

## 26 Common Street (circa 1795-1810)

From Boston Landmark Commission's Charlestown Historic Resources Study 1981 (E. W. Gordon, Consultant)\*:



26 Common Street

1981

Number 26 Common Street is an extensively altered wood frame gambrel house with a circa late 19<sup>th</sup> century store on its first floor and replacement front door at the side rather than the center.

This house is part of Charlestown's interesting collection of modestly scaled gambrel roof structures dating to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Although 26 Common Street has been extensively altered over time it retains its distinctive gambrel form. Judging by the

development pattern of its immediate area, this house was probably built circa 1795/1810.



26 Common Street

2015

Until as late as the 1790s the Training Field and vicinity was a grazing land-the development of the Charlestown Navy Yard (1800) and the opening of the Salem Turnpike through Charlestown (1803) triggered residential development in this area. Further deed research is needed to determine this house's date of construction and early ownership. Evidently number 26 was part of James Gould's extensive landholdings during the early 19th century. On June 11, 1837 Thomas Gould of Boston, a housewright, sold number 26 to Lenthall Phillips of Charlestown, a

housewright, for \$1200. It remained under Gould family ownership until as late as May 1879.

Later owners included Joseph and Elizabeth A. Campbell of Boston and Edward Wentworth (1890s-early 1900s).

Note: James Gould is listed in the 1834 Charlestown directory as owning the soap factory that was located on Washington Street at Prison Point. In 1834 Gould was living at 22 Austin Street.

Bibliography:

Maps- 1818, 1852

Mallory Panoramic view-1848

Middlesex deeds- 368:457, 434:329, 851:80, 981:195

Suffolk deeds- 1458:24

Charlestown Directories-1834-1840s

\*Digitized and edited, without change in content, from the scanned record in the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System, and with addition of current photographs. In the case of houses that have been altered since the survey, these photographs may not entirely correspond to the architectural description. If earlier photographs of suitable quality are available, these have been included.

R. Dinsmore