

THE WARREN HOUSE

BOSTON LANDMARKS COMMISSION

STUDY REPORT



Petition # 254.16
Boston Landmarks Commission
Environment Department
City of Boston

Report on the Potential Designation of

The Warren House
130 Warren Street, Roxbury (Boston), Massachusetts

As a Landmark under Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended

Approved by:

Rosanne Foley, Executive Director

Date

Approved by:

Lynn Smiledge, Chair

Date

Draft report posted on September 7, 2021

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	i
1.0 LOCATION	1
1.1 Address	1
1.2 Assessor's Parcel Number	1
1.3 Area in which Property is Located	1
1.4 Map Showing Location	1
2.0 DESCRIPTION	2
2.1 Type and Use	2
2.2 Physical Description of the Resource	2
3.0 SIGNIFICANCE	20
3.1 Historic Significance	20
3.2 Architectural (or Other) Significance	23
3.3 Archaeological Sensitivity	23
3.4 Relationship to Criteria for Designation	24
4.0 ECONOMIC STATUS	25
4.1 Current Assessed Value	25
4.2 Current Ownership	25
5.0 PLANNING CONTEXT	26
5.1 Background	26
5.2 Zoning	26
5.3 Planning Issues	26
6.0 ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES	27
6.1 Alternatives available to the Boston Landmarks Commission	27
6.2 Impact of alternatives	27
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	29
8.0 STANDARDS AND CRITERIA, WITH LIST OF CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES	30
8.1 Introduction	30
8.2 Levels of Review	30
8.3 Standards and Criteria	32
8.4 List of Character-defining Features	44
9.0 ARCHAEOLOGY	46
10.0 SEVERABILITY	47
11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY	48

INTRODUCTION

The designation of the Warren House was initiated in 2016 after a petition was submitted by registered voters to the Boston Landmarks Commission asking that the Commission designate the property under the provisions of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended. The purpose of such a designation is to recognize and protect a physical feature or improvement which in whole or part has historical, cultural, social, architectural, or aesthetic significance.

Summary

The Warren House is historically and architecturally unique in the United States as the only habitable memorial structure designed by descendants of a nationally important historical figure, Dr. Joseph Warren. Warren is an often-overlooked Revolutionary War hero. He played a significant role in the lead-up to the war, but was killed at the Battle of Bunker Hill in 1775. Today, counties in 14 states bear the name of Joseph Warren, as do four towns in New England. Constructed entirely from Roxbury puddingstone, a type of stone unique to Eastern Massachusetts, the building is one of the few puddingstone cottages in the City of Boston. It is a contemporary of the frame Gothic cottages still extant along Montrose Street in the Moreland Street Historic District of Roxbury.

Development pressures throughout Boston, including Roxbury, put this site under threat. Proposed development of a vacant lot (124 - 126 Warren Street) to the north of the Warren House has raised concerns among preservationists in the neighborhood.

This study report contains Standards and Criteria which have been prepared to guide future physical changes to the property in order to protect its integrity and character.

Boston Landmarks Commission

Lynn Smiledge, Chair
John Amodeo
David Berarducci
Joseph Castro
John Freeman
Susan Goganian
Jeffrey Gonyeau
Christopher Hart
Richard Henderson
Kirsten Hoffman
Thomas Hotaling
Felicia Jacques
Lindsey Mac-Jones
Justine Orlando
Diana Parcon
Anne Renehan
Brad Walker

Staff

Rosanne Foley, Executive Director
Kathleen von Jena, Assistant Survey Director
Yolanda Romero, Staff Architect
Joe Bagley, City Archaeologist
Jennifer Gaugler, Architectural Historian

Consultant for preparation of initial report

Laura Sitterley

1.0 LOCATION

1.1 Address

According to the City of Boston's Assessing Department, the Warren House is located at 130 Warren Street in Roxbury, 02119.

1.2 Assessor's Parcel Number

The Assessor's Parcel Number is 1200111000.

1.3 Area in which Property is Located

The Warren House is located on the east side of Warren Street. The street was named for Joseph Warren in 1825. Warren Street is a busy two-lane street, with a median divider, that runs north/south through the Roxbury neighborhood of Boston. The house is located in the middle of a block. The nearest cross streets are Winthrop Street (to the north) and Moreland Street (to the south). The property is setback from Warren Street with a vacant lot on the north side and three three-story red brick row houses (132 – 136 Warren) on the south side. The vacant lot (formerly 124 – 126 Warren Street) was once home to a nineteenth-century Second Empire duplex, which fell victim to suspected arson in 2014 and was subsequently torn down. The three row house buildings to the south of 130 Warren were constructed in 1869 in the Italianate/Second Empire style popular at the time. 132 and 134 are now multi-family residential dwellings. 136 is a mixed-use building that is both commercial and residential. A black-topped private driveway to access parking behind the row houses runs between 130 and 132 Warren Street. The Warren House is located within the Moreland Street Historic District, which was listed on the National Register in 1984.

1.4 Map Showing Location




Figure 1. Map showing the boundaries of parcel # 1200111000.

2.0 DESCRIPTION

2.1 Type and Use

The Gothic Revival building was constructed in 1846 to serve as a habitable memorial structure honoring Dr. Joseph Warren, an American physician and Revolutionary War soldier who died at the Battle of Bunker Hill. The building has been used as a residence, a commercial office space, and has most recently housed the offices of several nonprofit organizations.

The Warren House is located in the Roxbury Neighborhood Zoning District and a Multifamily Residential/Local Services SubDistrict. The property is also located within three zoning overlays: Neighborhood Design Review; Boulevard Planning District; Neighborhood Design Overlay District.

2.2 Physical Description of the Resource

This Gothic Revival building is comprised of a 2.5-story cross-gabled main block, a 2-story end-gabled rear wing at the east elevation, and a 1-story end-gabled addition at the easternmost wall of the rear wing. The main block and rear wing are constructed of local Roxbury Puddingstone laid in random ashlar with sandstone trim (Figure 2). The main block has deeply overhanging eaves. The Warren Street or front façade (west elevation) of the main block boasts a steeply pitched, centered cross gable. A diamond-shaped window with narrow muntins and a sandstone surround is centered within the cross gable and admits light into the interior. A flat-roofed, wooden entrance portico is supported by four hexagonal columns with sawn scroll brackets at the cornice (Figure 3). The floor of the porch is multi-colored slate. The six-panel wood entrance door has small lights at the two uppermost panels. It features a deep three-light transom and sidelights; the sidelight openings have been covered with plywood. The door fronts onto a stone step. Edge conditions at the main block and rear wing consist of puddingstone quoins at all corners and the edges of the projecting center bay below the center gable at the front facade (Figure 6); an ashlar puddingstone water table at the main block; and sandstone sills and lintels at the windows.

The front (west) façade is three bays wide with symmetrically placed openings. Deeply recessed, double-hung, 8-over-8 windows occupy the outer bays at both stories. The first story windows have jack arch lintels of painted sandstone and storm windows. Jack arch lintels visible above the water table at the outer bays mark basement windows that have been filled in with stone blocks. A narrow, two-leaf, paneled wood door with tall glass insets is centered at the second story over the portico. The exterior door panels protect paired inner windows with divided lights. The opening has an unpainted stone jack lintel. Earlier photographs of the Warren Street façade show that this opening was a door to a walk-out porch (Historic Image 8). The second-floor porch was surrounded by a wooden railing, which is no longer extant.

Between the first and second floor windows, set into the puddingstone, are two stone plaques with incised lettering (Figures 4 and 5). The plaque to the left of the entry reads:

“ON THIS SPOT STOOD A HOUSE ERECTED IN
1729 BY JOSEPH WARREN OF BOSTON,
REMARKABLE FOR BEING THE BIRTHPLACE
OF GENERAL JOSEPH WARREN,
HIS GRANDSON, WHO WAS KILLED ON

BUNKER HILL, JUNE 17, 1775.”

The plaque to the right of the entry reads:

“JOHN WARREN, A DISTINGUISHED PHYSICIAN
AND ANATOMIST, WAS ALSO BORN HERE.
THE ORIGINAL MANSION BEING IN RUINS, THIS
HOUSE WAS BUILT BY JOHN C. WARREN, M.D.
IN 1846, SON OF THE LAST NAMED, AS A
PERMANENT MEMORIAL OF THE SPOT.”

The north elevation of the main block has a single, centered, vertically aligned window at each story (Figure 7). The first and second floors have double-hung, 8-over-8 windows with sandstone sills and jack arch lintels. The smaller attic window is 8-over-8 with a triangular transom and a pointed-arch stone hood.

The south elevation of the main block is two bays wide with deeply recessed, vertically aligned windows with sandstone sills and jack arch lintels (Figure 8). The second-story windows are 8-over-8. The first-story windows are tall and nearly touch grade; they have 8-over-12 sash above wood panels that occupy the lower fourth of the openings. The attic window matches the window at the north elevation. A metal fire escape installed at this elevation extends from grade to the attic window.

The rear (east) elevation of the main block has a cross-gable that matches the one at the façade (west elevation); it has no openings. The exterior face of the east side of the main block (outside of where the main block connects to the rear wing) has no windows.

The main block has a slate roof. Two asymmetrically-placed, corbelled brick chimneys rise from the roof ridge that runs north-south; the southernmost chimney is oriented with its broad face to the street and the northernmost chimney with its narrow face to the street. The roof soffits are vinyl.

The two-story, three- by two-bay rear wing defines the back of the building (Figure 8). The windows at the side elevations are 6-over-6 with sandstone sills and jack arch lintels. Two small attic windows touch the eaves at the east elevation. The rear wing has a slate roof. A tall brick chimney with decorative brick banding rises from the roof ridge.

There is a one-story, gabled addition at the rear (east) elevation of the rear wing. It is three bays deep and contains a door and two windows on the south elevation. The addition is clad in aluminum siding and has an asphalt shingle roof with vinyl soffits. The date of this addition is not yet known definitively, but a Sanborn map from 1868 shows a one-story appendage in the same location.

The building's exterior still closely resembles a period engraving and a photograph from the nineteenth century (Historic Images 5 and 6), with the exception of a porch that was removed from the south side of the house sometime after 1876 (see Historic Images 6 and 7). Any nineteenth-century interior ornament has been lost.

The Warren House has a substantial setback from the street and a large front lawn (Figure 10). The grounds in front of the house are bisected by a paved path that extends from the building's entry porch to meet a set of five steps leading down to the sidewalk. These steps are set into a low puddingstone wall with granite posts. There are some low-lying evergreen bushes that line either side of the path from the sidewalk to the front entrance of the building. A mature rhododendron bush nearly covers a bottom floor window to the right of the entrance portico. Several tall trees line the south edge of the front lawn. The ground to the south and east of the house is paved. A black-topped private driveway runs along the south edge of the property.

2.3 Contemporary Images

All photographs were taken on May 25, 2021.



Figure 2: Entrance
Front facade (west elevation)



Figure 3: Wooden entrance porch
Front facade (west elevation)




Figure 4: Granite memorial plaque (one of two)
Front facade (west elevation)




Figure 5: Granite memorial plaque (two of two)
Front facade (west elevation)



Figure 6: Quoins detail
Corner between the west- and north-facing facades



Figure 7: North elevation



Figure 8: South elevation



Figure 9: Rear of building (southeast corner)



Figure 10: Front lawn and puddingstone wall (looking east)

2.4 Historic Maps and Images




Historic Image 1

This map dates from 1868 and shows the Warren House before other structures abutted it on Warren Street.

From *Insurance Map of Charlestown, 1868*

Published by D.A. Sanborn, New York

Leventhal Map & Education Center at the Boston Public Library



Historic Image 2

The above map dates from five years after (1873) Historic Image 1, and illustrates the rapid construction on the block where the Warren House stands, as well as a general building boom in the surrounding Roxbury neighborhood. The triangular piece of land that would become Warren Square is clearly visible at the intersection of five streets (clockwise from the top--Warren, Moreland, Recent, St. James, and Cliff). In 1904, a statue of Dr. Warren would be constructed on this site.

From *Atlas of the County of Suffolk, Massachusetts in 1873*

Published by G.M. Hopkins & Co., Philadelphia

Leventhal Map & Education Center at the Boston Public Library



Historic Image 3

A statue of Dr. Joseph Warren dedicated in 1904. It was sculpted and cast by American sculptor, Paul Wayland Bartlett. The triangular island (Warren Square) was eliminated and the sculpture and pedestal removed during the widening of Warren Street in the 1960s. Today the statue (without its pedestal) stands on the property of Roxbury Latin School, a private boys school, in West Roxbury. The sculpture is not accessible to the general public.

General Joseph Warren Statue, Warren Square, Roxbury (June 1920)

From the Nathaniel L. Stebbins Photographic Collection, Historic New England



Historic Image 4

Corner of Dudley and Warren Streets (Dudley Square) in 1856, as Irish and other immigrants were first moving into this emerging streetcar suburb.

Boston Pictorial Archive, Boston Public Library.



Historic Image 5

Birthplace of General Warren, Roxbury

Engraved print by Nathaniel Currier (1840), Boston Pictorial Archive, Boston Public Library



Historic Image 6

The Warren House (unknown date)

Image from The Town of Roxbury: its memorable persons and places, its history and antiquities, with numerous illustrations of its old landmarks and noted personages by Francis S. Drake, 1878



Historic Image 7

Warren House on July 4, 1876

The bunting on the roof of the portico surrounds a placard with an image of Joseph Warren in the center. Above the picture are the words: "Birth Place of Warren." And below: "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori." (It is sweet and noble to die for one's country.)

James Wallace Black, Photographer, Boston Pictorial Archive, Boston Public Library



Historic Image 8
Warren House (1940)

Leon H. Abdalian, Photographer, Leon Abdalian Collection, Boston Public Library

3.0 SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Historic Significance

History of Roxbury

The historical significance of the area that is now called Roxbury began with the important role of this place for the Native people who settled in the region. Boston, including Roxbury, is the traditional homeland of the Massachusett people, who are still here. Native people have been in the area for at least 12,500 years. Roxbury was a cultural and transportation hub, in much the same way nearby Nubian Square functions today.¹

Founded by English colonists of the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1630, Roxbury was originally a sprawling town that included the present-day neighborhoods of Jamaica Plain, Roslindale, and West Roxbury. Situated at the entrance to the narrow neck of the Shawmut Peninsula, Roxbury occupied the only land route into Boston for nearly two hundred years. Roxbury was prized as a source for timber, arable soil, fresh water (the Stony Brook), and plenty of stone for building. A particular type of local stone — later dubbed Roxbury puddingstone — exists only in the Boston basin.

Roxbury was largely a quiet farming village until the advent of the Revolutionary War. In 1775, the colonists built two major fortifications here known as Lower Fort and High (or Upper) Fort. The two forts commanded strategic views of and access to both the Neck and the road between Boston and Dedham, where the rebels kept a depot of army supplies.² The forts would prove invaluable during the Siege of Boston, the eleven-month period from April 19, 1775 to March 17, 1776 when American militiamen effectively contained British troops within Boston.

At the beginning of the 1800s, Roxbury was home almost exclusively to upper and middle class Yankees. But the 1800s were a time of great change. The original English settlers were replaced by successive waves of Irish, German, and Jewish immigrants. Single-family homes, row houses, and multi-family homes replaced the old farms and estates as the population of Roxbury continued to expand. Roxbury became a city in 1848 and was annexed to Boston in 1868.

In the 20th century, Roxbury was dramatically transformed by industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. The Great Migration of nearly six million African Americans from the rural south to the urban north reshaped the neighborhood yet again. Around World War II, African Americans established a vibrant working class community in Roxbury. By the 1960s, Roxbury was a majority Black neighborhood and became a center of grassroots activism and community organization to achieve justice, equality, and power.³

History of the Warren House

The Warren House is historically significant at the local, state, and national levels for its association with Dr. Joseph Warren, the first high-ranking American officer killed during the Revolutionary War.

¹ Information provided by Joseph Bagley, Boston City Archaeologist.

² Roxbury Historical Society, *About Roxbury*, accessed August 19, 2021.
<http://roxburyhistoricalsociety.org>.

³ Roxbury Historical Society.

Several other members of the Warren family — who were either born and/or lived at this site — made unprecedented contributions to the field of medicine.

The original Warren House, a three-story wooden farmhouse (Historic Image 5), was built on the site of the present-day Warren House in 1720. It was built by the first Joseph Warren, who was Dr. Joseph Warren's grandfather. The homestead included two barns (one a cider millhouse), several large outhouses, and a seven-acre orchard. The family orchard is said to have originated an apple cultivar known as the Roxbury (or Boston) Russeting. The yellow-green tart little apple was particularly suited for hard cider, a favorite beverage of the colonists.⁴

Dr. Joseph Warren was born on this site on June 11, 1741 to Joseph and Mary Stevens Warren. The farm was prosperous throughout Warren's childhood. The elder Joseph Warren was killed by a fall from one of his apple trees in 1755 when his son was only 14 years old.⁵

Dr. Joseph Warren attended Harvard College before launching a medical practice in 1763. At the time, Warren was the youngest doctor in Boston and frequently administered to the poor. He entered the political scene at the outset of resistance to British imperial policies in the mid-1760s. In 1772 to commemorate the second anniversary of the Boston Massacre, Warren delivered a speech at Old South Meeting House wearing a toga.⁶

Samuel Adams was one of the foremost figures to foment rebellion against Britain. He was also a patient of Dr. Warren's. Aware that the colonies had to act in union if the resistance movement were to make forward strides, Warren and Adams formed the Boston Committee of Correspondence. The Committee of Correspondence was intended to open lines of communication among patriot leaders throughout the Thirteen Colonies.

Warren was involved in almost every insurrectionary act in Boston leading up to the Revolution.⁷ He is commonly believed to be one of the main organizers of the Boston Tea Party (December 1773) and was the author (usually using a pseudonym) of countless incendiary newspaper articles critical of the British "occupiers."

In response to the Intolerable Acts, Warren helped draft a series of protest documents, which came to be known as the Suffolk Resolves. Historians believe the Suffolk Resolves to be Warren's most important piece of writing.⁸ The insurrectionary document instructed colonists to reject the acts of Parliament and to prepare to defend themselves against the violent onslaught that Britain would likely unleash because of their disobedience. Taken to Philadelphia by John Hancock, the

⁴ Francis Samuel Drake, *The Town of Roxbury: Its Memorable Persons and Places, Its History and Antiquities, with Numerous Illustrations of Its Old Landmarks and Noted Personages*, Boston, 1878.

⁵ Samuel A. Forman, *Dr. Joseph Warren: The Boston Tea Party, Bunker Hill, and the Birth of American Liberty* (Gretna, Louisiana: Pelican Publishing Company, Inc., 2012).

⁶ New England Historical Society, "Joseph Warren, The Patriot Who Might Have Made Us Forget George Washington," accessed September 7, 2021.

<https://www.newenglandhistoricalsociety.com/joseph-warren-patriot-made-forget-george-washington/>

⁷ Christian Di Spigna, *Founding Martyr: The Life and Death of Dr. Joseph Warren, the American Revolutions Lost Hero* (New York: Crown, 2018).

⁸ Forman, *Dr. Joseph Warren*.

Continental Congress endorsed the Suffolk Resolves in 1774. The Suffolk Resolves are thought to have influenced the Declaration of Independence.

Warren was one of the key figures of the Battles of Lexington and Concord.⁹ By this point, he had become President of the Massachusetts Provincial Government. It was Warren who on the night of April 18, 1775—anticipating that the British were marching on Concord to seize stores of Patriot munitions—sent Paul Revere on his famous Midnight Ride. The next day Warren would actively participate in skirmishes against Royal Soldiers as they retreated from Lexington and Concord. He also treated wounded Patriot militiamen along the Battle Road.

At dawn on June 17, the first pitched battle in the war for American independence began on Breed's Hill in Charlestown. The British, from superior positions on Copp's Hill in the North End and from warships in Boston Harbor, launched a steady stream of cannon fire toward the rebel lines. Colonial troops controlled the Charlestown peninsula, but were outnumbered and short of ammunition.¹⁰

Friends and colleagues of Dr. Warren, understanding his importance to the patriot cause, tried without success to dissuade him from joining the battle. We do not know the specifics of Warren's death that day. We do know he was fatally shot through the head and was buried in a common grave on the battle site.¹¹ His body was later exhumed and today lies in the Forest Hills Cemetery in Jamaica Plain. After Warren's death, Benedict Arnold petitioned Congress for a pension to support the doctor's four orphaned children (their mother, Elizabeth Hooten Warren, had died in 1773).

Joseph Warren's younger brother, Dr. John Warren, was also born at 130 Warren Street. He served as a surgeon during the American Revolution and later founded the Harvard Medical School.

Dr. John Warren's son, Dr. John C. Warren, had the memorial cottage at 130 Warren Street built to honor the birthplace of his uncle and father. John C. Warren founded Harvard's Anatomical Theater as well as its Anatomical Museum, to which he bequeathed his own skeleton. He established the New England Journal of Medicine and was a co-founder of the Massachusetts General Hospital. In 1846, Warren performed the first surgery where ether was used as an anesthetic in the Ether Dome of the Bulfinch Building at Mass General Hospital, now a national historic landmark.¹²

Before Warren Street was widened, a statue of Dr. Joseph Warren stood across the street in what was then Warren Square (Historic Image 3). The statue was removed and the layout of the square subsumed by the current street pattern sometime during the 1960s. The statue is currently housed at the Roxbury Latin School in West Roxbury. As Roxbury Latin is a private boys school, the statue is no longer accessible to the public.¹³

⁹ DiSpigna, *Founding Martyr*.

¹⁰ Nathaniel Philbrick, *Bunker Hill: A City, A Siege, A Revolution* (New York: Penguin Publishing Group, 2013).

¹¹ DiSpigna, *Founding Martyr*.

¹² Boston Landmarks Commission, Landmark Petition Form Number 254.16, 2016.

¹³ Boston Globe Editorial, "Honoring a Founding Father," *The Boston Globe*, February 21, 2011.

3.2 Architectural (or Other) Significance

The Warren House is historically and architecturally unique in the United States as the only habitable memorial structure designed by descendants of a nationally important historical figure, Dr. Joseph Warren.

Constructed entirely from Roxbury puddingstone, a type of stone unique to Eastern Massachusetts, the building is one of the few puddingstone cottages in the City of Boston. It is a contemporary of the frame Gothic cottages still extant along Montrose Street in the Moreland Street Historic District of Roxbury.

The Moreland Street Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984. The district encompasses more than 63 acres of predominantly urban streetscape.¹⁴ Development of the neighborhood began in earnest in 1840 and coincided with John C. Warren's decision to sell the family's multi-acre estate. The Warren Farm had remained in the family and intact since 1687, but in 1833, John C. Warren sold the property at auction. He maintained ownership of the site where the Warren farmhouse once stood, and where the Warren House stands today.

The Gothic cottage architecture of Warren House — constructed in puddingstone — can be found mirrored throughout the Moreland Street Historic District, but in wood. The largest, earliest, and most rare concentration of Gothic Revival cottages in the Boston area can be found on Montrose Street, less than 0.25 mile from Warren House. Numbers 6, 8, 10, 7-9, 11, and 15 Montrose Street, plus 27 Whiting Street (which backs up to 10 Montrose) were all built between 1845 and 1847.

The architect of the Warren House remains unknown. There is evidence that most of the early houses in the Moreland Street Historic District were built by housewrights without the benefit of architectural drawings. Many popular builders' companion and pattern books were widely available at the time. Andrew Jackson Downing's well-circulated *Rural Cottages of 1842*, for example, likely inspired the prevalence of Gothic Revival cottages in the area.

An important feature of the property is the building's handsome setback from the street. This is unique for the block. A lawn extends from the building's entry porch to a low puddingstone wall with granite posts. The slight elevation and setback add an air of importance to the structure.

3.3 Archaeological Sensitivity

Roxbury is archaeologically sensitive for ancient Native American and historical archaeological sites. The proximity of the neighborhood to natural resources including river, marine, and upland areas make it suitable for Massachusetts Native habitation and use and there are multiple intact ancient Native sites already documented in Roxbury. Open spaces that have not been developed, including yards and parks, may contain significant ancient Native archaeological sites. Historically, Roxbury was a significant part of Boston's 17th-19th century history, and contains intact archaeological sites related to Boston's colonial, Revolutionary, and early Republic history, especially yard spaces where features including cisterns and privies may remain intact and significant archaeological deposits.

¹⁴ *Moreland Street Historic District, Boston, Massachusetts, National Register of Historic Places nomination*, prepared by Candace Jenkins and Leslie Larson, 1984.

Unsurveyed areas within Roxbury's industrial core along the Stony Brook may contain significant industrial sites. These potential historical sites may represent the histories of Roxbury home-life, artisans, industries, enslaved people, immigrants, and Native peoples spanning multiple centuries.

3.4 Relationship to Criteria for Designation

The Warren House meets the following criteria for designation as a Boston Landmark as established in Section 4 of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended:

C. Structures, sites, objects, man-made or natural, associated significantly with the lives of outstanding historical personages.

D. Structures, sites, objects, man-made or natural, representative of elements of architectural or landscape design or craftsmanship which embody distinctive characteristics of a type inherently valuable for study of a period, style or method of construction or development, or a notable work of an architect, landscape architect, designer, or builder whose work influenced the development of the city, the commonwealth, the New England region, or the nation.

4.0 ECONOMIC STATUS

4.1 Current Assessed Value

According to the City of Boston's Assessor's Records, the property at 130 Warren Street (parcel 1200111000) where the Warren House in Roxbury is located has a total assessed value of \$553,900.00, with the land valued at \$228,800.00 and the building valued at \$325,100.00.

4.2 Current Ownership

The Warren House is owned by Peter H. Creighton. Mr. Creighton's mailing address is c/o 130 Warren Realty Trust, P.O. Box 170499, Boston, MA 02117.

5.0 PLANNING CONTEXT

5.1 Background

Since its construction in 1846, the Warren House has served many purposes. Unlike other buildings constructed for famous historical figures, the Warren House was never intended to serve as a museum or shrine, but rather a habitable memorial structure honoring Dr. Joseph Warren. Through the years, the building has served as a commercial office space, a residence, a boarding house, and a mixed-use (commercial/residential) dwelling. Most recently, the building has served as home to several non-profit organizations including the Boston Urban Youth Foundation.

5.2 Zoning

The Warren House is located in the Roxbury Neighborhood Zoning District and the MFR/LS SubDistrict. The property's SubDistrict Type is Multifamily Residential/Local Services. The property is also located within three zoning overlays: Neighborhood Design Review; Boulevard Planning District; Neighborhood Design Overlay District.

5.3 Planning Issues

According to the Massachusetts Property Classification System Occupancy Codes, the Warren House is currently classified as a one- to two-story office building. The building is divided into three commercial units.

In 2014, a fire (suspected to be arson) demolished the building next door, a Second Empire duplex. Fortunately, the Warren House survived the fire with relatively minor damage, including damage to the slate roof, some melted vinyl under the eaves, and the shattering of a few windows.¹⁵

In recent years, the building has at times stood vacant and unused. Development pressures throughout Boston, including Roxbury, put this site under threat. Proposed development of a vacant lot (124 - 126 Warren Street) to the north of the Warren House has raised concerns among preservationists in the neighborhood.

On March 28, 2016, a petition was submitted to Landmark the exterior of the Warren House. At the public hearing on April 26, 2016, the Boston Landmarks Commission voted to accept the petition for further study.

¹⁵ Yawu Miller, "Roxbury history preserved in Warren Street house," *Bay State Banner*, March 19, 2014, <https://www.baystatebanner.com/2014/03/19/roxbury-history-preserved-in-warren-street-house/>.

6.0 ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

6.1 Alternatives available to the Boston Landmarks Commission

A. Designation

The Commission retains the option of designating 130 Warren Street in Roxbury as a Landmark. Designation shall correspond to the Assessor's Parcel Number and shall address the following exterior elements hereinafter referred to as the "Specified Exterior Features":

- The exterior envelope of the building.
- Certain landscape elements including the building's setback from the street and the low puddingstone wall with granite posts.

B. Denial of Designation

The Commission retains the option of not designating any or all of the Specified Exterior Features.

C. National Register Listing

The Commission could recommend that the property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places, if it is not already.

D. Preservation Plan

The Commission could recommend development and implementation of a preservation plan for the property.

E. Site Interpretation

The Commission could recommend that the owner develop and install historical interpretive materials at the site.

6.2 Impact of alternatives

A. Designation

Designation under Chapter 772 would require review of physical changes to 130 Warren Street in Roxbury in accordance with the Standards and Criteria adopted as part of the designation.

B. Denial of Designation

Without designation, the City would be unable to offer protection to the Specified Exterior Features, or extend guidance to the owners under chapter 772.

C. National Register Listing

130 Warren Street in Roxbury could be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register provides an honorary designation and limited protection from federal, federally-funded or federally assisted activities. It creates incentives for preservation, notably the federal investment tax credits and grants through the Massachusetts 19 Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) from the Massachusetts Historical Commission. National Register listing provides listing on the State Register affording parallel

protection for projects with state involvement and also the availability of state tax credits. National Register listing does not provide any design review for changes undertaken by private owners at their own expense.

D. Preservation Plan

A preservation plan allows an owner to work with interested parties to investigate various adaptive use scenarios, analyze investment costs and rates of return, and provide recommendations for subsequent development. It does not carry regulatory oversight.

E. Site Interpretation

A comprehensive interpretation of the history and significance of 130 Warren Street could be introduced at the site.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission makes the following recommendations:

1. That 130 Warren Street in Roxbury be designated by the Boston Landmarks Commission as a Landmark, under Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended (see Section 3.4 of this report for Relationship to Criteria for Designation);
2. That the boundaries corresponding to Assessor's parcel 1200111000 be adopted without modification;
3. And that the Standards and Criteria recommended by the staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission be accepted.

8.0 STANDARDS AND CRITERIA, WITH LIST OF CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

8.1 Introduction

Per sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the enabling statute (Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as amended) Standards and Criteria must be adopted for each Designation which shall be applied by the Commission in evaluating proposed changes to the historic resource. The Standards and Criteria both identify and establish guidelines for those features which must be preserved and/or enhanced to maintain the viability of the Designation. The Standards and Criteria are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.¹⁶ Before a Certificate of Design Approval or Certificate of Exemption can be issued for such changes, the changes must be reviewed by the Commission with regard to their conformance to the purpose of the statute.

The intent of these guidelines is to help local officials, designers and individual property owners to identify the characteristics that have led to designation, and thus to identify the limitation to the changes that can be made to them. It should be emphasized that conformance to the Standards and Criteria alone does not necessarily ensure approval, nor are they absolute, but any request for variance from them must demonstrate the reason for, and advantages gained by, such variance. The Commission's Certificate of Design Approval is only granted after careful review of each application and public hearing, in accordance with the statute.

Proposed alterations related to zoning, building code, accessibility, safety, or other regulatory requirements do not supersede the Standards and Criteria or take precedence over Commission decisions.

In these standards and criteria, the verb **Should** indicates a recommended course of action; the verb **Shall** indicates those actions which are specifically required.

8.2 Levels of Review

The Commission has no desire to interfere with the normal maintenance procedures for the property. In order to provide some guidance for property owners, managers or developers, and the Commission, the activities which might be construed as causing an alteration to the physical character of the exterior have been categorized to indicate the level of review required, based on the potential impact of the proposed work. Note: the examples for each category are not intended to act as a comprehensive list; see Section 8.2.D.

- A. Routine activities which are not subject to review by the Commission:
 - 1. Activities associated with normal cleaning and routine maintenance.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, et al. *THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITH GUIDELINES FOR PRESERVING, REHABILITATING, RESTORING & RECONSTRUCTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS*, Secretary of the Interior, 2017, www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf.

- a. For building maintenance, such activities might include the following: normal cleaning (no power washing above 700 PSI, no chemical or abrasive cleaning), non-invasive inspections, in-kind repair of caulking, in-kind repainting, staining or refinishing of wood or metal elements, lighting bulb replacements or in-kind glass repair/replacement, etc.
 - b. For landscape maintenance, such activities might include the following: normal cleaning of paths and sidewalks, etc. (no power washing above 700 PSI, no chemical or abrasive cleaning), non-invasive inspections, in-kind repair of caulking, in-kind spot replacement of cracked or broken paving materials, in-kind repainting or refinishing of site furnishings, site lighting bulb replacements or in-kind glass repair/replacement, normal plant material maintenance, such as pruning, fertilizing, mowing and mulching, and in-kind replacement of existing plant materials, etc.
 2. Routine activities associated with special events or seasonal decorations which do not disturb the ground surface, are to remain in place for less than six weeks, and do not result in any permanent alteration or attached fixtures.
- B. Activities which may be determined by the staff to be eligible for a Certificate of Exemption or Administrative Review, requiring an application to the Commission:
1. Maintenance and repairs involving no change in design, material, color, ground surface or outward appearance.
 2. In-kind replacement or repair.
 3. Phased restoration programs will require an application to the Commission and may require full Commission review of the entire project plan and specifications; subsequent detailed review of individual construction phases may be eligible for Administrative Review by BLC staff.
 4. Repair projects of a repetitive nature will require an application to the Commission and may require full Commission review; subsequent review of these projects may be eligible for Administrative Review by BLC staff, where design, details, and specifications do not vary from those previously approved.
 5. Temporary installations or alterations that are to remain in place for longer than six weeks.
 6. Emergency repairs that require temporary tarps, board-ups, etc. may be eligible for Certificate of Exemption or Administrative Review; permanent repairs will require review as outlined in Section 8.2. In the case of emergencies, BLC staff should be notified as soon as possible to assist in evaluating the damage and to help expedite repair permits as necessary.
- C. Activities requiring an application and full Commission review:
- Reconstruction, restoration, replacement, demolition, or alteration involving change in design, material, color, location, or outward appearance, such as: New construction of any

type, removal of existing features or elements, major planting or removal of trees or shrubs, or changes in landforms.

D. Activities not explicitly listed above:

In the case of any activity not explicitly covered in these Standards and Criteria, the Landmarks staff shall determine whether an application is required and if so, whether it shall be an application for a Certificate of Design Approval or Certificate of Exemption.

E. Concurrent Jurisdiction

In some cases, issues which fall under the jurisdiction of the Landmarks Commission may also fall under the jurisdiction of other city, state and federal boards and commissions such as the Boston Art Commission, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the National Park Service and others. All efforts will be made to expedite the review process. Whenever possible and appropriate, a joint staff review or joint hearing will be arranged.

8.3 Standards and Criteria

The following Standards and Criteria are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.¹⁷ These Standards and Criteria apply to all exterior building alterations that are visible from any existing or proposed street or way that is open to public travel.

8.3.1 General Standards

1. Items under Commission review include but are not limited to the following: exterior walls (masonry, wood, and architectural metals); windows; entrances/doors; porches/stoops; lighting; storefronts; curtain walls; roofs; roof projections; additions; accessibility; site work and landscaping; demolition; and archaeology. Items not anticipated in the Standards and Criteria may be subject to review, refer to Section 8.2 and Section 9.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided. See Section 8.4, List of Character-defining Features.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved. (The term "later contributing features" will be used to convey this concept.)

¹⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, et al. *THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITH GUIDELINES FOR PRESERVING, REHABILITATING, RESTORING & RECONSTRUCTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS*, Secretary of the Interior, 2017, www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material shall match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.
8. Staff archaeologists shall review proposed changes to a property that may impact known and potential archaeological sites. Archaeological surveys may be required to determine if significant archaeological deposits are present within the area of proposed work. Significant archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be required before the proposed work can commence. See section 9.0 Archaeology.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of a property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
11. Original or later contributing signs, marquees, and canopies integral to the building ornamentation or architectural detailing shall be preserved.
12. New signs, banners, marquees, canopies, and awnings shall be compatible in size, design, material, location, and number with the character of the building, allowing for contemporary expression. New signs shall not detract from the essential form of the building nor obscure its architectural features.
13. Property owners shall take necessary precautions to prevent demolition by neglect of maintenance and repairs. Demolition of protected buildings in violation of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended, is subject to penalty as cited in Section 10 of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended.

8.3.2 Masonry at exterior walls (including but not limited to stone, brick, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar)

1. All original or later contributing masonry materials shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing masonry materials, features, details, surfaces and ornamentation shall be repaired, if necessary, by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the masonry using recognized preservation methods.

3. Deteriorated or missing masonry materials, features, details, surfaces, and ornamentation shall be replaced with materials and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail of installation.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
6. Sound original mortar shall be retained.
7. Deteriorated mortar shall be carefully removed by hand raking the joints.
8. Use of mechanical hammers shall not be allowed. Use of mechanical saws may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.
9. Repointing mortar shall duplicate the original mortar in strength, composition, color, texture, joint size, joint profile, and method of application.
10. Sample panels of raking the joints and repointing shall be reviewed and approved by the staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission.
11. Cleaning of masonry is discouraged and should only be performed when necessary to halt deterioration.
12. If the building is to be cleaned, the masonry shall be cleaned with the gentlest method possible.
13. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission to ensure that no damage has resulted. Test patches shall be carried out well in advance. Ideally, the test patch should be monitored over a sufficient period of time to allow long-range effects to be predicted (including exposure to all seasons if possible).
14. Sandblasting (wet or dry), wire brushing, or other similar abrasive cleaning methods shall not be permitted. Doing so can change the visual quality of the material and damage the surface of the masonry and mortar joints.
15. Waterproofing or water repellents are strongly discouraged. These treatments are generally not effective in preserving masonry and can cause permanent damage. The Commission does recognize that in extraordinary circumstances their use may be required to solve a specific problem. Samples of any proposed treatment shall be reviewed by the Commission before application.
16. In general, painting masonry surfaces shall not be allowed. Painting masonry surfaces will be considered only when there is documentary evidence that this treatment was used at some significant point in the history of the property.
17. New penetrations for attachments through masonry are strongly discouraged. When necessary, attachment details shall be located in mortar joints, rather than through

masonry material; stainless steel hardware is recommended to prevent rust jacking. New attachments to cast concrete are discouraged and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

18. Deteriorated stucco shall be repaired by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.
19. Deteriorated adobe shall be repaired by using mud plaster or a compatible lime-plaster adobe render, when appropriate.
20. Deteriorated concrete shall be repaired by cutting damaged concrete back to remove the source of deterioration, such as corrosion on metal reinforcement bars. The new patch shall be applied carefully so that it will bond satisfactorily with and match the historic concrete.
21. Joints in concrete shall be sealed with appropriate flexible sealants and backer rods, when necessary.

8.3.3 Wood at exterior walls

1. All original or later contributing wood materials shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing wood surfaces, features, details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing wood surfaces, features, details, and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail or installation.
4. When replacement of materials is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
6. Cleaning of wood elements shall use the gentlest method possible.
7. Paint removal should be considered only where there is paint surface deterioration or excessive layers of paint have coarsened profile details and as part of an overall maintenance program which involves repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings. Coatings such as paint help protect the wood from moisture and ultraviolet light; stripping the wood bare will expose the surface to the effects of weathering.
8. Damaged or deteriorated paint should be removed to the next sound layer using the mildest method possible.

9. Propane or butane torches, sandblasting, water blasting, or other abrasive cleaning and/or paint removal methods shall not be permitted. Doing so changes the visual quality of the wood and accelerates deterioration.
10. Repainting should be based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

8.3.4 Architectural metals at exterior walls (including but not limited to wrought and cast iron, steel, pressed metal, terneplate, copper, aluminum, and zinc)

1. All original or later contributing architectural metals shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing metal materials, features, details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, or reinforcing the metal using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing metal materials, features, details, and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail or installation.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
6. Cleaning of metal elements either to remove corrosion or deteriorated paint shall use the gentlest method possible.
7. The type of metal shall be identified prior to any cleaning procedure because each metal has its own properties and may require a different treatment.
8. Non-corrosive chemical methods shall be used to clean soft metals (such as lead, tinplate, terneplate, copper, and zinc) whose finishes can be easily damaged by abrasive methods.
9. If gentler methods have proven ineffective, then abrasive cleaning methods, such as low pressure dry grit blasting, may be allowed for hard metals (such as cast iron, wrought iron, and steel) as long as it does not abrade or damage the surface.
10. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission to ensure that no damage has resulted. Test patches shall be carried out well in advance. Ideally, the test patch should be monitored over a sufficient period of time to allow long-range effects to be predicted (including exposure to all seasons if possible).
11. Cleaning to remove corrosion and paint removal should be considered only where there is deterioration and as part of an overall maintenance program which involves repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings. Paint or other coatings help retard the

corrosion rate of the metal. Leaving the metal bare will expose the surface to accelerated corrosion.

12. Repainting should be based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

8.3.5 Windows (also refer to Masonry, Wood, and Architectural Metals)

1. The original or later contributing arrangement of window openings shall be retained.
2. Enlarging or reducing window openings for the purpose of fitting stock (larger or smaller) window sash or air conditioners shall not be allowed.
3. Removal of window sash and the installation of permanent fixed panels to accommodate air conditioners shall not be allowed.
4. Original or later contributing window elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
5. Deteriorated or missing window elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration, and detail of installation.
6. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. Replacement sash for divided-light windows should have through-glass muntins or simulated divided lights with dark anodized spacer bars the same width as the muntins.
8. Tinted or reflective-coated glass shall not be allowed.
9. Metal or vinyl panning of the wood frame and molding shall not be allowed.
10. Exterior combination storm windows shall have a narrow perimeter framing that does not obscure the glazing of the primary window. In addition, the meeting rail of the combination storm window shall align with that of the primary window.
11. Storm window sashes and frames shall have a painted finish that matches the primary window sash and frame color.
12. Clear or mill finished aluminum frames shall not be allowed.
13. Window frames, sashes, and, if appropriate, shutters, should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

8.3.6 Entrances/Doors (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Porches/Stoops)

1. All original or later contributing entrance elements shall be preserved.
2. The original or later contributing entrance design and arrangement of the door openings shall be retained.
3. Enlarging or reducing entrance/door openings for the purpose of fitting stock (larger or smaller) doors shall not be allowed.
4. Original or later contributing entrance materials, elements, details and features (functional and decorative) shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
5. Deteriorated or missing entrance elements, materials, features (function and decorative) and details shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation.
6. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
8. Original or later contributing entrance materials, elements, features (functional and decorative) and details shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
9. Storm doors (aluminum or wood-framed) shall not be allowed on the primary entrance unless evidence shows that they had been used. They may be allowed on secondary entrances. Where allowed, storm doors shall be painted to match the color of the primary door.
10. Unfinished aluminum storm doors shall not be allowed.
11. Replacement door hardware should replicate the original or be appropriate to the style and period of the building.
12. Buzzers, alarms and intercom panels, where allowed, shall be flush mounted and appropriately located.
13. Entrance elements should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building/entrance.

8.3.7 Porches/Stoops (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, Entrances/Doors, Roofs, and Accessibility)

1. All original or later contributing porch elements shall be preserved.

2. Original or later contributing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall be retained if possible and, if necessary, repaired using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute material may be considered.
6. Original or later contributing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
7. Porch and stoop elements should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building/porch and stoop.

8.3.8 Lighting

1. There are several aspects of lighting related to the exterior of the building and landscape:
 - a. Lighting fixtures as appurtenances to the building or elements of architectural ornamentation.
 - b. Quality of illumination on building exterior.
 - c. Security lighting.
2. Wherever integral to the building, original or later contributing lighting fixtures shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piercing in or reinforcing the lighting fixture using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing lighting fixtures materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration, and detail of installation.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.

6. Original or later contributing lighting fixture materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
7. Supplementary illumination may be added where appropriate to the current use of the building.
8. New lighting shall conform to any of the following approaches as appropriate to the building and to the current or projected use:
 - a. Reproductions of original or later contributing fixtures, based on physical or documentary evidence.
 - b. Accurate representation of the original period, based on physical or documentary evidence.
 - c. Retention or restoration of fixtures which date from an interim installation and which are considered to be appropriate to the building and use.
 - d. New lighting fixtures which are differentiated from the original or later contributing fixture in design and which illuminate the exterior of the building in a way which renders it visible at night and compatible with its environment.
9. The location of new exterior lighting shall fulfill the functional intent of the current use without obscuring the building form or architectural detailing.
10. No exposed conduit shall be allowed on the building.
11. Architectural night lighting is encouraged, provided the lighting installations minimize night sky light pollution. High efficiency fixtures, lamps and automatic timers are recommended.
12. On-site mock-ups of proposed architectural night lighting may be required.

8.3.9 Roofs (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Roof Projections)

1. The roof shapes and original or later contributing roof material of the existing building shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing roofing materials such as slate, wood trim, elements, features (decorative and functional), details and ornamentation, such as cresting, shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching or reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing roofing materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.

5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute material may be considered.
6. Original or later contributing roofing materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
7. Unpainted mill-finished aluminum shall not be allowed for flashing, gutters and downspouts. All replacement flashing and gutters should be copper or match the original material and design (integral gutters shall not be replaced with surface-mounted).
8. External gutters and downspouts should not be allowed unless it is based on physical or documentary evidence.

8.3.10 Roof Projections (includes satellite dishes, antennas and other communication devices, louvers, vents, chimneys, and chimney caps; also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Roofs)

1. New roof projections shall not be visible from the public way.
2. New mechanical equipment should be reviewed to confirm that it is no more visible than the existing.

8.3.11 Additions

1. Additions can significantly alter the historic appearance of the buildings. An exterior addition should only be considered after it has been determined that the existing building cannot meet the new space requirements.
2. New additions shall be designed so that the character-defining features of the building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged or destroyed.
3. New additions should be designed so that they are compatible with the existing building, although they should not necessarily be imitative of an earlier style or period.
4. New additions shall not obscure the front of the building.
5. New additions shall be of a size, scale, and materials that are in harmony with the existing building.

8.3.12 Accessibility

1. Alterations to existing buildings for the purposes of providing accessibility shall provide persons with disabilities the level of physical access to historic properties that is required under applicable law, consistent with the preservation of each property's significant historical features, with the goal of providing the highest level of access with the lowest level of impact. Access modifications for persons with disabilities shall be designed and installed to least affect the character-defining features of the property.

Modifications to some features may be allowed in providing access, once a review of options for the highest level of access has been completed.

2. A three-step approach is recommended to identify and implement accessibility modifications that will protect the integrity and historic character of the property:
 - a. Review the historical significance of the property and identify character-defining features;
 - b. Assess the property's existing and proposed level of accessibility;
 - c. Evaluate accessibility options within a preservation context.
3. Because of the complex nature of accessibility, the Commission will review proposals on a case-by-case basis. The Commission recommends consulting with the following document which is available from the Commission office: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Preservation Assistance Division; Preservation Brief 32 "Making Historic Properties Accessible" by Thomas C. Jester and Sharon C. Park, AIA.

8.3.13 Renewable Energy Sources

1. Renewable energy sources, including but not limited to solar energy, are encouraged for the site.
2. Before proposing renewable energy sources, the building's performance shall be assessed and measures to correct any deficiencies shall be taken. The emphasis shall be on improvements that do not result in a loss of historic fabric. A report on this work shall be included in any proposal for renewable energy sources.
3. Proposals for new renewable energy sources shall be reviewed by the Commission on a case-by-case basis for potential physical and visual impacts on the building and site.
4. Refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings for general guidelines.

8.3.14 Building Site

1. The general intent is to preserve the existing or later contributing site and landscape features that enhance the property.
2. It is recognized that often the environment surrounding the property has character, scale and street pattern quite different from what existed when the building was constructed. Thus, changes must frequently be made to accommodate the new condition, and the landscape treatment can be seen as a transition between the historic property and its newer surroundings.
3. All original or later contributing features of the building site that are important in defining its overall historic character shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired using recognized preservation methods. This may include but is not limited to walls, fences, steps, walkways, paths, roads, vegetation, landforms, furnishings and fixtures, decorative

elements, and water features. (See section 9.0 for subsurface features such as archaeological resources or burial grounds.)

4. Deteriorated or missing site features shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation.
5. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute material may be considered.
7. The existing landforms of the site shall not be altered unless shown to be necessary for maintenance of the designated property's structure or site.
8. If there are areas where the terrain is to be altered, these areas shall be surveyed and documented to determine the potential impact to important landscape features.
9. The historic relationship between buildings and the landscape shall be retained. Grade levels should not be changed if it would alter the historic appearance of the building and its relation to the site.
10. Buildings should not be relocated if it would diminish the historic character of the site.
11. When they are required by a new use, new site features (such as parking areas, driveways, or access ramps) should be as unobtrusive as possible, retain the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape, and be compatible with the historic character of the property. Historic rock outcroppings like puddingstone should not be disturbed by the construction of new site features.
12. Original or later contributing layout and materials of the walks, steps, and paved areas shall be maintained. Consideration will be given to alterations if it can be shown that better site circulation is necessary and that the alterations will improve this without altering the integrity of the designated property.
13. When they are necessary for security, protective fencing, bollards, and stanchions should be as unobtrusive as possible.
14. Existing healthy plant materials which are in keeping with the historic character of the property shall be maintained. New plant materials should be appropriate to the character of the site.
15. Maintenance of, removal of, and additions to plant materials should consider restoration of views of the designated property.
16. The Boston Landmarks Commission encourages removal of non-historic fencing as documentary evidence indicates.

17. The Boston Landmarks Commission recognizes that the designated property must continue to meet city, state, and federal goals and requirements for resiliency and safety within an ever-changing coastal flood zone and environment.

8.3.15 Guidelines

The following are additional Guidelines for the treatment of the historic property:

1. Should any major restoration or construction activity be considered for a property, the Boston Landmarks Commission recommends that the proponents prepare a historic building conservation study and/or consult a materials conservator early in the planning process.
 - a. The Boston Landmarks Commission specifically recommends that any work on masonry, wood, metals, or windows be executed with the guidance of a professional building materials conservator.
2. Should any major restoration or construction activity be considered for a property's landscape, the Boston Landmarks Commission recommends that the proponents prepare a historic landscape report and/or consult a landscape historian early in the planning process.
3. The Commission will consider whether later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed. Since it is not possible to provide one general guideline, the following factors will be considered in determining whether a later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed include:
 - a. Compatibility with the original property's integrity in scale, materials and character.
 - b. Historic association with the property.
 - c. Quality in the design and execution of the addition/alteration.
 - d. Functional usefulness.

8.4 List of Character-defining Features

Character-defining features are the significant observable and experiential aspects of a historic resource, whether a single building, landscape, or multi-property historic district, that define its architectural power and personality. These are the features that should be identified, retained, and preserved in any restoration or rehabilitation scheme in order to protect the resource's integrity.

Character-defining elements include, for example, the overall shape of a building and its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details and features, as well as the various aspects of its site and environment. They are critically important considerations whenever preservation work is contemplated. Inappropriate changes to historic features can undermine the historical and architectural significance of the resource, sometimes irreparably.

Below is a list that identifies the physical elements that contribute to the unique character of the historic resource. The items listed in this section should be considered important aspects of the

historic resource and changes to them should be approved by commissioners only after careful consideration.

The character-defining features for this historic resource include:

1. **Architectural style.** The Warren House is a Gothic Revival cottage constructed entirely of Roxbury puddingstone. It remains the only habitable memorial structure designed by descendants of a nationally important historic figure, Dr. Joseph Warren.
2. **Ornamentation.** Building ornamentation includes: a) two granite plaques that memorialize Dr. Joseph Warren and his grandson, also Dr. Joseph Warren; b) a diamond-shaped attic window on the front-facing facade; 3) quoins in contrasting stone that adorn all corners of the building as well as the sides of the gable bump out; 4) attic-level windows on the north- and south-facing windows that are set back behind pointed puddingstone arches.
3. **Building materials and finishes.** The building is constructed entirely from Roxbury puddingstone, a rock unique to Eastern Massachusetts. The Warren House is one of the few puddingstone cottages in the City of Boston.
4. **Roof type, forms, and features.** The front-facing (west) facade boasts a steeply pitched center cross gable. The roof is slate. Two red brick chimneys ascend from either side of the horizontal street-facing part of the building. Another tall and more decorative chimney sits at the very back end of the building (the eastern elevation).
5. **Doors and windows.** The front door was styled with a transom and sidelights. Seventeen rectilinear windows (five on the western facade, two on the north-facing facade, four on the south-facing facade, and six on the back of the building) allow light into the building's interior. All of the building's rectilinear windows feature simple granite lintels. Three attic-level windows provide visual interest--the front window being a diamond shape and the north and south-facing windows set back behind pointed decorative stone arches.
6. **Porches.** A wooden entrance porch is supported by four hexagonal columns with simple bracket detail at the roofline.
7. **Relationship of building to lot lines, sidewalks, and streets.** An important feature of the property is the building's handsome setback from the street. This is unique for the block. The slight elevation and setback add an air of importance to the structure.
8. **Stone wall and granite posts.** A low puddingstone wall with granite posts defines the property's relationship with the sidewalk.

The Standards and Criteria have been financed in part with funds from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, through the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Secretary William Francis Galvin, Chairman.

The U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, gender, or handicap in its federally assisted programs. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity or facility as described above, or if you desire further information, please write to: Office for Equal Opportunity, 1849 C Street NW, Room 1324, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.

9.0 ARCHAEOLOGY

All below-ground work within the property shall be reviewed by the Boston Landmarks Commission and City Archaeologist to determine if work may impact known or potential archaeological resources. An archaeological survey shall be conducted if archaeological sensitivity exists and if impacts to known or potential archaeological resources cannot be mitigated after consultation with the City Archaeologist. All archaeological mitigation (monitoring, survey, excavation, etc.) shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist.

Refer to Section 8.3 for any additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

10.0 SEVERABILITY

The provisions of these Standards and Criteria (Design Guidelines) are severable and if any of their provisions shall be held invalid in any circumstances, such invalidity shall not affect any other provisions or circumstances.

11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atlascope Boston, Norman B. Leventhal Map & Education Center at the Boston Public Library. Maps and Atlases: 1873 (Hopkins), 1884 (Bromley), 1885 (Sanborn), 1888 (Bailey), 1889 (Bromley), 1895 (Bromley), 1899 (Bromley), 1906 (Bromley), 1915 (Bromley), 1931 (Bromley).

Boston Globe Editorial. "Honoring a Founding Father." *The Boston Globe*. February 21, 2011.

Boston Landmarks Commission. Landmark Petition Form. Petition Number 254.16. 2016.

Boston Landmarks Commission Building Information Form for 130 Warren Street

Cary, John H. *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1961.

Champagne, Jim. "Boston Massacre." *Boston Massacre Historical Society*. November 2, 2018.
<http://www.bostonmassacre.net/academic/essay3.htm>.

Drake, Francis Samuel. *The Town of Roxbury: Its Memorable Persons and Places, Its History and Antiquities, with Numerous Illustrations of Its Old Landmarks and Noted Personages*. Boston. 1878.

Di Spigna, Christian. *Founding Martyr: The Life and Death of Dr. Joseph Warren, the American Revolutions Lost Hero*. New York: Crown, 2018.

Forman, Samuel A. *Dr. Joseph Warren: The Boston Tea Party, Bunker Hill, and the Birth of American Liberty*. Gretna, Louisiana: Pelican Publishing Company, Inc., 2012.

Haywood, H.L. "The House of the Temple." *The Builder Magazine*. October 1918.

Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System (MACRIS). Massachusetts Historical Commission.

Miller, Yawu. "Roxbury History Preserved in Warren Street House." *Bay State Banner*. March 19, 2014.

Moreland Street Historic District, Boston, Massachusetts. National Register of Historic Places nomination. Prepared by: Candace Jenkins and Leslie Larson. 1984.

New England Historical Society. "Joseph Warren, The Patriot Who Might Have Made Us Forget George Washington." Accessed September 7, 2021.
<https://www.newenglandhistoricalsociety.com/joseph-warren-patriot-made-forget-george-washington/>.

Philbrick, Nathaniel. *Bunker Hill: A City, A Siege, A Revolution*. New York: Penguin Publishing Group, 2013.

Roxbury Historical Society, *About Roxbury*, Accessed August 19, 2021.
<http://roxburysociety.org>

Warner, Sam Bass Jr. *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston (1870 - 1900)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Archeological Bibliography

The following archaeological reports are arranged by neighborhood and are available to qualified researchers by appointment at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, 220 Morrissey Blvd. Boston, MA 02125. 617-635-3850

214 Bower, Beth, and Byron Rushing 1979 Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Southwest Corridor Project Area (Part One). 48 pages.

353 Bawden, Garth 1981 Phase I Archaeological Survey, New Dudley Street Phase II. 26 pages.

771 Bower, Beth Anne, Sheila Charles, John Cheney, and Woodard Openo 1986 The "Stone Jail" Site (SWC-31), Roxbury, Massachusetts Report on the Phase III Excavation. 76 pages.

779 Bower, Beth Anne, Sheila Charles, Constance Crosby, Woodard Openo, and Byron Rushing 1986 Report on the Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery, The Metropolitan Railroad Company Site (SWC-1a-22) Roxbury, Massachusetts. 118 pages.

913 Gallagher, Joan, and Richard Rose 1989 Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Roxbury Station Post Office, Parcel P-2C, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 84 pages.

915 Gallagher, Joan 1989 Intensive Archaeological Survey, New Dudley Street, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 70 pages.

978 Ritchie, Duncan, and Beth Miller 1990 Reconnaissance and Intensive Level Archaeological Survey of the Nawn Factory Site, Roxbury Heritage State Park, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 211 pages.

1012 Harrell, Pauline Chase, Victoria Bunker Kenyon, and Dina Freedman 1988 Documents Submitted for 106 Review of Washington Street Replacement Transit Study. 76 pages

1067 Bower, Beth Anne, Constance Crosby, and Byron Rushing 1984 Report on the Phase II Archaeological Subsurface Testing of the Southwest Corridor Project Area, Roxbury, Massachusetts. Part One – Management Summary. 34 pages.

1068 Bower, Beth Anne, Constance Crosby, and Bryon Rushing 1984 Report on the Phase II Archaeological Subsurface Testing of the Southwest Corridor Project Area, Roxbury, Massachusetts. Part Two – Site Reports. 438 pages.

1688 Rainey, Mary Lynne 1990 Final Report Phase I Intensive Archaeological Surveys for the Algonquin Gas Transmission Company Proposed 1.9 Mile 36 Inch Pipeline Loop and Temporary Materials Storage Site in Medway, Massachusetts, FERC Docket No. CP90-643-000, and 1.8 Mile 10 Inch Pipeline Replacement in Milford and Medway, Massachusetts, FERC Docket No. CP8B-187-001. 93 pages.

1689 Ring, James W., and James W. Skehan 1986 Geologic History of the Five Olmsted Parks in the Boston Basin. 31 pages

1069 Bower, Beth Anne, Sheila Charles, Constance Crosby, Woodard Openo, and Byron Rushing 1986 Report on the Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery the Elmwood Street Pumping Station Site (SWC-33) Roxbury, Massachusetts. 42 pages.

1070 Bower, Beth Anne, Sheila Charles, and John Cheney 1987 The Guild and White Company Tannery Site, Roxbury, Massachusetts: Report on the Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery. 75 pages.

1071 Bower, Beth Anne, and Sheila Charles 1988 The Highland Foundry Site, Roxbury, Massachusetts. Report on Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery. 50 pages.

1072 Bower, Beth Anne, Sheila Charles, John Cheney, and Stephen Mrozowski 1987 The Pierpont Homestead, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 98 pages.

1073 Charles, Sheila, and Woodard Openo 1987 Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, Southwest Corridor Project, The Tremont Street Housing Site, Roxbury, Massachusetts, Reports on the Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery. 62 pages.

1074 Charles, Sheila, Scott Lewis, and Woodard Openo 1988 The Williams Homestead Site, Roxbury, Massachusetts: Management Summary of the Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery. 91 pages.

1247 Ritchie, Duncan, and Beth Miller 1990 Reconnaissance and Intensive Level Archaeological Survey of the Nawn Factory Site Roxbury Heritage State Park, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 213 pages.

1439 Ritchie, Duncan, and Beth P. Miller 1994 Archaeological Investigations of the Prehistoric and Historic Period Components of the Dillaway-Thomas House Site, Roxbury Heritage State Park, Boston, Massachusetts. 279 pages.

1525 Bower, Beth Anne 1978 Report on the Archaeological Excavation at the Dogget and Cunningham Houses, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 26 pages.

1775 Richard, Rose, and Neill DePaoli 1989 Management Summary/Memorandum Proposed Roxbury Heritage Park Intensive Archaeological Survey of Lots at 161 and 173 Roxbury Street. 9 pages.

2372 Herbster, Holly, and Duncan Ritchie 2003 Archaeological Site Examination of the New Education Center, First Church in Roxbury, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 122 pages.

3128 Donta, Christopher L., F. Timothy Barker, and Antonio Medina 2010 Archaeological Site Examination Survey for the Proposed Eustis Street Firehouse Restoration, Boston, Massachusetts. 65 pages.

3161 Donohue, Barbara 2011 Archaeological Monitoring Report of Construction Activities at the Eustis Street Firehouse, Roxbury, Massachusetts. 29 pages.

3465 Banister, Jennifer, and Suzanne Cherau 2013 Intensive (Locational) Archaeological Survey, Parcel 10 Development Project, Boston (Roxbury), Massachusetts. 122 pages.

3288 Johnson, Eric S. 2012 Roads, Rails, and Trails: Transportation-Related Archaeology in Massachusetts. 58 pages.

3604 Donohue, Barbara 2015 Archaeological Monitoring at the Eustis Street Burying Ground Pathway Landscape Renovation Project, Boston, Massachusetts. 34 pages.

3965 Bagley, Joseph, Andrew Glyman, and Sarah Johnson 2018 Report for Intensive (Locational) Archaeological Survey at the Malcolm X / Ella Little Collins House, 72 Dale Street, Boston (Roxbury), Massachusetts. 252 pages

4066 Shugar, Miles 2014 From Horse to Electric Power at the Metropolitan Railroad Company Site: Archaeology and the Narrative of Technological Change, Boston (Roxbury), Massachusetts. 118 pages.

4119 Kelly, John M., and Holly Herbster 2020 Archaeological Monitoring and Data Recovery, Kearsarge-Warren Avenue Cemetery, Dearborn 6-12 Stem/Early College Academy Project, Boston (Roxbury), Massachusetts. 136 pages.