HARDENBROOK - SOMARINDYCK HOUSE, 135 Bowery, Manhattan. Built c. 1817.

Landmark Site: Borough of Manhattan Tax Map Block 423, Lot 4.

On July 13, 2010, the Landmarks Preservation Commission held a public hearing on the proposed designation as a Landmark of the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House and the proposed designation of the related Landmark Site (Item No. 1). The hearing had been duly advertised in accordance with the provisions of law. Eight people spoke in favor of designation, including representatives of Councilmember Margaret Chin, Historic Districts Council, Bowery Alliance of Neighbors, and Lower East Side History Project. Three representatives of the owner opposed designation. In addition, the Commission received a number of communications in support of designation.

Summary
The Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House, a Federal style rowhouse at No. 135 Bowery in Lower Manhattan, was built c. 1817 and, for 150 years, the property was associated with the intertwined, wealthy and prominent Hardenbrook and Somarindyck families, serving as the family residence of John A. Hardenbrook, his wife nee Maria Aymar, and later of their daughter, Rebecca Hardenbrook Somarindyck, until 1841. Hardenbrook was a broker who was one of the 24 men who signed the Buttonwood Agreement in 1792 that established the New York Stock and Exchange Board (predecessor to the New York Stock Exchange). He became an import merchant, and then a soap and candle manufacturer, with his business next door at No. 133. At this time, the lower Bowery was a fashionable address for New York’s social elite and wealthy merchant class. This building remained in the Somarindyck family until 1944. For over six decades, from 1841 to 1907, No. 135 Bowery was the location of the nationally significant business of the Wilson family, saddlers, harness- and trunkmakers, and purveyors of firemen’s equipment, and was for many years the family residence as well.

The Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House is among the oldest of the relatively rare extant and substantially intact Manhattan houses of the Federal period and style (many such houses were raised with additional stories in the later 19th century), and is significant as a rare surviving house from the period of the lower Bowery’s history as an elite neighborhood in the post-Revolutionary War era, the other being the Edward Mooney House (c. 1785-89) at No. 18. Despite alterations, it is notable as a grand early Federal style rowhouse due, particularly, to its original form and materials, with its three-and-a-half-story height and 22-foot width, high peaked roof with two pedimented dormers and end chimney, and front facade with Flemish bond brickwork (now painted).
DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

Early History and Residential Development of the Lower Bowery

Prior to the arrival of European fur traders and the Dutch West India Company, Manhattan and much of the present-day tri-state area was populated by bands of Lenape Indians. The Lenape traveled from one encampment to another with the seasons. Fishing camps were occupied in the summer and inland camps were used during the fall and winter to harvest crops and hunt. The main trail ran the length of Manhattan from the Battery to Inwood, following the course of Broadway adjacent to present-day City Hall Park, before veering east toward the area now known as Foley Square. It then ran north with major branches leading to habitations in Greenwich Village and the Lower East Side at a place called Rechtauck or Naghtogack in the vicinity of Corlears Hook. In 1626, Director-General Peter Minuit of the Dutch West India Company “purchased” the island of Manhattan from the Lenape for sixty guilders worth of trade goods.

The Bowery was, like Broadway, originally part of a Native American trail extending the length of Manhattan; during the Dutch colonization, slave laborers widened the portion of this pathway linking the city of New Amsterdam at the southern tip of Manhattan with a group of bouweries, or farms, established by the Dutch West Indies Company to supply its fledging settlement. After 1664, when the British took control of New Amsterdam and renamed it New York, this “Bowry Lane” became a component of the Post Road linking New York City and Boston. It was officially designated “The Bowery” in 1813.

During the period of Dutch rule, the area now known as the Lower East Side was divided into a number of large farms. The land on which today’s No. 135 Bowery is situated was part of what was known as Bouwery No. 4, which was also known as the Pannebacker’s Bouwery until the early 19th century. The earliest settler is not known but it was probably occupied by a tile baker or brick maker. Bouwery No. 4 was granted to Gerrit Jansen van Oldenborch on February 17, 1646, by William Kieft, Director of the Dutch West India Company. On October 27, 1649, Gerrit Jansen exchanged this farm for the Mallesmistsberg with Thomas Hall. Hall leased the property to Cornelius Gertsen on August 18, 1660, and then conveyed it by deed dated October 30, 1662, to Cornelius Steenwyck. Before 1666, Steenwyck had taken in Oloff Stevenson van Cortlandt as a partner. Upon Steenwyck’s death in 1684, his widow Margarita Reimers inherited his interest in the property and four years later she and her new husband, the Reverend Henricus Selyns, a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, took over Van Cortlandt’s interest from his son, Jacobus. This land became known as “The Dominie’s Farm.” The block on which No. 135 Bowery is situated was within the Dominie’s Farm that James DeLancey purchased from the heirs of Margarita Reimers Selyns in 1741.

James DeLancey died intestate in 1760 and his eldest son, also named James, inherited the extensive east side property. The younger DeLancey soon had a portion of the estate surveyed into a regular grid of streets centered on a large open square, named the Great Square or DeLancey’s Square, modeled after London’s great Georgian residential enclaves. By 1761, DeLancey had rented out most of the newly-mapped lots under long-term ground leases. Some – particularly those along the Bowery – were developed with modest wooden houses by artisan tenants. Many lots, however, remained vacant as their leaseholders held onto the properties as speculative investments in anticipation of the future growth of the city into the Lower East Side.

By 1783, at the end of the Revolutionary War and the seven-year occupation of New York by the British Army, the city had been devastated by the halt in trade, two fires that had
destroyed over one-third of its buildings, and the loss of over one-half of its population (down to 12,000). New York rebounded rapidly, serving briefly as the capital of the United States in 1789-90 and emerging as the second largest American city after Philadelphia in 1800. Local merchants rebuilt the city’s shipping infrastructure and created great wealth based on commerce with Europe, the Caribbean, and Asia. During the 18th century, participation in the trans-Atlantic “triangular trade” became an integral part of New York City’s economy. New York merchants were significant in this highly lucrative Europe-Africa-Americas shipping network that traded enslaved persons from Africa and the Caribbean, manufactured goods, and products from the Caribbean, such as sugar, rum, molasses, tobacco, rice, and cotton. By the early 18th century, the cattle and butchering industries were located outside of town around the Bull’s Head Tavern, which was located on the Bowery just below present-day Canal Street. The tavern had been purchased, along with the adjacent stockyards and abattoir (slaughterhouse), in 1785 by John Jacob Astor’s brother Henry, a cattle trader and butcher, from Nicholas Bayard. After 1800, the meat processing industries expanded on both sides of the Bowery outward from the tavern, and stockyards and slaughterhouses proliferated on Chrystie and Elizabeth Streets. Interspersed were establishments for the reduction of lard, tallow and soap fats and making of candles. Cattle were herded across or along the Bowery causing many accidents. Between the 1820s and 1850s, the cattle and butchering industries had been forced farther uptown and to the shores of the East and Hudson Rivers, and a little later the driving of cattle through the streets was prohibited.

While the Revolutionary War and occupation had disrupted the plans of the entrepreneurial leaseholders along the Bowery and brought a temporary halt to development on the Lower East Side, the situation was further complicated when, in 1779, James DeLancey, a Loyalist, was pronounced a traitor and his lands declared forfeit under New York State’s Act of Attainder. It took several years following the end of hostilities for the Commissioners of Forfeiture to dispose of the property. In 1782-84, Evert Bancker was engaged in resurveying the area into salable lots. To maximize profits, he did away with DeLancey’s Square and laid out two additional streets parallel to the Bowery. After Bancker’s survey was completed in 1784, Isaac Stoutenburgh and Philip Van Cortlandt, Commissioners of Forfeiture for the Southern District of New York, began the process of selling off the property at public auction. Property that included the lot at No. 135 Bowery was conveyed to Jacob Reed in 1787.

Even with nearly 2,000 building lots suddenly made available for purchase on the open market, development of the Lower East Side remained relatively slow through the final decade of the 18th century. However, one of the first wealthy businessmen to construct a house on the Bowery on land confiscated from James DeLancey was Edward Mooney, a successful wholesale meat merchant, who built his early Federal style brick town house at No. 18 Bowery c. 1785-89 (addition 1807; a designated New York City Landmark). By the early 1800s, the city had grown northward to such an extent that construction in the area had become imperative. In 1803, the City’s Common Council ordered that “all the Streets on the ground commonly known by the name of Delancey’s ground be opened as soon as possible.” Within a decade, many of the roads on the Lower East Side had been regulated and some were even paved. The area continued to develop rapidly during the 1810s and 20s, and by the 1830s, virtually the entire Lower East Side had been transformed into a bustling urban neighborhood composed in large part of brick-fronted Federal style rowhouses. For a time, the Bowery was one of the fashionable addresses for New York’s social elite and wealthy merchant class, along with the area around the Battery and lower Broadway around Bowling Green, considered the most
fashionable residential district in New York, including lower Greenwich Street. The large waves of immigrants that began landing in New York during the 1840s transformed the demographic composition of the Lower East Side. As wealthy merchants and middle-class families migrated out of the neighborhood, working class tenants moved in.

After the Civil War, the Bowery became known for its cheap amusements – some wholesome, some not – as music halls, dramatic theaters, and German beer halls shared the street with dive bars, taxidance halls, pawnbrokers, medicine shows, confidence men, shady merchants staging “mock auctions,” and “museums” featuring sword swallowers, exotic animals, and scantily clad women. With the opening of the Third Avenue Elevated along the Bowery in 1878 (with two lines, above the sidewalks, immediately adjacent to the buildings), the street was cast into permanent shadow, and pedestrians were showered with hot cinders from the steam trains running above. Nevertheless, the Bowery remained “the liveliest mile on the face of the earth” through the 19th century. Despite its honky-tonk reputation, the Bowery also functioned as “the grand avenue of the respectable lower classes,” where Federal-era residences, some converted to saloons and boarding houses, stood cheek-by-jowl with grand architectural showpieces constructed by the neighborhood’s financial and cultural institutions, such as the Young Men’s Institute Building of the YMCA (1884-85, Bradford L. Gilbert) at No. 222; Bowery Savings Bank (1893-95, McKim, Mead & White) at No. 130; and Germania Bank (1898-99, Robert Maynicke) at No. 190.

In the 20th century, the Bowery became notorious as a “skid row” lined with flop houses and vagrants, but at the same time, because of low rents, became one of New York’s centers of such specialty shops as lighting fixtures and restaurant equipment. The elevated railway line, reconstructed in the middle of the Bowery in 1916, helped to deter the redevelopment of this area for decades (it was demolished in 1955), and the close physical proximity of the line to the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House, in particular, had an undoubted role in its survival.

The Hardenbrook-Somarindyck Families and Their House at No. 135 Bowery

For 150 years, the property at No. 135 Bowery was associated with the intertwined, wealthy and prominent Hardenbrook and Somarindyck families, and the house constructed here c. 1817 served as the family residence until 1841.

In 1795, five lots at the northeast corner of Bowery Lane and Grand Street were conveyed to William A. Hardenbrook (1769-1835) and his wife, nee Margaret Somarindyck (they were married in 1791). Hardenbrook, a son of Abel and Rebecca Anthony Hardenbrook, was a bank and insurance company director who was politically well-connected under Mayor DeWitt Clinton, serving as an assistant alderman, tax assessor, and excise commissioner, but by 1815 he was an “insolvent debtor.” Margaret was a daughter of John Somarindyck (-1790), owner of a large farm at Bloomingdale (on today’s Upper West Side), that had previously been the property of James DeLancey, and sold to Somarindyck in 1785 by the Commissioners of Forfeiture. Somarindyck’s heirs began to partition this property in 1809.

In 1806, four of the Bowery Lane lots were transferred by William A. Hardenbrook to his brother, John A. Hardenbrook (who also acquired numerous parcels of the Somarindyck farm in 1814-17). John A. Hardenbrook (1761-1832), who in 1787 had married Maria Aymar (of French Huguenot descent), was one of the 24 men who had signed the Buttonwood Agreement in 1792 that established the New York Stock and Exchange Board (predecessor to the New York Stock Exchange). He was at that time a broker at 24 Nassau Street, and by 1795 was a merchant importing wines and teas at 54 Nassau Street. In 1804, he served as one of the jurors in the
inquest over Alexander Hamilton’s death in his duel with Aaron Burr. Hardenbrook became a soap and candle manufacturer, supplying candles to City Hall and other public buildings in the 1810s. He and his family lived at 106 First Avenue (now Allen Street) near Broome Street, and in 1814 he opened his soap and candle business at No. 133 Bowery, on one of the lots he had acquired from his brother. This location was convenient to the nearby area burgeoning with stockyards and slaughterhouses. Based on city tax assessments, the house next door at No. 135 Bowery was built c. 1817, and Hardenbrook was listed in city directories residing here by 1818. This remained the Hardenbrook residence until his death in 1832.24

John A. and Maria A. Hardenbrook had one surviving child, daughter Rebecca M. Hardenbrook (1791-1859), who in 1810 married Hyder Somarindyck (-1831), the brother of her aunt Margaret Somarindyck Hardenbrook, who worked in the firm of Bulkly & Somarindyck. Hyder and Rebecca Somarindyck were listed in city directories residing with her parents in No. 135 Bowery in 1821-23. After her husband’s death in 1831 and her father’s in 1832, Rebecca Hardenbrook Somarindyck resided in No. 135 until 1841. The house was apparently inherited by both of her sons, Edwin Hyder Somarindyck (1812-1874), married in 1839 to Elizabeth Titus Townsend ( -1880); and John William Somarindyck (1815-1896), married to Anna Frost Townsend (c. 1823-1910); both brothers lived in Glen Cove, Long Island, and neither had children. In 1879, after the death of Edwin H. Somarindyck and just prior to his wife Elizabeth T. Somarindyck’s, their interest in the property was conveyed to his brother. John W. Somarindyck’s will in 1896 left the No. 135 Bowery building to a cousin, John Somarindyck, in Aurora, Illinois; in 1911, it was conveyed to his wife, Anna. After being held continuously since 1795 within the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck family, the sale of the property was announced in the Times in 1941 by Julia Somarindyck Gill, of San Antonio, Texas, daughter of John and Anna Somarindyck, but title was not actually transferred until 1944.

Federal Style Houses in Manhattan25

As the city of New York grew in the period after the Revolution, large plots of land in Manhattan were sold and subdivided for the construction of rows of brick-clad houses. Their architectural style has been called “Federal” after the new republic, but in form and detail they continued the Georgian style of Great Britain. Federal style houses were constructed from the Battery as far north as 23rd Street between the 1780s and 1830s. The size of the lot dictated the size of the house: typically each house lot was between 20 and 25 feet wide (though some were smaller) and 90 to 100 feet deep. These lots accorded with the rectilinear plan of New York City, laid out in 1807 and adopted as the Commissioners’ Plan in 1811. The house itself would be as wide as the lot, and commonly 35 to 40 feet deep. This allowed for a stoop and small front yard or areaway, and a fairly spacious rear yard, which usually contained a buried cistern to collect fresh water and the privy. During the early 19th century, houses were often constructed together, sharing common party walls, chimneys, and roof timbering to form a continuous group. The houses were of load-bearing masonry construction or modified timber-frame construction with brick-clad front facades. With shared structural framing and party walls, each house in a row was dependent on its neighbor for structural stability. The design of some houses has been identified with certain architects or builders, such as John McComb, Jr., though such documentation is rare. With the increasing availability of pattern books, such as Asher Benjamin’s American Builders Companion (published in six editions between 1806 and 1827), local builders had access to drawings and instructions for exterior and interior plans and details.
Federal style rowhouses usually had a three-bay facade with two full stories over a high basement and an additional half story under a peaked roof with the ridge line running parallel to the front facade, while very modest houses could be two bays wide. Grander townhouses had three full stories, and could be up to five bays wide. The front (and sometimes rear) facade was usually clad in red brick laid in the Flemish bond pattern, which alternated a stretcher and a header in every row. This system allowed the linking of the more expensive face brick with the cheaper, rougher brick behind. Walls were usually two “wythes,” or eight inches, thick. Because brick was fabricated by hand in molds (rather than by machine), it was relatively porous. To protect the brick surface and slow water penetration, facades were often painted.

The planar quality of Federal style facades was relieved by ornament in the form of lintels, entrances, stoops with iron railings, cornices, and dormers. Doorway and window lintels, seen in a variety of types (flat, splayed, incised, or molded), were commonly stone. The most ornamental feature was the doorway, often framed with columns and sidelights and topped with a rectangular transom or fanlight, and having a single wooden paneled door. The entrance was usually approached by a stoop – a flight of stone steps usually placed to one side of the facade – on the parlor floor above a basement level, though some houses had ground-story entrances and commercial shopfronts. Wrought-iron railings with finials lined the stoop and enclosed areaways. Window openings at the parlor and second stories were usually the same height (the size sometimes diminished on the third story), aligned and were the same width from story to story. The wood-framed sash were double hung and multi-light (typically six-over-six). Shutters were common on the exterior. A wooden cornice with a molded fascia extended across the front along the eave, which carried a built-in gutter. A leader head and downspout that drained onto the sidewalk extended down the facade on the opposite side from the doorway. Pedimented or segmental dormers on the front roof slope usually had decorative wood trim, and the top sash were often arched with decorative muntins. The roof was covered with continuous wood sheathing over the rafters and clad in wood shingles or slate.

The design of the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House is characteristic of the Federal style. It is notable as a grand early Federal style rowhouse due, particularly, to its original form and materials, with its three-and-a-half-story height and 22-foot width, high peaked roof with two pedimented dormers and end chimney, and front facade with Flemish bond brickwork (now painted). Based on historic evidence of the house’s interior construction, the original entrance to the upstairs stories was located at the north end, and the front portion of the ground story may have originally been occupied as an office or commercial space (its earliest documented use as a commercial storefront dates from 1841). The foundations indicate that it was originally an L-shaped house with a rear wing. Despite the loss or alteration of some architectural details, the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House is among the oldest of the relatively rare surviving and significantly intact Manhattan townhouses of the Federal style and period (dating from 1789 to 1834), especially considering that many such houses were raised with additional stories in the later 19th century. It is also significant as a rare surviving house of the period of the lower Bowery’s history as an elite neighborhood in the post-Revolutionary War era, the other being the Edward Mooney House (c. 1785-89) at No. 18.
The Wilson Family: Saddlery, Harnesses, Trunks and Firemen’s Equipment

For over six decades, from 1841 to 1907, No. 135 Bowery was the location of the nationally significant business of the Wilson family, and was for many years the family residence as well. John Wilson was listed in directories as a saddler, harnessmaker, and trunkmaker at No. 135 from 1841 to 1859, and this address was listed as his home between 1845 and 1858 (he apparently died soon after). The American Institute of the City of New York gave an award to Wilson for “best fireman’s caps” in 1849. William H. Wilson was listed here from 1848 to 1894, as a maker of harnesses, saddles, trunks, and firemen’s caps, and he resided in No. 135 from 1846 to at least 1862. A profile of William H. Wilson’s firm, and its location at No. 135 Bowery, was included in *New York’s Great Industries* in 1885:

This large elegant fine store is considered one of the best places in New York City to purchase trunks, bags, pocket books, whips and all kinds of firemen’s equipments, which is the specialty of Mr. Wilson’s business. Firemen’s hats, caps, badges, belts, torches, wrenches, trumpets, lanterns, fire department buttons, etc., are manufactured extensively and shipped to all parts of the country to the “boys.” The stock is the most complete of its kind in the metropolis, so that all orders both as to measure and extent can be promptly filled. The business has had a prosperous and healthy existence for over fifty-nine years, and may well be regarded as one of the oldest and best in the Union.

A[lbert]. Wilson & Co., firemen’s equipment, was in No. 135 from 1894 to 1907. The *New York Times* in 1903 expounded on the firm’s national scope in terms of firemen’s hats:

There are only two firms in New York that make the solid leather hats that firemen wear while fighting the flames, and they are within a stone’s throw of each other in Grand Street. ... New York has set the fashion in fire helmets for the entire country. In fact, in Western cities, where the municipality pays for the helmets of its firemen, and the ordering is done by contract, the New York manufacturers are the successful bidders because they can do the work more cheaply than their competitors. The plain black leather helmet worn by the New York firemen is the standard all over the United States, and even in Uncle Sam’s new possessions.

An 1852 map shows the original rear wing of the rowhouse, while an 1857 map shows an extension, both accessible though a south side passageway also located on the property. The original wing and the extension were altered/extended for the Wilson firm in 1875 and 1881; an 1885 map provides evidence that the entire rear of the lot had been built upon by that time.

Other Businesses in No. 135 Bowery and Later Ownership

During the same period of occupancy as the Wilson family, there were several unusual tenants – early photographers, some producing daguerreotypes, in studios in No. 135 (presumably on the second story of the rowhouse). According to city directories, these included Charles W. Alderdice (1858-62 and 1867-71), William Vaughan (1860), Samuel Bennett (1870), and Alfred Amery, “show cards” (1870-74); another source listed a Charles Wilson as a daguerreian at No. 135 in 1860.

According to Dept. of Buildings applications, in 1903 one family resided in the attic, and after 1907 the upper stories were occupied by two families. After the building was sold in 1944
by Julia Somarindyck Gill to Meyer Fish, some structural work was performed that year. Fish transferred the property in 1952 to 135 Bowery Realty Corp., of Ft. Lee, New Jersey, and a renovation was done for “offices, manufacturing and stores.” As this area of the Bowery became highly desirable in the 1960s for artists looking for large and affordable living quarters and studios, several artists moved into the building. A lighting business in the building, Lamp & Lighting Liquidators (c. 1981-94), was operated by David Seitzman, whose parents, Steven and Judith Seitzman, of East Brunswick, New Jersey, owned the building from 1986 to 2008. The property was transferred in 2008 to 135 Bowery LLC, then to First American International Bank.

Description
The Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House is 22 feet wide, three bays, and three-and-a-half stories, with a high peaked roof with two pedimented dormers (with round-arched windows) and a southern end chimney. On the property’s south side, an original passageway to the rear of the lot has been enclosed by sheet metal (now having an interior stair well), so that the original southern exterior wall is no longer visible (except above the cornice line). Based on historic evidence of the house’s interior construction, the original entrance to the upstairs stories was located at the north end, and the front portion of the ground story may have originally been occupied as an office or commercial space (its earliest documented use as a commercial storefront dates from 1841). A late-19th-century cast-iron pilaster survives at each end of the facade (the southern one covered with sheet metal), supporting a steel beam. Currently, there are (north to south) the following non-historic alterations: a metal-and-glass entrance (with louver panel); a storefront covered by a metal rolldown gate; a metal-and-glass store entrance with a transom; and a metal entrance door (with louver panel), surmounted by a sheet metal panel, leading to the south end internal stair well. The second and third stories are clad in Flemish bond brickwork (now painted). Original stone lintels (probably incised panels) were replaced by later 19th-century stone and molded pressed-metal ones. Sills are stone. The original windows, which would have been six-over-six double-hung wood sash, have been replaced by one-over-one anodized aluminum sash. The alignment of the northernmost second-story window was shifted slightly northward. A large flagpole has been placed above the second story. A fire escape was placed on the second through attic stories c. 1901. The original wooden cornice has been replaced by a simpler one. Roof surfaces have been covered with tar.
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NOTES


2. The Native American “system of land tenure was that of occupancy for the needs of a group” and those sales that the Europeans deemed outright transfers of property were to the Native Americans closer to leases or joint tenancy contracts where they still had rights to the property. Reginald Pelham Bolton, *New York City in Indian Possession*, 2d ed. (New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Ftn., 1920; reprint, 1975), 7.

3. Bouwery (and later bowery) is derived from the old Dutch word for farm, *bouwerij*.

4. The road, which was known by a variety of names, including the “High Road to Boston,” appears as Bowry Lane on John Montresor and P. Andrews, *A Plan of New-York and its Environs* (1766) in the collection of the Lionel Pincus and Princess Firyal Map Division of the New York Public Library.

5. Pannebacker is derived from the old Dutch word for tile maker, *pannebakker*.

6. I. N. Phelps Stokes, *Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1924), 6: 86-91. Cornelius Steenwyck was a merchant and public official (Mayor of New York, 1668-70 and 1682-83). Although it cannot be determined if he owned any enslaved persons, he did participate in the slave trade after the Dutch West India Company opened the trade to private investors in 1652. Oloff Stevensen van Cortlandt owned a brewery on Stone Street and sat on several public commissions. It cannot be determined if he owned slaves, but his son Jacobus van Cortlandt, Mayor of New York, 1710-11 and 1719-20, did.


8. Stokes, 6: 86-91. *Dominie* was a name given to pastors in the Reformed Church.

9. New York County, Office of the Register, Liber Deeds and Conveyances; Stokes, 6: 86. This land was part of the west farm of James DeLancey; the division between his east and west farms was around present-day Clinton Street. Eric Hornberger, *The Historical Atlas of New York City* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1994), 61. At the time of his acquisition of the land, DeLancey was a rising member of New York’s Knickerbocker society. The son of Stephen DeLancey, a French Huguenot émigré and prosperous New York merchant, he had received his advanced education in England under the Archbishop of Canterbury and had returned to New York in 1725 as a fully admitted member of the bar. In 1729, he married Anne Heathcote, the daughter of Mayor Caleb Heathcote, and the following year helped lead the committee that drafted a new corporate charter for the City of New York, commonly known as the Montgomerie Charter. In 1731, DeLancey was appointed second justice of the New York Supreme Court, and in 1733 was promoted to Chief Justice. He later served as Lieutenant Governor of New York and for a few years as acting Governor. De Lancy was a recorded slave owner; Othello, a slave owned by DeLancey, was hanged as a conspirator following the slave uprising of 1741. Jill Lepore, *New York Burning: Liberty, Slavery, and Conspiracy in Eighteenth-Century Manhattan* (New York: Vintage Bks., 2006), 171-176.

10. Research was inconclusive on the status of the younger James DeLancey as a slave owner.

11. The square was bounded by present-day Eldridge, Broome, Essex, and Hester Streets. Elizabeth Blackmar, *Manhattan for Rent, 1785-1850* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1989), 34.

12. As early as 1720, it has been estimated that one-half of New York ships were involved in Caribbean trade. Located closer to the West Indies, New York surpassed Boston in the domination of the northern Atlantic
coastal trade. This trade, in turn, spurred a number of profitable local industries, such as shipbuilding and food processing, particularly sugar refining, distilling molasses into rum, and the conversion of tobacco into snuff.


14. Stokes, 6: 94. Although the streets were originally numbered pursuant to a scheme established by James DeLancey in the 1760s, many of the streets in the Lower East Side were renamed in 1817 to honor those who served during the War of 1812.

15. New York County, Office of the Register, Forfeiture Estate, Sale No. 295, Liber 156, page 30, recorded August 16, 1787. The next conveyance found was from John and Catharine Lamb to Thomas White, Liber 53, page 149, recorded November 2, 1796. Thomas and Ann White then conveyed it to William A. Hardenbrook by deed dated 1795, Liber 162, page 416, recorded October 14, 1822.

16. Both the Taylor-Roberts Plan of 1797 and the Goerck-Mangin Plan of 1803 indicate that development of the Lower East Side was confined at this time primarily to the western edge of the former Rutgers farm and a narrow ribbon hugging the Bowery on its way north out of town. Both maps appear in Stokes 1, plates 64 and 70.


19. As noted by Andrew S. Dolkart, “the city made no effort to restrict what could be built” on the former DeLancey property, which was therefore developed “with a mix of wooden buildings and more substantial brick rowhouses.” The development of the Rutgers estate just to the south, on the other hand, was guided by restrictive covenants and contained almost exclusively two-story brick rowhouses. Andrew S. Dolkart, *Biography of a Tenement House in New York City: An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street* (Santa Fe, NM and Staunton, VA: The Center for American Places, 2006), 7.


21. These three buildings are designated New York City Landmarks.

23. Another signer was Augustine (Augustus) Hicks Lawrence (1769-1828), who owned the Federal style house at 94 Greenwich Street, a designated New York City Landmark.

24. According to Censuses in 1800 and 1810, John A. Hardenbrook did not own slaves, though other members of the Hardenbrook family did. Regardless of whether or not such wealthy New Yorkers actually owned household slaves, most directly profited from American slavery. The exhibition catalogue of the New-York Historical Society, Slavery in New York, pointed out that in the early 19th century, New York’s ties to the slave system were strengthened by its increased connections to the Southern economy: “Following the War of 1812, New York City became the primary port for the shipment of raw cotton from the South to the textile mills of Europe. With the growth of the cotton trade, New York bankers, factors, and brokers became the chief financiers of slavery’s expansion... In bankrolling the cotton economy, New York businessmen assisted planters in purchasing the land slaves worked, the tools with which they labored, and most importantly – the clothes they wore. New York’s textile industry specialized in so-called “negro cloth.”... Money borrowed from New York lenders allowed planters to buy slaves, and insurance purchased from New York brokers protected planters’ investments. White New Yorkers lubricated the Southern economy and became rich in the process. Even as the number of slaves in New York shrank, New York’s links to – even dependence upon – slavery grew.” — Ira Berlin and Leslie M. Harris, eds., Slavery in New York (New York: The New Pr., 2005), 22. New York merchants also made huge profits from the sale of goods to Southerners.

25. Adapted from LPC, 94 Greenwich Street House Designation Report.

26. No. 135 Bowery site visit on November 18, 2010.

27. The following Federal style houses are designated New York City Landmarks: Edward Mooney House (1785-89), 18 Bowery; James Watson House (1793, attrib. to John McComb, Jr.; 1806), 7 State Street; nine houses at 25-41 Harrison Street (1796-1828; two designed by John McComb, Jr.); 94 Greenwich Street House (c. 1799-1800); Nicholas and Elizabeth Stuyvesant Fish House (1803-04), 21 Stuyvesant Street; Gideon Tucker House (1808-09), 2 White Street; Robert and Anne Dickey House (1809-10), 67 Greenwich Street; Stephen van Rensselaer House (c. 1816), 149 Mulberry Street; James Brown House (c. 1817), 326 Spring Street; 480 Greenwich Street and 502-508 Canal Street Houses (1818-41); 83 and 85 Sullivan Street Houses (1819; third stories added 1860 and 1874); 486 and 488 Greenwich Street Houses (c. 1823); William and Rosamond Clark House (1824-25; two stories added in the 19th century), 51 Market Street; 265 Henry Street House (1827; third story added 1895); 145 and 147 Eighth Avenue Houses (c. 1827 and c. 1828); 511 and 513 Grand Street Houses (c. 1827-28); 127, 129, and 131 MacDougal Street Houses (c. 1828-29); Isaac Ludlam House (c. 1829), 281 East Broadway; 143 Allen Street House (c. 1830-31); Hamilton-Holly and Daniel Leroy Houses (1831), 4 and 20 St. Mark’s Place; Seabury Treadwell House (1831-32), 29 East 4th Street; 116 Sullivan Street House (1832; third story added 1872); 190 and 192 Grand Street Houses (c. 1833); 131 Charles Street House (1834); and 203 Prince Street House (1834; third story added 1888).


32. New York City Directories (1857-1933); New York State Business Directory and Gazetteer (1870), 204, 208, 227; NY County; Manhattan Address Directories (1929-93); NYC, Dept. of Buildings (Alts. 1745-1903, 2291-1907, 484-1920, and 184-1944); “Recorded Leases,” NYT, Nov. 7, 1903, 14; “B. Gutter,” World Almanac & Book of Facts (1906), 606; B. Gutter obit., NYT, June 26, 1908; “Stole Gems Here,”
Later tenants included: Max Meyer & Samuel Mendelsohn, tobacco/cigar shop (1877-78); barber Valentine Lemille (1879-88); Ridle & Bros. (Hugo and Samuel), upholstery trimmings (1894-95); B. Gutter & Son, pawnbrokers (1901-17), established 1879 and operated by Bernhard Gutter (died 1908), then by Esther, Selig, Luther, and Louis Gutter; Heinke Mfg. Co. (1912-14), a paint firm (Robert Henke, Jr., president) that produced Henke Marine Bronze boat paints; Gliedman’s, Inc. (Barnet Gliedman), store fixtures (1919-25); L. Unterman & Son (Louis and Benjamin), picture frames, paintings, etchings, and mirrors (c. 1925-39); Prusansky Bros., signs (c. 1929-39); and Alpine Store Equipment Co., store and hotel equipment (c. 1941-49).

Commercial tenants included Regan Purchase & Sales (c. 1954); C.S. Schwartz, auctioneer (c. 1954); Advance Store Fixture Co./Charlson Fixture Co. (c. 1959); Goldy Electric Co. (c. 1959); and International Fluorescent Co. (c. 1965-80).

These included artist Ray Donarski (c. 1962-69), and his wife, Mary Lou Storm; sculptor Tom Doyle (1963-1970), with his wife, Jane; and sculptor Alan Finkel (c. 1970-75).
On the basis of a careful consideration of the history, the architecture, and other features of this building, the Landmarks Preservation Commission finds that the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House has a special character and a special historical and aesthetic interest and value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of New York City.

The Commission further finds that, among its important qualities, the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House, a Federal style rowhouse at No. 135 Bowery in Lower Manhattan, was built c. 1817 and, for 150 years, the property was associated with the intertwined, wealthy and prominent Hardenbrook and Somarindyck families, serving as the family residence of John A. Hardenbrook, his wife nee Maria Aymar, and later of their daughter, Rebecca Hardenbrook Somarindyck, until 1841, and it remained in the Somarindyck family until 1944; that Hardenbrook was a broker who was one of the 24 men who signed the Buttonwood Agreement in 1792 that established the New York Stock and Exchange Board (predecessor to the New York Stock Exchange), became an import merchant, and then a soap and candle manufacturer, with his business next door at No. 133 Bowery, when the lower Bowery was a fashionable address for New York’s social elite and wealthy merchant class; that for over six decades, from 1841 to 1907, No. 135 Bowery was the location of the nationally significant business of the Wilson family, saddlers, harness- and trunkmakers, and purveyors of firemen’s equipment, and was for many years the family residence as well; that the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House is among the oldest of the relatively rare extant and substantially intact Manhattan houses of the Federal period and style (many such houses were raised with additional stories in the later 19th century), and is significant as a rare surviving house from the period of the lower Bowery’s history as an elite neighborhood in the post-Revolutionary War era, the other being the Edward Mooney House (c. 1785-89) at No. 18; and that, despite alterations, it is notable as a grand early Federal style rowhouse due, particularly, to its original form and materials, with its three-and-a-half-story height and 22-foot width, high peaked roof with two pedimented dormers and end chimney, and front facade with Flemish bond brickwork (now painted).

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 74, Section 3020 of the Charter of the City of New York and Chapter 3 of Title 25 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission designates as a Landmark the Hardenbrook-Somarindyck House, 135 Bowery, Borough of Manhattan, and designates Manhattan Tax Map Block 423, Lot 4, as its Landmark Site.

Robert B. Tierney, Chair
Frederick Bland, Michael Devonshire, Michael Goldblum,
Christopher Moore, Roberta Washington, Commissioners
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