial highways bounding the west and east sides of the neighborhood. Mixed within the residential neighborhood are six (6) school properties, the largest number of any of the Ward D neighborhoods, as well as a handful of churches, the most prominent of which is St. Anne’s Roman Catholic Church at the corner of John F. Kennedy Boulevard and Congress Street (Block 1304/Lot 5).

Historical Uses	
Residential – Single Family	1205
Residential – Duplex	40
Residential – Multi-Family	49
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial	18
Commercial	62
Church	3
Industrial	6
Park or Designed Landscape	2
School	6
Transportation	8
Firehouse	1
Civic	1

Only 280 (20%) of the Western Slope's 1,401 parcels with properties over 40 years of age can be assigned an architectural style. Aside from the industrial and transportation-oriented Meadowlands, this is the least percentage of any of the Ward D neighborhoods. This means that the Western Slope's historic architectural character is comparatively weak. The Late Victorian architectural styles are about evenly divided between Queen Anne (40 buildings), Italianate (38 buildings) and Renaissance Revival (39 buildings), mostly found in residential or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings. The Art Deco style is by far the most prevalent of the interwar styles, accounting for 31 of 47 buildings of the period between 1915 and 1944.

The most prevalent style of building in the Western Slope, however, is the Bayonne Box, accounting for 111 of the 280 buildings (40%) with an assignable style. A series of Bayonne Box-style dwellings located at 811-833 Secaucus Road (Block 401/Lots 2-12) occupy a significant portion of the block and illustrate a broader pattern of mid- to late 20th-century development exhibited throughout Ward D. This collection of 12 Bayonne Boxes appears to have been constructed by the same developer, with some variations in form and appearance having been offered to homebuyers. These dwellings demonstrate the two primary Bayonne Box forms of hipped-roof and front-gable. One has a faux gambel frieze added to its front elevation (819 Secaucus Road (Block 401/Lot 9)). All other details, including what remains of original entry and fenestration patterns, open front porches, original locations of the garages and original locations of the staircases, are consistent across all 12 dwellings.

Properties with Discernable Architectural Style	
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type (c. 1830-1870)	
Greek Revival	1
Late Victorian Architectural Type (c. 1870-1914)	
Italianate	38
Other	1
Queen Anne	40
Renaissance Revival	39
Second Empire	2
Interwar Architectural Type (c. 1915-1944)	
Art Deco	33
Art Moderne	1
Colonial Revival	1
Dutch Colonial Revival	2
Gothic Revival	3
Italianate	1
Other	1
Queen Anne	1
Renaissance Revival	5
Post-WWII Architectural Type (c. 1945-1980)	
Bayonne Box	111
Colonial Revival	1
International	5
Modernistic	1

The Western Slope's pattern of historical development, which was scattered over the decades from the 1870s to the 1960s, has left it with architecturally choppy streetscapes. None are judged to have the continuity or consistency that would be required of a potential historic district, although some specific small assemblages of buildings that share common history and architectural character could be considered potentially significant, like the previously mentioned Bayonne Box assemblage in the 800 block of Secaucus Road.

Intact Historic Streetscapes*	
Properties with Intact Historic Streetscapes	524
Properties without Intact Historic Streetscapes	872

*This data was only collected for properties built before 1981.

Commercial – Commercial buildings in the Western Slope are concentrated on and near Tonnele Avenue and John F. Kennedy Boulevard. Few of them are historic or architecturally significant although exceptions are the Art Moderne-style White Mana Diner at 294 Manhattan Avenue (Block 3301/Lot 1) at the intersection with Tonnele Avenue, and the Art Deco-style Kennedy Marble and Tile building at 725 Tonnele Avenue (Block 1101/Lots 11-13).

Religious – The only religious property of note in the Western Slope neighborhood is the Gothic Revival-style St. Anne Roman Catholic Church at 3555 John F. Kennedy Boulevard (Block 1304/Lot 5). St. Anne's was constructed in 1904, a new parish that split from old St. Paul of the Cross parish in the South Hudson City neighborhood. It was noted at the time that St. Anne's relieved residents of the Western Slope from the long walk or streetcar ride to St. Paul's. Associated with the St. Anne's are an adjacent rectory, school and parish house, although these are of a later International style, reflecting a post-1945 date of construction.

Schools – The largest building in the Western Slope is the Renaissance Revival-style Nicolas Copernicus School (Public School 25), built in 1921 at 3385 John F. Kennedy Boulevard (Block 3402/Lot 12). Its ornate recessed archway entry creates a stately entry and a focal point on the boulevard.

Parks – Leonard Gordon Park (Block 3501/Lot 14) anchors the southeast corner of the Western Slope. This municipal park was established in 1907 and its design takes advantage of terraces and a naturally rocky terrain with winding paths, offering views westward over the Meadowlands. The park is perhaps best known for its lion and bear sculptures by artist Solon Hannibal Borglum. The focal point of the park is a reinforced-concrete gazebo.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PROPERTIES RECOMMENDED FOR PHASE 2 INDIVIDUAL INTENSIVE-LEVEL SURVEY

A primary goal of a Phase 1 reconnaissance-level study is to identify properties that may meet minimum thresholds for Phase 2 individual intensive-level study. Specifically, this means that they have historic architectural character or potential historic associations with significant events or people, and retain, at least on first inspection, sufficient aspects of historical integrity to possibly meet the City of Jersey City's definitions of a historic as contained in the Code of Ordinances Chapter 345-6 (see Chapter 2).

The Phase 1 survey methodology was intended to address these definitions by asking a series of questions of each of 6,682 properties in Ward D. This data was collected in the field using iPads and compiled into a GIS database. Architectural historians then reviewed and analyzed the data making determinations of which properties merited further in-depth survey at the intensive level.

Properties determined to merit Phase 2 survey needed to meet the following requirements:

- The property must contain a building, structure, object, landscape or site that was built prior to 1981 [Phase 1 GIS Database, Property Built before 1981: Yes]
- The property must have present one or more character-defining elements of architectural style sufficient to assign a style and be potentially significant in comparison with other examples of similar style or vernacular typologies [Phase 1 GIS Database, Elements of Architectural Style Present: Yes]
- The property must have historic architectural integrity defined as retaining at least some if not all of the aspects of design, material, workmanship, location, setting, feeling and association [Phase 1 GIS Database, Architectural Integrity: Yes]
- Excluded from this methodology were assemblages of buildings sharing similar characteristics that might indicate associations with historic events or people (see Chapter 4, Section C) and other special historic use types like transportation resources, e.g. railroad grades and alignments, which could be considered linear historic resources and are discussed in further detail below in Chapter 4, Section F.

Based on the above criteria applied to all 6,682 parcels in the Ward D database, the Phase 1 survey identified 1,144 parcels that merit consideration at the Phase 2 level (Maps 4.1a to 4.1g, Table 4.1). Maps 4.1a to 4.1g show those properties coded in the Phase 1 GIS database as recommended for Phase 2 survey [Phase 1 GIS Database, Phase 2 Survey: Yes]. The total parcels by neighborhood is Hudson City North (262), Hudson City South (400), Meadowlands (20), Mount Pleasant (108), Sparrow Hill (94), Washington Village (103) and Western Slope (157).

The number of properties recommended for Phase 2 survey is higher than expected. The survey team believes the reason is related to the application of the screening questions assigning style and integrity to individual properties. Based on past experiences of Jersey City with the Brooks survey and current approaches to review-

ing properties for determinations of significance, these screening questions were applied conservatively, usually with a building only needing one or two elements of style and a moderate amount of integrity of design, materials and workmanship. For future Phase 1 studies, it may be advisable to add a new assessment question that asks whether integrity is moderate or high. The moderate/high thresholds might be different for wood houses than those for masonry houses, since the masonry houses tend to have higher integrity due to the durability of the materials.

Prior to beginning Phase 2 survey of Ward D, it is recommended that the project team review the City's tax cards and photographs from 1938 for the properties proposed for Phase 2 study. This review is likely to weed out some properties from further consideration due to documentary evidence of significant alterations that may not be clearly evident from a Phase 1 screening.

Phase 2 intensive-level survey is recommended to consist of digital photography, closer examination of the property in the field to collect in-depth data on exterior physical and architectural features, background research using historic maps, city directories and other sources on Jersey City history, and completion of 2-page individual survey form with a Phase 2 recommendation of whether the property meets or doesn't meet the definition of historic.

B. PROPERTIES RECOMMENDED FOR PHASE 2 SURVEY AS POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

A historic district per City Ordinance definition is a collection of properties that has definable geographic boundaries and contains within it one or more individually significant historic properties. It may include other buildings or structures, including accessories such as walls, fences, garages, etc., that may not be individually significant but nonetheless contribute to the visual historic characteristics of the district. Those resources that are individually significant are usually referred to as "key contributing" while those that are not individually significant are referred to as "contributing." There can also be "non-contributing" resources in a historic district, usually those built after a defined period of significance. For example, all building built after 1950 would be non-contributing in a district with a period of significance of 1850 to 1950. Resources within a historic district also share a common area of significance such as architecture, community planning and development, social history and the like.

As was noted in Chapter 2, Ward D already has within its boundaries seven historic districts that have been surveyed and determined eligible by the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO). In all instances, these historic districts were identified through regulatory compliance surveys required by federal or state law, usually related to either fund sources or permitting for transportation or utility improvements. In this instance, the seven districts consist of four historic railroad corridors, two historic utility corridors and one historic street.

1. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Boonton Line Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 6/11/2013)
2. Erie Railroad Main Line Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 2/19/2003)
3. Holland Street (COE 11/23/2018)

4. Jersey City Waterworks Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 4/11/2013)
5. New Jersey Midland Railway/New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Historic District (NJHPO Opinion 7/17/2016)
6. Old Main Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Historic District (NJHPO Opinion, 9/23/1996)
7. Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) Kearny-Essex-Marion Interconnection (NJHPO Opinion 12/13/2013)

Properties associated with all seven of these historic districts are included in the Phase 1 database. The seven districts account for 91 parcels, mostly located in the Meadowlands neighborhood or the far western edges of Sparrow Hill or Western Slope where they meet the Meadowlands. No Phase 2 survey is recommended for these historic districts since NJHPO Phase 2 surveys already have been completed and can be referenced. Existing or former railroad and utility infrastructure is not often reviewed under City historic preservation ordinances; however, City historic preservation specialists, planners and officials should be aware of the historic railroad and utility corridors and review any redevelopment plans that impact them.

Of the seven NJHPO-identified districts only the Jersey City Municipal Utilities Authority's (JMUA's) Jersey City Waterworks Historic District (entirely below ground water mains in Ward D) and the Jersey City Department of Public Works' Holland Street stone paving currently fall within City jurisdiction. City historic preservation staff and the City of Jersey City Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) should review activities in these districts as appropriate.

The Phase 1 survey identified three study areas of Ward D that merit consideration of their historic district potential.

1. Central Avenue Commercial Historic District Study Area

This study area is a north-south linear corridor of mostly commercial or mixed-use residential/commercial buildings dating from *circa* 1870 to 1940 (Map 4.2). There is a high concentration of Italianate, Renaissance Revival and Art Deco-style buildings, mostly two, three or four-stories and built flush to the sidewalks. Central Avenue is Ward D's "main street" with portions located in and serving the Hudson City North, Hudson City South and Mount Pleasant neighborhoods. Historically, this street has provided necessary services including groceries, hardware, restaurants, taverns and retail and craft shops for bakers, seamstresses, cobblers, tailors and the like. Although many storefronts have experienced alterations to reflect new businesses and changing styles of marketing, many buildings retain their original architectural character from the second-story up, creating a distinct streetscape from the residential character of the intersecting east-west streets.

A Phase 2 survey of the 230 properties in the Central Avenue Commercial Historic District Study Area is recommended (Map 4.2, Table 4.2). Of the 230 properties, 92 are among those recommended for individual Phase 2 survey (Chapter 4.A).

2. Sherman Place Residential Historic District Study Area

Sherman Place between Central Avenue to the east and John F. Kennedy Boulevard to the west is the east-west axis of a historic residential setting that has historic district potential (Map 4.3). This district study area includes properties on nearby streets including John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Manhattan Avenue, Sanford Place and Summit Avenue. It is noteworthy within Ward D for its concentration of Queen Anne-style dwellings of *circa* 1890 to 1910, some large and individually significant, although it also has its fair share of Italianate and a few select examples of less common Ward D styles including Craftsman, Gothic Revival, Second Empire, Colonial Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival.

Under a separate private contract, Hunter Research recently completed a Phase 2 survey of most of the 196 properties in the Sherman Place Residential Historic District Study Area (Map. 4.3, Table 4.3), inclusive of 125 properties recommended for Phase 2 survey (see Chapter 4.A). This Phase 1 survey identified an additional 25 properties on Sanford Place and Summit Avenue that the surveyor recommend should have been included in the boundaries of the original study area using a consistent methodology to assess historical integrity and intact streetscapes. The Phase 2 survey forms for the Sherman Place Historic District are being presented to the City historic preservation staff in a separate submittal. It is recommended that the staff review the submittal and proceed with the next steps in consideration of establishing the Sherman Place Residential Historic District as an official City designation.

3. Washington Village Historic District Study Area

Washington Village has one of the densest concentrations of residential and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings of the last third of the 19th century in Ward D (Map 4.4). This reflects a somewhat more geographically concentrated period of development in the 1860s to 1890s as compared with other Ward D neighborhoods that often continued to develop and in-fill during the first third of the 20th century. This architecture, strong in Italianate, Queen Anne and Renaissance Revival style buildings, combined with a historically strong German ethnic identity, make Washington Village a candidate for historic district potential under Criterion A and C.

A proposed study area includes 291 properties concentrated on Palisade Avenue between Griffith Street and Paterson Plank Road, and on Ogden Avenue from just south of Griffith Street to Congress Street (Map 4.4, Table 4.4). Of the 291 properties, 103 are included in the total of properties recommended for Phase 2 survey at the individual level (Chapter 4.A).

C. HISTORIC ASSEMBLAGES AND STREETSCAPES

The Phase I survey collected data on historic assemblages and streetscapes to assist the City in its reviews of Determinations of Significance and Demolition permits per the City Ordinance. This data was used to gauge where concentrations of potentially historic resources may exist or that may be surviving in sufficient numbers

to constitute smaller groupings of historic resources that share similar characteristics. These areas of historic assemblages and historic streetscapes may merit a higher level of scrutiny any time redevelopment is under consideration (Maps 4.5a to 4.5g).

Historic assemblages are those groups of buildings, structures, objects or sites or sometimes a single building, structure or resource that is large and occupying multiple parcels. An assemblage is a set of properties that appear to share common historical and physical characteristics. These may be, for instance, a set of Italianate-style row houses, that singly are not of particular note, but that taken together likely represent a single construction episode and may be far more visually important as a group. Assemblage could also apply to a church complex, an industrial complex or a linear transportation resource such as a railroad. During Phase 1, surveyors who answered “yes” to the assemblage questions were then prompted to enter a brief description of the nature of the assemblage. Surveyors reviewed historic assemblages to determine if they might have the potential for associations with historic events or people and therefore might merit elevating to the Phase 2 survey list. This might include, for example, a church complex that might be associated with an important aspect of the City’s social, cultural or religious history. Those assemblages that were elevated are included in the counts of properties recommended for individual Phase 2 survey (see Chapter 4.A).

Streetscapes are different than assemblages in that this assessment is a judgment by the survey team whether a block or portion of a block retains sufficient numbers of resources of a similar age and character to be a considered an intact streetscape. This is a subjective assessment, as some blocks might be buildings of similar uses, forms and massing, while other could be dominated by a large building that is intact, surrounded by smaller buildings that are not. A general guideline was that at least 75% of the buildings on a street should be intact, that they should represent one or more periods of historical architectural development, usually with one period being the more dominant one, and that there should be very few interruptions as a result of demolition, vacant lots or newer post-1981 construction. An answer of “yes” indicated that a property was part of a moderately to highly intact streetscape.

Generally speaking, answering “yes” to both assemblages and streetscapes created zones in which the survey team carefully assessed whether sufficient aspects of historical integrity existed to merit consideration of historic district potential. Several of these zones, as noted above, rose to the mark. However, there are many intact streetscapes in Ward D that have aspects of integrity of location, setting, feeling and association, but the buildings may fall short collectively in the aspects of integrity of design, materials and workmanship. That is there is so much removal or covering over of original wood materials and architectural detail, as well as incompatible alterations to windows, doors and porches, that it is challenging to consider the street to have sufficient integrity to be a potential historic district. In many instances it is possible that the diminishment of historical design, materiality and workmanship could be reversed through restoration work, e.g. removing vinyl/aluminum siding and replacing with wood clapboarding, restoring wood-sash windows, uncovering and repairing wood cornices, etc. For this reason, an historic assemblage or streetscape may be an indication that an area may have historic district potential at a future time or that decisions to redevelop a few of the properties could diminish historic neighborhood character or make any future historic district less viable.

D. HISTORIC PLACES OF WORSHIP AND BURIAL GROUNDS

Churches and burial grounds due to their close spiritual and cultural connections to communities require careful assessment as historic resources. The New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places have special considerations for churches and burial grounds, in part because of the doctrine of separation of church and state, which means that governments generally cannot simply rely on the historical association of a building or burial ground with a specific religious denomination to equate with non-sectarian historical significance. Usually churches and burial grounds must have some architectural significance or they must have broader connections to community. Historical significance can derive from a church serving as a community center for specific neighborhoods or ethnic and racial groups where the church is the historic resource that best embodies a set of cultural practices and identities. A concrete example of this might be a church that served in the 19th-century as a center for Irish immigrants. The following churches in Ward D have been identified for Phase 2 survey for additional research into their architectural and cultural significance (Map 4.6).

Places of Worship and Burial Grounds Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
Central Avenue Reformed Church	141 Bowers St. (Block 2802/Lot 24)	Hudson City South	Romanesque Revival, c. 1871
Congregation Mount Sinai Hudson City	128 Sherman Ave. (Block 2904/Lot 31)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival, c. 1900
German Seventh-Day Adventist Church	158-160 Congress St. (Block 1504/Lot 50)	Hudson City North	modest Romanesque Revival, c. 1922
Grace Gospel Church (Gospel Hall)	877 Summit Ave. (Block 4302/Lot 17)	Hudson City South	modest Gothic Revival chapel, c. 1900
Hope Presbyterian Chapel (Iglesia Presbyteriana Nuevo Esperanza)	3597 John F. Kennedy Blvd. (Block 1302/Lot 17)	Western Slope	Modest Gothic Revival chapel, c. 1900
La Luz del Mundo (All Souls English Lutheran Church)	9-11 Paterson St. (Block 1507/Lot 16)	Hudson City North	modest Gothic Revival, c. 1898, with modifications to entrance

Places of Worship and Burial Grounds Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
Saint Anne's Roman Catholic Church, Rectory and Convent	3545-3555 John F. Kennedy Blvd. (Block 1304/Lots 3, 5) and 244 Congress St. (Block 1303/Lot 20)	Western Slope	Gothic Revival church, c. 1903 with later mid-20th-century rectory and convent
Saint John's Lutheran Church and Parish House	155 North St. (Block 1401/Lot 7)	Hudson City North	Modernist, c. 1960
Saint Paul of the Cross Roman Catholic Church Complex (Church, Rectory, Convent)	156-166 Hancock Ave. (Block 2205, Lots 13-15)	Hudson City North	Gothic Revival and later rectory and convent, c. 1868
Saint Peter's Roman Catholic Cemetery	301 Tonnele Ave. (Block 5301/Lot 36)	Meadowlands	Sectarian burial ground, c. 1849
Saint Trinitatis Kirche (St Trinitatis Evangelical Lutheran Church)	66 Bowers St. (Block 2301/Lot 56)	Hudson City North	Gothic Revival, c. 1890
Second Dutch Reformed Church	940 Summit Ave. (Block 3703/Lot 4)	Hudson City South	Gothic Revival, c. 1910 (F. E. Leicht, architect)
Trinity Baptist Church	159 Bower St. (Block 2802/Lot 14)	Hudson City South	Gothic Revival, c. 1900
Trinity United Methodist Church	987 Summit Ave. (Block 2703/Lot 17)	Hudson City South	International, c. 1960

E. HISTORIC PARKS AND DESIGNED LANDSCAPES

Jersey City and Hudson County's history of public park development reaches into the early 19th century when original plats for Paulus Hook included public squares. Park planning did not reach an era of greater architectural sophistication until the late 1800s and early 1900s when Progressive-era planners, landscape architects and public parks advocates persuaded city and county governments to invest more heavily in parks that offered residents a respite from an increasingly crowded built urban environment. Parks of this era tended toward Olmstedian ideals of orderly plantings, lawns and winding pathways that allowed visitors to enjoy scenery and quiet naturalistic spaces. Parks also featured commemorative monuments or spaces for gathering such as gazebos. Recreational spaces, particularly baseball fields, tennis courts and swimming pools, were also sometimes provided, but often at the margins of the parks where they would not interfere with the landscape.

Hudson County undertook major effort to acquire and improve parks in the first decades of the 20th century. A central organizing concept was the creation of Hudson Boulevard (later renamed John F. Kennedy Boulevard). It was conceived as scenic roadway linking a series of parks along the spine of the Bergen Hill from Union City to Bayonne, including Washington Park and Leonard Gordon Park in Ward D. Unfortunately, as traffic volumes increased with expanding ownership of automobiles, the boulevard evolved into just another crowded arterial street. Eventually, the County even dropped the prohibition on trucks.

The use of public parks also changed with time. By the 1950s, the public and park managers were demanding that parks be more active recreational spaces. There was less appreciation for the passive scenery and plantings of the early 1900s and 1910s. As a result, park areas historically used for gardens and lawns were often converted into sports facilities or playgrounds.

Ward D's oldest parks all date to the early 1900s and have historic associations with Progressive-era park planning and design. The two most historically intact of the parks are Riverview-Fisk Park in the Washington Village neighborhood and Leonard Gordon Park in the Western Slope neighborhood. Both are recommended for Phase 2 survey (Map 4.7). A slightly later park of this era, Washington Park (established *circa* 1915-20), which straddles the Jersey City and Union City boundary at Paterson Plank Road, has undergone many later alterations to expand and improve on the quality of its sports and recreational facilities. Terrace Avenue Park, a pocket park with tennis courts, was established *circa* 1960 on vacant land in the Western Slope.

Parks and Designed Landscapes Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
Leonard Gordon Park	3305 John F. Kennedy Blvd. (Block 3501/Lot 14)	Western Slope	Acquired as city park c. 1907, John T. Withers landscape architect, "buffalo and bears" sculptures by S.H. Borglum
Riverview-Fisk Park	300 Ogden Ave./498 Palisade Ave. (Block 906/Lots 3002-3)	Washington Village	Dedicated as a city park in 1901, renovated by WPA in 1935

F. HISTORIC TRANSPORTATION ROUTES, UTILITIES AND INDUSTRIES

Ward D has historically been one of Jersey City's residential wards, an area of mostly *circa* 1870s to 1910s residences organized into neighborhoods. The one area of the ward that is an exception to this is the Meadowlands, which spatially organized around four regional railroad lines beginning in the 1860s and 1870s. The four historic railroads in the Meadowlands were the Erie Railroad Main Line, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Old Main Line and Boonton Branch, and the New Jersey Midlands/New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad. All four have been recognized by the NJHPO as historic district corridors; therefore, it is not recommended that the City of Jersey City resurvey the railroads as part of a Phase 2 effort. There is also one historic street in Ward D – Holland Street in the Washington Village neighborhood – which has been recognized as the only remaining stone-paved street in the Heights and is named an official City landmark and is not in need of Phase 2 survey.

Jersey City's significant history of urbanization is built around access to the Port of New York and railroad systems that became highly developed during the 19th century, which in turn supported major industries that were at the heart of the city's economy from *circa* 1850 to 1970. Ward D's residents were historically drawn to Jersey City in search of work that was supported by transportation and industry, but Ward D, except for the Meadowlands, was not the location where much of this work actually took place. Simply put, there are not many industrial buildings in Ward D that have potentially significant architectural or historic associations under Criteria A, B or C, and most that exist can be characterized as small and architecturally undistinguished utilitarian buildings historically occupied by small businesses or shops. A handful however rise above the ordinary and merit Phase 2 evaluations (Map 4.8).

Transportation, Utilities and Industrial Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
162 New York Ave.	162 New York Ave. (Block 3901/Lot 2)	Hudson City South	Modest industrial shop or commercial brick garage with decorative parapet, c. 1900
Gibbons Manufacturing Company	3421-3431 John F. Kennedy Blvd. (Block 2602, Lots 26, 30)	Western Slope	Daylight factory construction with brick veneer, c. 1920. Gibbons manufactured cookware
Grossenbach and Fimple Silk Mill	120 Sherman Ave. (Block 2904/Lot 29)	Hudson City South	Multi-story, brick, Renaissance Revival textile mill, c. 1900
John Leiser Swiss Embroidery	156-158 Lincoln St. (40 Columbia Ave.)(Block 2602/Lot 32)	Western Slope	Modest, two-story brick textile mill, c. 1870-80

Transportation, Utilities and Industrial Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
John Mehl & Company Leather Goods Factory	187 New York Ave./126 Webster Ave. (Block 4503/ Lots 17-18)	Hudson City South	Multi-story brick industrial complex with chimney, c. 1880-1910
L.O. Koven & Brothers Factory (The Cliff Lofts)	100 Paterson Plank Road (Block 4001/ Lot 1)	Washington Village	Italianate brick factory and important American maker of galvanized boilers/sheet metal, c. 1897, interesting site plan hard against Paterson Plank Road and Palisade cliff, converted to condos
Manhattan Biscuit Company Factory (Zayden's Auto Repair Center)	458 Tonnele Ave. (Block 4201/Lot 1)	Sparrow Hill	Single-story utilitarian brick industrial building, c. 1915
Old Dominion Freight Line Company Warehouses	55-105 Van Keuren Ave. (Block 7404/ Lots 3, 7-12)	Meadowlands	Motor freight warehouses of a major interstate carrier early in the interstate-highway/turnpike/container port era, c. 1960
Oltmer Iron Works (Total Welding/ Manhattan Steel Supply)	327 Manhattan Ave. (Block 4101/ Lot 11)	Sparrow Hill	Brick industrial shop with stepped parapet, c. 1915. Associated with structural and ornamental iron company that originated in Hoboken
Roben Company	717 Tonnele Ave. (Block 1101/Lot 11)	Western Slope	Industrial complex with NJHPO opinion of eligibility,
U.S. Postal Service National Distribution Center	New County Road (Block 101, Lots 8-9 and 14; Block 1001, Lots 11-13, 17-19, 21, 25)	Meadowlands	Large warehouse-like structure with potential historical significance to development of postal delivery system/ technology/distribution, c. 1975
West End Interlocking Tower (DL&WRR)	Block 5301/Lot 22	Meadowlands	Critical railroad infrastructure at West End of Hoboken tunnel, c. 1922

G. HISTORIC SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, FIREHOUSES AND OTHER TYPES OF CIVIC BUILDINGS

Although Ward D has not historically been a “center” of Jersey City or Hudson County governance, it is replete with the types of public and civic buildings that are essential to an urban way of living. From the last quarter of the 19th century onward, Ward D has had libraries, firehouses and police stations. Some of the ward’s most distinctive civic buildings are social halls built by its German immigrants including Arion Hall, which was home to a German singing society, and Turn Verein, a German gymnasium and athletic club. Unsurprisingly, schools for educating children in both sectarian and non-sectarian settings are by far the most numerous of the types of civic buildings found in Ward D. One of the oldest surviving schools in the city is the former Public School No. 7 at 464-470 Central Avenue, built in 1876. Due to the historic associations these buildings have with governance and community under Criterion A, as well as their obvious architectural distinctions, they are recommended for Phase 2 survey (Map 4.9).

Historic Schools, Libraries, Firehouses and Civic Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
Arion Hall (Enterprise Lodge #31)	81-87 Hutton St. (Block 4404/Lots 21-22)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival society hall (German singing society), c. 1870
Charles E. Trefurt School, Public School No. 8	96 Franklin St. (Block 4406/Lot 1)	Hudson City South	Art Deco school, c. 1950
Engine Company No. 14 Firehouse (Engine Company No. 11 Firehouse)	152 Lincoln St. (Block 2602/Lot 31)	Western Slope	Renaissance Revival firehouse, c. 1890
Engine Company No. 11 Firehouse	137 South St. (Block 2805/Lot 18)	Hudson City North	Neo-Classical firehouse, c. 1890
Engine Company No. 12 Firehouse	103 Webster Ave. (Block 4502/Lot 13)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival firehouse, c. 1890
Engine Company No. 14 Firehouse (Hook and Ladder No. 7)	46 Irving St. (Block 803/Lot 4)	Hudson City North	Renaissance Revival firehouse, c. 1890
Engine Company No. 18 Firehouse	520 Palisade Ave. (Block 2401/Lot 9)	Washington Village	Renaissance Revival firehouse, c. 1917

Historic Schools, Libraries, Firehouses and Civic Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey			
Name	Address	Neighborhood	Comment
Greater Bergen Community Action School	93 Nelson Ave. (Block 701/Lot 4)	Western Slope	International school, c. 1959 with some older support buildings on site of German kinderfriends
Heights Branch Jersey City Free Public Library	14-16 Zabriskie St. (Block 3704/Lot 38)	Hudson City South	Colonial Revival library, c. 1920
Police Station – North District	282 Central Ave. (Block 4404/Lot 17)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival police station, c. 1900
Public School No. 7	464-470 Central Ave. (Block 2202/Lot 15)	Mount Pleasant	Italianate school, c. 1876
Public School No. 25 (Nicklaus Copernicus Elementary School)	3385 John F. Kennedy Blvd. (Block 3402/Lot 12)	Western Slope	Renaissance Revival school, c. 1910
Public School No. 27 (Alfred E. Zampella School)	201-227 North St. (Block 1302/Lots 14-15)	Western Slope	International school, c. 1950
Saint Anne’s School (JC Global Charter School)	244-255 Congress St. (Block 1303/Lot 20 and Block 1304/Lot 4)	Western Slope	International school, c. 1950
Saint Paul of the Cross School (Liberty Academy)	201 Sherman Ave. (Block 2205/Lot 30)	Hudson City North	Neo-Classical Revival school, c. 1930
Talmud Torah Association School	100 Sherman Ave. (Block 3804/Lot 31)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival school, c. 1920
Turn Verein (3ra Iglesia Pentecostal Puerta de Salvacion)	158 Webster Ave. (Block 3805/Lot 4)	Hudson City South	Renaissance Revival gymnasium and recreational center (German society), c. 1920

H. NEXT STEPS

The following are recommended as next steps in using the results of this Phase 1 survey and completing a comprehensive historic and architectural resources survey of Ward D.

Begin using the Ward D Phase 1 survey data to assist with making assessments for historical significance, reviewing demolition permits and in advising the HPC and the City regarding the historical, cultural and architectural significance of specific neighborhoods, potential historic districts and individual properties. The Phase 1 survey data should be particularly useful in screening out properties that have no or very little potential to be considered historic resources.

Undertake a Phase 2 survey of individual properties identified during Phase 1 as meeting a minimum threshold for further consideration of historic, architectural and cultural significance (see Maps 4.1a-f, Table 4.1). The Phase 2 survey might begin with review of the 1938 tax cards as an additional level of screening to reduce the number of Phase 2 properties. Following the 1938 tax card screening, conduct background research, field work, analysis and forms to create a list of properties that meet historic designation criteria.

Undertake a Phase 2 survey of the Central Avenue Commercial Historic District Study Area and the Washington Village Historic District Study Area (see Maps 4.2 and 4.4, Tables 4.2 and 4.4). The Phase 2 survey of the Sherman Place Residential Historic District Study Area has already been completed.

Consider undertaking updated Phase 1 surveys of the City's other wards using the methodology developed and refined for use in Ward D. The other wards were last comprehensively surveyed in 1985-86 and that data is out-of-date except in some select areas where more recent survey has taken place, e.g. West Bergen-East Lincoln Park Historic District in Ward B, surveyed in the early 2010s. More recently surveyed historic districts/properties likely do not require Phase 1 survey and could be eliminated from the Phase 1 effort.

Chapter 5

LIST OF DIGITAL ATTACHMENTS

The following digital resources have been developed for the users of the Phase 1 survey. These are also listed in the Table of Contents of this report.

- Attachment A. Kick-Off Meeting Minutes (PDF)
- Attachment B. Phase 1 Screening Methodology and Survey Questions (PDF)
- Attachment C. Digital Historic Maps, 1841-1928 (Folder of Assorted PDF and JPG Map Images)
- Attachment D. Tables (Digital Submission)
 - Table 4.1. Individual Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
 - Table 4.2. Central Avenue Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
 - Table 4.3. Sherman Place Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
 - Table 4.4. Washington Village Historic District Study Area, Properties Recommended for Phase 2 Survey (Excel and PDF)
 - Table 4.5. Master Table of All Phase 1 Surveyed Properties (Excel only)
- Attachment E. Ward D Survey GIS Data Package (Digital Submission in Arc-GIS). All data collected in the field and analyzed as part of Phase 1, keyed to tax parcel and address.
- Phase 1 Survey Maps as PDFs (Maps 2.1, 3.1, 4.1 to 4.9). These maps were generated from the GIS and are only a sampling of the large number of sorts that can be performed on the Phase 1 data using the GIS software.
- Excel tables and PDFs generated from the GIS data as summaries and for users who may not have GIS software.

REFERENCES

City of Jersey City

- 2000 Historic Preservation Element. City of Jersey City Master Plan (Amended 2005 and 2015): IX-1 to IX-26. On file, Jersey City Historic Preservation Commission, Jersey City, New Jersey.

Culver, D.E.

- 1868 *Map Showing the Location of the Proposed Roads I the County of Hudson, N.J.* N.p., Jersey City, New Jersey.

Douglas, L.F.

- 1841 *Topographical Map of Jersey City, Hoboken and the Adjacent Country.* L.F. Douglas, Jersey City, New Jersey.

Dripps, M.

- 1860 *Map of the Five Cities of New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Hoboken & Hudson City.* M. Dripps, New York, New York.

Earle & Harrison

- 1889 *Map of Jersey City and Environs, Hudson County, N.J.* J.W. Harrison, Jersey City, New Jersey.

Fowler, L.D., George W. and Walter Bromley.

- 1887 *Atlas of Jersey City, New Jersey.* G.W. Bromley and Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Hopkins, G.M.

- 1908 *Atlas of Hudson County, New Jersey.* Volume One, Jersey City. G.M. Hopkins Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- 1873 *Combined Atlas of the State of New Jersey and the County of Hudson.* G.M. Hopkins & Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- 1919 *Plat Book of Jersey City and Bayonne, Hudson Co., N.J.* G.M. Hopkins Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- 1928 *Plat Book of Jersey City, Hudson Co., N.J.* G.M. Hopkins Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Joseph C. Brooks and Associates

- 1985 Jersey City Phase 1 Historic Sites Inventory Survey, Ward D. On file, Jersey City Historic Preservation Commission, Jersey City, New Jersey.'

Mary B. Dierickx, Architectural Preservation Consultants

- 1986 Phase 2 Survey of Ward D, Jersey City. On file, Jersey City Historic Preservation Commission, Jersey City, New Jersey.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR)

- 2022 Jersey City, Hudson County, New Jersey, 1931-2019. Electronic document, <https://www.historicaerials.com/>, accessed March 2022.

New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO)

- 2022 New Jersey's Cultural Resources GIS Online Map Viewer (LUCY). Electronic document, <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=44ce3eb3c53349639040fe205d69bb79>, accessed March 2022.

New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO) Staff

- 2015 Inactive National Register Nominations Compilation: Hudson County. On file, New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, Trenton, New Jersey.

Sanborn Map Company

- 1910 *Insurance Maps of Hudson County, New Jersey*. Jersey City, Volumes 3 and 4. Sanborn Map Company, New York, New York.

Sanborn-Perris Map Co., Limited

- 1896 *Insurance Maps of Hudson County, New Jersey*. Volumes 3 and 4. Sanborn-Perris Map Co., Limited, New York, New York.

Spielmann & Brush

- 1880 *Sanitary & Topographical Map of Hudson County, N.J. Prepared for the National Board of Health, Washington, D.C.* Snyder & Black, New York, New York.

Sulleberger Associates

- 1991 New Jersey Transit Hudson River Waterfront AA/DEIS, Historic Architectural Resources Background Study. On file, New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, Trenton, New Jersey.

Wood, William H.

- 1885 *Map of Jersey City, Hoboken & Hudson Cities*. R.B. Kashow, Jersey City, New Jersey.

Attachment A

KICK-OFF MEETING MINUTES

Hunter Research, Inc.
120 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08608
(609) 695-0122
www.hunterresearch.com

Memo

To: Maggie O'Neill, City of Jersey City

From: Patrick Harshbarger, Hunter Research, Inc.

cc: Tanya Marione, City of Jersey City
Sara Quinlan, City of Jersey City
Dan Wrieden, City of Jersey City
Jim Lee, Hunter Research, Inc.
Patty Madrigal, Hunter Research, Inc.

Date: March 16, 2021

Re: Ward D Reconnaissance-Level Historic Architectural Survey – Phase I Screening
Jersey City, Hudson County, New Jersey
Kick-Off Meeting Summary

Summary:

Hunter Research, Inc. (HRI) staff (Boyce, Craft, Harshbarger, Lee and Madrigal) met via video conference with City of Jersey City Division of City Planning staff (Marione, O'Neill, Quinlan and Wrieden) to begin the Phase I Screening of the Ward D Reconnaissance-Level Historic Architectural Survey. Following introductions, points of discussion proceeded as follows:

- 1). HRI staff anticipates receiving the city's GIS property data for Ward D from the department's GIS personnel. Lee will serve as the primary HRI point-of-contact for the sending and receiving of GIS data. The data will then be used to coordinate the creation of an ArcGIS Survey123 survey for all properties within Ward D by street address and tax block/lot.
- 2). HRI will develop property screening questions prior to beginning fieldwork and send to O'Neill for approval. These questions will be focused on determining the property's historic architectural character, remaining historical integrity, contribution to its surrounding streetscape and potential historical significance to narrow the list of properties eligible for the Phase II survey.
- 3). The Division of City Planning will notify Jersey City public safety of the survey team's presence in Ward D prior to the start of fieldwork. HRI and Division of City Planning staff will work together to develop a letter to distribute to community organizations and neighborhood associations to notify them of the upcoming survey work. A similar letter will be produced for the

survey team to carry and distribute to residents who have further questions regarding the survey. The letterhead on which the letter will be distributed is to be determined. Contact numbers for both HRI and Division of City Planning staff will be provided.

4). The Phase I Screening will be completed within five months of the kick-off meeting. Upon completion of fieldwork, a report with a completed database of properties surveyed and a digital library containing historic maps, aerials, postcards, etc. will be submitted to the Division of City Planning. No photography of properties will be completed during this screening phase.

5). Following the completion of the Phase I Screening, HRI and Division of City Planning staff will work together to select the first 100 properties for Phase II Survey. The Phase II Survey will consist of 35mm digital field photography, further historical research and comparative analysis and completion of NJHPO individual survey forms and historic district overlays as needed. This phase will be completed within a few months of the completion of the screening phase.

Attachment B

PHASE 1 SCREENING METHODOLOGY AND SCREENING QUESTIONS

Hunter Research, Inc.
120 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08608
609-695-0122
www.hunterresearch.com

To: Maggie O'Neill, City of Jersey City

From: Patrick Harshbarger, Hunter Research, Inc.

cc: Tanya Marione, City of Jersey City
Sara Quinlan, City of Jersey City
Dan Wrieden, City of Jersey City
Jim Lee, Hunter Research, Inc.
Patty Madrigal, Hunter Research, Inc.

Date: April 1, 2021

Re: Ward D Reconnaissance-Level Historic Architectural Survey – Phase I Screening
Jersey City, Hudson County, New Jersey
Phase I Screening Questions

Phase I Screening:

In order to efficiently evaluate the large number of properties in Ward D, Hunter Research will be using a Cloud-based, on-line GIS remote data-collection system and handheld devices using an application known as Survey123. Based on a visual inspection via pedestrian or windshield survey, architectural historians will complete a basic digital short form and answer questions that assess whether a property meets a minimum threshold for later completion of a more in-depth New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (HPO) survey form (Phase II Survey).

Hunter Research has coordinated with the City to receive its GIS property data for Ward D (current as of March 18, 2021). This data was preliminarily evaluated to contain 8,367 parcels and 6,675 buildings. Vacant tax parcels/lots will not be surveyed.

Hunter Research has created a set of screening questions related to historical/architectural significance and integrity. These questions can be assessed in the field and will be designed to screen out and provide documentation of buildings that clearly do not meet a threshold for carrying over to the Phase II Survey.

The purpose of this memorandum is to present the threshold questions and methodology to the City's Historic Preservation Specialists for review and concurrence prior to the Phase I Screening fieldwork.

Phase I Screening Questions

Question 1: Do tax block/lot and street address match digital data? [Yes/No]

If no, a pull down will allow historian to enter an alternate street address.

Methodological comment: The purpose of this question is to validate the GIS data. Records created in the field will be reviewed in the office and matched with appropriate tax parcel data. This will prevent time being lost in the field trying to correct locational data.

Question 2a: Was Property Built before 1981? [Yes/No]

If “no”, the property will be eliminated from the Phase I Screening and no further questions answered. If “yes”, the historian will estimate the period of development (see Question 2b).

Methodological comment: The purpose of this question is to screen out buildings that have not achieved historic age, which is defined by the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places as at least 50 years old. The screening will cover buildings that turn 50 years of age through the year 2030 to give the project a longer shelf life. Prior to going into the field, the historian will have access to tax data year built and historic maps to assist with dating.

Question 2b: What Is the Property’s Estimated Period of Development? [Restricted Field, Pulldown]

The historian will estimate the period of development based on form, massing, style and other physical evidence.

Methodological comment: This question will provide within GIS a way of visually identifying on a map where there are concentrations of resources of similar age. This data will be useful in combination with Question 7 in determining historic district potential.

Post-WWII Architectural Type, c.1945-1980
Interwar Architectural Type, c.1915-1944
Late Victorian Architectural Type, c.1870-1914
Mid-19th Century Architectural Type, c. 1830-1870
Early National Architectural Type, c. 1780-1830
Colonial Architectural Type, pre-1780
Age Not Evident from Physical Characteristics

Question 3: Common Name of Property [Text Field, 100 characters]

The historian will enter the current common name of the property from any identifying signs, plaques, etc., as well as any readily visible date markers. For example, St. Mark's Lutheran Church (1855, Cornerstone). This will be left blank if no name or date is evident.

Question 4: Historical Use [Restricted Field, Pulldown]

The historian will select the most appropriate "historical use" of the property from a table.

Methodological comment: This will be based on the historical use of the property as judged in the field. It is anticipated that properties screened as non-residential have a higher likelihood of having historical associations and contexts that may merit Phase II Survey.

Residential – Single Family
Residential – Duplex
Residential – Multi-family
Mixed Use Residential and Commercial
Commercial
Cemetery
Church
Industrial
Park or Designed Landscape
Public Service/Utility
School
Transportation
Library
Firehouse
Civic
Other

Question 5a: Does the Property Have Any Potentially Significant Elements of Architectural Style? [Yes/No]

Methodological comment: The historian will judge in the field whether the building has remaining elements of style (e.g. cornice treatments, windows/doors, decorative elements, etc.) that are 1) sufficient to assign an architectural style and 2) potentially significant as either examples of vernacular or high style typologies. For buildings where the answer is "yes," a style will be selected from a pulldown (Question 5b) and it is anticipated that the property will be carried to the Phase II Survey.

Question 5b: Select an Architectural Style [Restricted Field, Pulldown]

If a style is present, the historian will select the most appropriate match. This list conforms to the NJHPO's *Guidelines* for completing survey forms.

Art Moderne
Art Deco
Bayonne Box
Beaux Arts
Brutalism
Colonial
Colonial Revival
Craftsman
Dutch Colonial
Dutch Colonial Revival
Egyptian Revival
Federal
Georgian
Georgian Revival
Gothic Revival
Greek Revival
International
Italianate
Modernistic
Neo-Classical
New Formalism
Post-Modern
Queen Anne
Renaissance Revival
Richardsonian Romanesque
Romanesque Revival
Second Empire
Shingle
Spanish Colonial Revival
Stick
Sullivanese
Tudor Revival
Wrightian
Other

Question 6: Does the Property Have Moderate or Better Historic Architectural Integrity?
[Yes/No]

The historian will make a subjective judgment as to the level of historical integrity, answering "yes" if the property is judged to have moderate or better integrity. The criteria for answer "no" will be clear evidence of a major non-reversible character-defining alteration. Such alterations would include 1) major changes in fenestration and door opening patterns, placement and size, 2) severe changes to form and massing, 3) loss of all elements of style and materiality. Note: this will not include materiality changes such as vinyl/aluminum siding or replacement of doors and window/sashes

since these are exceedingly common and in the case of siding may be covering over older materials.

Methodological comment: Properties where the answer is “no” have irreversible losses of historic character. Properties with low integrity have low likelihood to be carried over to Phase II Survey.

Question 7: Is the Property within an Intact Historic Streetscape? [Yes/No]

The historian will make a subjective judgment in the field as to whether there is the potential for the property to be judged contributing to a historic streetscape. This will be a visual assessment of the streetscape along adjacent streets. As a rough estimate, at least 75% of a streetscape should be visually intact in at least one or more directions to answer “yes.”

Methodological comment: This question in combination with Question 2b will provide a method in GIS for visually representing where there may be combinations of properties that could have historic district potential for assessment in Phase II Survey.

Question 8a: Is the Property Part of An Assemblage with Potential Historic Significance? [Yes/No]

The historian will make a judgment in the field whether the property could have specific historical associations with other buildings, structures, objects, landscapes or sites. An answer of “yes” might apply to an industrial complex, a linear transportation resource, a connected series of row houses or buildings that appear to have been constructed at the same time by the same developer. If the answer is “yes”, the historian will be prompted to leave a comment in Question 8b.

Methodological comment: An answer of “yes” is likely to merit further investigation of the assemblage in the Phase II Survey.

Question 8b: Describe the Assemblage [Text, 100 characters]

If the question to 8a is “yes”, the historian will be prompted to enter a brief description, e.g., industrial complex, row housing, etc.

Phase I Screening Evaluation

Following completion of field data collection (Questions 1 to 8), an evaluation will be made in the office whether to make a recommendation for carrying to the Phase II Survey or not. As well, the data will be checked against existing NJHPO and City data and historic atlas maps to ensure consistency of results. The following data fields will be entered:

Evaluation Question 1: Has the Property Been Previously Identified as Individually Listed, Eligible or Potentially Eligible by the NJHPO or City of Jersey City? [Yes/No]

The property will be crosschecked against NJHPO GIS data and City lists of landmarked properties. If the answer is “yes”, the following data will be entered:

Historic Name of Property [Text, 100 characters]:

Current Status [Text, 100 characters]: Listed, Eligible, Landmarked and date, etc., e.g., SR/NR, 1980]

Evaluation Question 2: Has the Property Been Previously Identified as Being Located within a Listed, Eligible or Potentially Eligible Historic District by the NJHPO or the City of Jersey City? [Yes/No]

The property will be crosschecked against NJHPO GIS data, City lists of landmarked properties and the Brooks survey. If the answer is “yes”, the following data will be entered:

Historic District/Neighborhood Name [Text, 100 characters]

Historic District Status [Text, 100 characters, NR Listed, Local Landmark and date, etc., e.g., SR/NR 1980, Brooks 1985, etc.]

Status [Pulldown: Contributing, Non-Contributing, Undetermined]

Methodological comment: Data from past surveys will be entered. In instances where the data is current (e.g., Hudson City Historic District, aka Sherman Place), the properties do not need to be re-surveyed in the Phase II Survey, although the data will be incorporated. Judgment may be made in consultation with the City whether properties in older identified districts (e.g. Brooks) may need updating during the Phase II Survey.

Evaluation Question 3: Is the Property a Candidate for Phase II Survey? [Yes/No]

Data Collected in the field, in combination with current status data, will be reviewed to make an assessment as to whether the property merits continuation to the Phase II Survey either individually or as part of a potential historic district. The consultant will enter a yes/no recommendation.

Methodological comment: This evaluation will be performed consistently using a set of criteria and contextual evaluations developed following review of data, placed in writing and confirmed in consultation with the City Historic Preservation Specialists. There are likely to be some base level assessments, e.g., post-1981 properties will be screened out; properties with low integrity will be screened out unless flagged to be evaluated in potential historic districts; residential properties with no discernible style and no historic district potential will be screened out, etc. There may also be large numbers of certain property types (e.g., Bayonne Boxes) where decisions will be made whether to carry to Phase II Survey or not.

Attachment C

**DIGITAL HISTORIC MAPS, 1841-1928
(DIGITAL SUBMISSION)**

Attachment D

TABLES (DIGITAL SUBMISSION)

Attachment E

**WARD D SURVEY GIS DATA PACKAGE
(DIGITAL SUBMISSION IN ARC-GIS)**

