A DISCUSSION OF KINGSTON AND AREA’S HISTORIC SMALL HOUSES KNOWN AS “THE ONTARIO COTTAGE” TYPE

> Jennifer McKendry

“Yon cottage seems a bower of bliss,
A covert for protection
Of tender thought, that nestle there –
The brood of chaste affection.”
– William Wordsworth,
“Yarrow Visited, September, 1814.”

The term “the Ontario Cottage” is one invented by secondary sources resulting in some confusion about which historical buildings fit this term. There is also confusion over today’s North American meaning of a cottage as “a dwelling used for vacation purposes, usually located in a rural area near a lake or river,” as defined by the Canadian Oxford Dictionary. An alternative definition for Britain in the same dictionary is “a small simple house, especially in the country.”

A small simple house was the position advocated by Andrew Jackson Downing [1815-1852], an American whose writings strongly influenced architecture in the United States and Canada. In his book of 1850, The Architecture of Country Houses, he referred to the concise definition of a cottage as “a small house” by Samuel Johnson in his 1755 Dictionary of the English Language, which went through a number of revised editions in the United States at the time Downing was preparing his book.2 Unlike Johnson’s definition of three words, Downing went on at some length to explain “what a cottage should be.”

Another primary source was Canadian artist Daniel Fowler [1810-1894], who lived on Amherst Island when he expressed that his 1856 house exhibited “the cottage class of house,” because the upper rooms were not visible from the...
front; that is, it was one and a half storeys with the bedroom windows in the upper part of the gable-end walls.4

Let us turn to definitions by modern architectural historians. James Stevens Curl, for example, in the Oxford Dictionary of Architecture (1999), ignores the broad term “cottage” and defines only “cottage orné” as a late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century small dwelling in the country or a park. It was often asymmetrical with a thatched roof, ornamental chimneys and small leaded windows, and incorporated a verandah with tree-trunk posts. Such a building was aptly described in the Kingston Chronicle of December 20, 1828: “the cottage, a low, thatched, irregular building, [closed] by a blooming orchard and covered with honeysuckle and jasmine, looks like the chosen abode of snugness and comfort. And so it is.” Part of the picturesque tradition of Britain, this sort of cottage does not seem to have played a role in the story of cottages in the Kingston area.5

Downing did not approve of introducing these elements into North American cottages, as their small dimensions were not suited to too much complexity and ornamentation. He also noted that cottages here were smaller than farm houses, which were, in turn, smaller than mansions and villas. Furthermore, he pointed out that, in Britain with its stock of huge castles and palaces, other building types were larger, potentially making a quite large building still a “cottage.” In 1984, Janet Wright employed in Architecture of the Picturesque the term cottage orné for hipped-roof types with verandahs and French windows. She drew attention to the use of smooth unbroken wall surfaces.6

In 1963, Marion MacRae and Anthony Adamson’s Ancestral Roof devoted a page and a half to cataloguing “the Ontario Cottage”? (fig. 2). They defined the basic form as one and a half storeys with a hipped roof, which has four pitched slopes, usually meeting in a short ridge pole. Among the accompanying drawings, seven houses appear to be one storey, while four more have dormers or belvederes to accommodate the attic rooms. Some feature verandahs and one has a front gable or peak containing a window to light the attic but with a hipped roof. MacRae and Adamson defined the full Regency cottage as one where the roof extends to form a verandah.4 Left out in the cold is the one-and-a-half-storey house with a gable roof (two slopes), with or without a front gable or peak.

Adamson continued the MacRae-Adamson definition of the Ontario Cottage as hipped roof in 1974 in The Gaiety of Gables and saw the rise of gables with bargeboards as the influence of Downing’s writing.7 In 1992, Alan Gowans labelled the hipped-roof type “the Classical Square” or “Classical Cottage.”10 There is definitely a link to classicism due to the typical insistence on symmetry for the main façade.11 As recently as 2001, Lynne DiStefano continued the characterization of the Ontario Cottage by its hipped roof.12 Seven years earlier, however, Hal Kalman had offered an alternative definition in his two-volume book on A History of Canadian Architecture:
The Ontario Cottage was 1½-storeys high with the principal gables on the sides and a secondary gable over the entrance. This central gable, known as a “peak,” was both utilitarian and ornamental: it permitted a large window to illuminate the upper floor and gave the house an air of distinction, similar in effect to a full-blown classical pediment in a two-storey house, but at a lower cost.\(^{(10)}\) (fig. 3 type 3)

For the purposes of this paper, I prefer the definitions offered during the nineteenth century by a number of writers—the cottage is a small house, in this instance appearing in south-eastern Ontario or more narrowly in the Kingston area. I have divided these cottages into three main subcategories (fig. 3): 1) hipped roof, usually one storey; 2) gable roof, usually one and a half storeys; 3) gable roof, usually one and a half storeys with a front central gable or peak interrupting the eaves.

**TYPE 1. THE HIPPED-ROOF “ONTARIO COTTAGE”**

Not an invention of this location, cottages were widespread in the province and originated in memories of the British Isles and New England. Here, however, one can claim its appearance as early as 1783. Among the earliest hipped-roof “Ontario Cottages” during the British regime and for which there is a visual record, the frame Commanding Officer’s House, also known as Government House, was recorded in a painting of August 1783 showing its hipped roof over one storey, balancing chimneys and centre door flanked by a pair of casement windows\(^{(14)}\) (fig. 4). Its roof form stood out among the other buildings with their gable roofs. Even though one might expect that this established an official stamp of approval for the hipped roof, gable roofs proved more popular in the area. Awkwardly located on King Street East and Queen Street and an impediment to the movement of traffic, the building was sold and moved off its site (by which time extensions, flanking wings, and dormers had been added) in 1821. In its original form, it was of considerable width—some fifty feet, which makes it larger than most cottages and, of course, lived in by an individual with a higher status than many other cottage dwellers.\(^{(15)}\)

We can trace the hipped-roof, one-storey version of the Ontario Cottage throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, but the number of known early examples in this region is small compared with houses built with gable roofs. I have found around twenty examples from the nineteenth century; however, there are no doubt more structures still to be catalogued. They range from the plain and small cottage, usually with three bays, to elaborate buildings with verandahs and still three bays, but with generously sized windows making them appear larger. Recorded in a painting of 1815 (fig. 1), the roof slopes of the Commodore’s House on Point Frederick were extended to shelter verandahs—a form found in the Anglo-Indian bungalow and spreading across the British Empire with the movement of military forces and the Royal Engineers as well as the illustrations in architectural pattern books.\(^{(16)}\) The building was log covered in clapboard. As early as 1800, John Plaw, in one of his architectural pattern books, described one of his cottage designs as having “a Veranda in the manner of an Indian bungalow.”\(^{(17)}\)

Although it is frustrating not to have an image, an advertisement in 1829 for the sale of a rural dwelling, “Champignon,” previously owned by Captain William Payne of the Royal Engineers, confirms that there was a “cottage style” recognized in this region, “On the farm there is a very neat substantial dwelling house built in the cottage style, sufficiently capacious for the accommodation of a gentleman’s family, and has a verandah of 70 feet in length, which commands a beautiful view of the lake.”\(^{(18)}\)

Other hipped-roof cottages were more austere, such as McVicar Cottage at 46 Kennedy Street built in 1845 in what was then Portsmouth Village (fig. 5).\(^{(19)}\) It is unusual in that there are four bays, causing the doorway to be off-centre. Other than this irregularity, it conformed to Downing’s advice in 1850 that cottages should reflect “regularity, uniformity, proportion, symmetry” and these
are the proper beauties “consistent with the simple forms of the cottage.” The tenant-occupants were the “industrious and intelligent mechanics and working men” he promoted. He also pointed out that this size of house suited a family with no servants or, at the most, with one or two to help manage the household. The advantage of the four-bay façade was that the parlour was afforded two windows in the front wall while the thick stonework of the side wall accommodated a fireplace and cupboard. With no servants, it was an advantage to have the kitchen on the main floor.

Other plain cottages of this type had three bays with a door off-centre, as in
153 Clergy Street and 416 Bagot Street. This pattern was repeated three times for three families under a common hipped roof at 141-145 James Street (fig. 6), a fortunate local survivor of a simple type of workers’ row cottages. Cottages for labourers were illustrated in various early British and American books such as Lamond’s of 1821, Loudon’s of 1839, Allen’s of 1853, and Tarbuck’s of c. 1856, as single or multiple units (fig. 7).²¹

Moreover, hipped-roof cottages could be sophisticated for well-to-do owners such as William Russell Bartlett at Otterburn of c. 1841 (at 124 Centre Street),²² and the Hon. Hamilton Killaly at Newcourt of 1842 (at 799 King Street West) (fig. 8). In the case of Otterburn, the French windows open onto a platform, while at Newcourt there is a wraparound verandah on the projecting front portion. Both merged architecture and nature, creating a kind of outdoor room. Edging toward pretentiousness (or at least Downing might have considered it thus) is 56 Alwington Avenue c. 1856 for Selina and Archibald Livingston (fig. 9). The entrance porch reminds one of a portico and that was an aspect Downing did not like.

One of the most unusual hipped-roof cottages in southeastern Ontario is 75 Lower Union Street, also known as Charles Place (fig. 10), of the early 1830s, due to its umbrage or recessed porch and fine stonework.²⁴ Dormers were added over time to improve the livability of the attic.

In general, urban cottages on confined lots did not gain the visual advantage of a picturesque or Romantic setting. The building design and small scale based on symmetry were also not sympathetic to the irregularity and roughness so admired in the picturesque aesthetic—a disadvantage understood by Downing in 1850, and he pointed out that “Cottage Architecture, especially, borrows the most winning and captivating expression from foliage.”²⁵ Rural scenery, trees, shrubbery, and vines were good accessories for simple cottages; in fact, flowering vines and creepers added poetry and feeling. Verandahs, of course, could play an important role in that regard. Nevertheless, their roofs interfered with the warmth and light of the sunshine during the long, harsh Canadian winters.²⁶

As urban centres became more congested and polluted in the late nineteenth century, the trend to build summer houses along waterways or in the woods increased in hopes of obtaining relief from heat, noise, and smells. The term “summer cottage” was in use locally by 1887.²⁷ Frank Lent, for example, wrote and illustrated Summer Homes and Camps in 1899 (fig. 11).²⁸ He promoted “the plain hip [sic] roof,” which he considered the strongest construction with four rafters forming the hip securely held in place by sheathing or shingle laths. The roof plate was held securely in place by the thrust of the rafters at each corner. A gambrel roof, fashionable at the time he was writing, was more expensive to build. The hipped roof required less material but greater costs in labour than the “A” roof (here described as a gable roof), but basically they cost about the same. He suggested the gable-roof form for countries like Canada with very heavy snowfalls that were likely to rest on the roof.²⁹ The hipped roof was a popular form for vacation cottages in the twentieth century, for example along the River Styx (part of the Rideau Canal system) in the 1930s. One could order plans for such cottages from Kamp Kabins and Wee Homes in the 1940s³⁰ (fig. 12).

Hipped-roof cottages as permanent dwellings continued to be built and illustrated in architectural pattern books, such as Small Homes of Architectural Distinction,³¹ published in New York in 1929 (fig. 13). Modern local examples include 11 Richard Street of 1956, 15 Richard Street of 1964, and 575 Union Street of 1947. They may include modern devices such as picture windows, poured concrete basements, and built-in garages.

**TYPE 2. THE GABLE-ROOF “ONTARIO COTTAGE,” USUALLY WITH ONE AND A HALF STOREYS**

I have assembled an inventory of about forty early examples (double that of the hipped-roof type), but many more could be added by studying drawings and paintings of early Kingston and surviving buildings, even if altered. Just like hipped roofs, gable roofs can be found from the 1780s into the modern era. Numerous gable-roof, one- or one-and-a-half-storey, frame or log Loyalist and military buildings are shown in James Peachey’s view of Kingston from Brant’s house in July 1784 (fig. 14).³²
The Lines House, a frame example that survived until 1987 (when it was burnt by an arsonist after being moved from its site), was built in the 1790s on Ontario Street at Earl (fig. 15). It was a double, one-and-a-half-storey house with numerous fireplaces. The owner was well connected but the limitations of a newly established town meant that elaboration was sacrificed for pragmatic reasons; for example, the street doors opened directly into the kitchens which, in turn, opened into the parlours—that is, there were no internal hallways.

Architectural pattern books dealing with cottage or rural architecture often showed a simple three-bay, gable-roof cottage with a central door. An 1821 book even specified this type of house as suitable for those leaving Scotland for Upper Canada (fig. 16). Of the nine designs, only one had a gable roof (one being a hut or wigwam, another a shanty with a lean-to roof, and the rest hipped). It was to be built of squared logs with a shingled roof, stone or brick hearths and chimneys, and an interior trapdoor leading to an excavated cellar. The centred front door had six panels and was topped by a rectangular transom. The windows appear to be ten panes in the form of casements. The end chimneys and regular placement of the windows and doorway presented a symmetrical design of the sort advocated by Downing at mid-century.

There is little doubt that such log cottages were built in the area but few have survived, were visually recorded, or are recognizable today due to being covered over later with sidings. Many had asymmetrical openings suited more for interior convenience than external aesthetics, such as the Lyons House on Collins Lake (fig. 17). Some houses were very small, consisting of only two bays such as each unit of the stone double house at 77-79 Gore Street, which has end stone chimneys (fig. 18). The roof was raised in later years.
originally may have been one storey, as there is no window in the gable-end wall to light an attic. Other simple, three-bay houses were one and a half storeys—the roofs may be steeply pitched such as 14 Rideau Street, part of an interesting stone row, which once extended to Barrack Street, where there was another 1820s stone Ontario Cottage of one and a half storeys but with five bays, and which was demolished by 1963.36

Another early stone house with five bays was 4 North Street, which was demolished in 1964 (fig. 19). Built c. 1810 by John Cumming, it was considered “a spacious and elegant stone mansion”—an example of the loose use of such terms.37 During the War of 1812, the property was converted into a Naval Hospital, and then the residence into the Commandant’s House. Later known as Cataract Cottage, it had stone massive end chimneys and the front, which faced the Great Cataract River, was softened by a verandah.

An example with unusual stonework over the windows is the c. 1830, five-bay English farm at 1380 John F. Scott Road (fig. 20) but there are, as well, many in frame, including 61 Baiden Street, built c. 1865 in Portsmouth Village in board and batten (covered over in the 1978).38 Brick was the material of choice at the Ann and William Michael House, 249 Main Street, c. 1819, in Barriefield Village. This house is graced with five fireplaces, four of which have identical neoclassical mantelpieces (fig. 21).

Also built were more sophisticated gable-roof cottages such as the frame neoclassical Davy House erected in Bath in the early 1820s (fig. 22). It has its flanking wings and an elaborate doorway.39 Something of the grandeur is caught in this July 14, 1829, description in the Kingston Chronicle:

The Dwelling House contains on the first floor, an Entrance Hall, Drawing Room, Sitting Room, two Bed Rooms, Pantry, Kitchen, and an Attorney’s office. Above Stairs, there are four good Bed Rooms, and underneath the house, an excellent cellar. There is also on the premises, a Stable, and suitable out offices. The whole of the Buildings are nearly new and in excellent condition. There is nearly an acre of Land... tastefully laid out into gardens, and well stocked with choice Fruit Trees, forming altogether one of the most delightful places of residence for a genteel family in the District.

Genteel folks sometimes lived in row housing, as in Hales Cottages, 311-317 King Street West (fig. 23), of 1841, designed as a “range of five cottages” (now four stone units) by architect George Browne for Charles Hales, who
also owned Bellevue House.40 Described in 1863 as having ten rooms in each unit and fit for a gentleman’s family, only 311 King West retains the original roof form.41 The centre bay of each cottage projects forward and draws attention to the doorway with its sidelights and arched transom, over which a gentle peak breaks the eave line. Ornamental pendants emphasize the roof line with its deep overhang creating shadows on the stucco walls in the picturesque mode—as does Bellevue House. To each side of the doorway is a generous, modified Venetian window.

Also sophisticated is 103 Wellington Street, attributed to builder-turned-architect Joseph Scobell in 1841 (fig. 24). Three bays wide, one’s eye is immediately drawn to the centre doorway with its fine rectangular transom and sidelights.42 Over the doorway and windows are fascia boards decorated with rondels and a Greek key of the type seen in Asher Benjamin’s architectural pattern books of the 1830s.43 An example of the gable-roof cottage, showing how interesting and sophisticated the interiors may be, is 711 King Street West with its four fireplaces, bake oven, and fine staircase (fig. 25).44 The chimney pieces were based on designs in Asher Benjamin’s The Practice of Architecture,45 published in Boston in 1833.

It is unlikely that gable-roof cottages ever went out of style and they were particularly appreciated during the 1930s and 1940s “Cape Cod” revival of New England colonial houses seen, for example, in architectural pattern books such as Small Homes of Architectural Distinction (fig. 26) of 1929, published in...
New York. Kingston examples from the 1940s include 811 Johnson Street and 233 Willingdon Avenue. The gable roof vied with the hipped roof as a popular choice for twentieth-century seasonal cottages, for example as portrayed in plans and drawings supplied in the 1940s by Kamp Kabins and Wee Homes of Kansas (fig. 27).

**TYPE 3. GABLE-ROOF “ONTARIO COTTAGE,” USUALLY ONE AND A HALF STOREYS WITH A FRONT CENTRAL GABLE OR PEAK INTERRUPTING THE EAVES**

This type, an attractive and practical outgrowth of the gable-roof cottage, gained popularity in the 1840s, was in its golden age in the 1860s and 1870s, and then declined in popularity at the turn of the twentieth century. It prepared the way for a multiplicity of gables on houses of the late nineteenth century. At that time, the traditional front-gable Ontario Cottage often became the form used on a secondary wing, while the main part of the house became ever-increasingly busy with ornament and complex roof forms.

It seems plausible that the idea for a front peak originated in neoclassical houses that featured pediments, especially those with windows, such as the Gildersleeve House of c. 1830 at 264 King Street East (fig. 28). They were a fine accent over the important central bay on large, two-storey houses. When one shrinks the height to one and a half storeys, upstairs bedrooms only have the gable-end walls for windows (unless dormers are inserted into the front and/or back slopes of the roof), and the central upstairs hall has no window. The bedrooms lose overall interior space due to the angles of the roof, and walls along the front and back become knee walls. To give up the special advantages of full walls in upstairs rooms of two-storey houses suggests the need to economize on labour and materials. In some years and places, there may also have been a saving on tax assessments. In the census of 1861, the material (brick, stone, frame, or log) and number of stories (one, one and a half, two, three) are noted. Once the idea of inserting a window into the knee wall in the top centre of the main façade and allowing it to extend into its own gable or peak became established, the advantages of light and breezes in the upstairs hallway became apparent (fig. 29). Furthermore, the angled gable, reminiscent of the form of a classical pediment, borrowed prestige from this association. The first gables had shallow angles but these steepened over time and took on the proportions of Gothic Revival, often reinforced by a pointed window—even though the rest of the house might show little allegiance to the medieval era. Reinforcing the medieval aspect of the front gable and sometimes the eaves was the use of scrolled vergeboards and finials.

There is another possibility for the origins of the front-gable cottage, namely vernacular houses in England with gables peeking out from thatched roofs.46

Perhaps the earliest front gable in this area on a one-and-a-half-storey house is found at the Snook farm, 2935 Latimer Road, which was built of stone in 1820 (fig. 31).49 The wood gable with its almost square casement window is confined to the area above the eaves and this raises the question of it being an addition. However, the interior finish of the upper storey was made with unpainted, wide pine boards and appears to be original (or at least an early change) to the rest of the stair hall. The gable’s pedimental proportions seem appropriate to the neoclassical detailing around the main doorway. It provided a precedent for

---

[Fig. 28. Gildersleeve House, 264 King St. E., Kingston.] [Fig. 29. Front gable of upstairs hall in an “Ontario Cottage,” Milton House, Canadian Forces Base Kingston.]
the more characteristic stone gable and round-arch window, when a wing was added in the 1840s.

A close rival for the earliest use of the front gable was a one-and-a-half-storey stone row, the Naval Cottages, composed of sixteen units built in 1822 on Point Frederick (fig. 32). Several units were ruined in a fire of 1868 and the surviving ones demolished in 1910.

I have been able to record in the region around one hundred and ten front-gable Ontario Cottages, some of which are found in the same area, suggesting the idea spreading from one neighbour to the next; for example, there are eight on Middle Road and five in the same part of Princess Street. Some are almost identical, such as 156 Clark Road and 361 Clark Road (fig. 33), or 13 Aragon Road and 384 Aragon Road. Many were built in stone, although frame and brick are also found. Round-arch windows were the most common with pointed and rectangular also in evidence. Some window glazing patterns were plainly designed, while others had appealing, intricate patterns, often echoing those around the entrance door. Occasionally, the original name related in an interesting manner to the house’s owner or setting. “Drovers’ Cottage” at 858 Division Street, for example, suited the trade of the owners, the Elliott family, who included butchers.

Architectural pattern books by Andrew J. Downing (1842 and 1850), William Ranlett (1851) and George Woodward (1868), and journals such as The Canada Farmer (1864 on) offered inspiration (fig. 34). Due to the scarcity of documentation, it is difficult to estimate the total number of houses designed by...
architects, but there are enough tender calls by architects for contractors for a wide range of buildings to suggest that their intervention in the designing process was common. Builders such as the prolific Hay brothers were not necessarily designers. Architects would have consulted architectural pattern books and journals and paid close attention to what their competition was designing.

We know of at least one set of drawings for a front-gable Ontario Cottage by an architect, William Coverdale [1801-1865]. The very detailed written specifications and drawings for his stone house “Prospect Hill” built in 1848 on Division Street for Patrick C. Murdock, butcher, have survived but not the house itself (fig. 35).53 The front gable has gentle angles protecting the rectangular nine-pane window, which intrudes into the main wall and illuminates the upper stair hall. The verandah has a graceful, bell-cast roof supported by four Tuscan columns and sheltering one modified Venetian window to each side of the main doorway, which is composed of a six-panel door with transom and sidelights. As is often found on this type of house, particularly when there is plenty of land available, the drawings show a long, one-storey rear wing composed of a drive-shed and a kitchen with a cooking fireplace. Also typical, are the gable-end walls with a pair of double-hung, twelve-pane windows per storey. The Murdock House’s main façade with a stone chimney over each of the gable-end walls shows the symmetry characteristic of the Ontario Cottage.

Interiors often featured on the main floor wide central stair halls (fig. 36), flanked by spacious rooms with generous windows and bold woodwork around fireplaces and doorways. Examples include the 1876 Milton House facing Highway 15 at CFB Kingston, 80 Gore Road (now part of the Pittsburgh Library), and the Blacklock House at 1060 Unity Road.

Well-known Canadian artist Daniel Fowler designed his own house, “The Cedars,” finished in 1856 on Amherst Island (fig. 37). It was roughcast (stuccoed) over stone, which helped to unify the appearance given that he had built an older section in log in 1848. Of considerable width, it was one and a half storeys and characterized by Fowler as “a decidedly ornamental house of this cottage class,” and bespoke “the hand of taste and culture.” In fact, it was described by Lady Macdonald during a visit around 1884 as a “charming cottage.” Fowler heartedly agreed and, as the designer-owner, offered this description:

It stands on a terrace, and presents to the west a frontage of fifty feet. It is rough-cast, but time has chastened its tone, and the entrance door and windows and wide eave are all marked out in ornamental designs in wood-work. The pendant frieze or cornice from the eave is particularly effective; it is continuous (except when broken by a dormer window, which forms the centre of the design) and is of the nature of a canopy.55

Typical of many cottages illustrated at mid-century, the front gable rises with its own wall above the main eaves (fig. 34), in contrast to gables with eaves that merge...
FIG. 36. ENTRANCE HALL, MILTON HOUSE, CANADIAN FORCES BASE, KINGSTON. | JENNIFER MCKENDRY.
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FIG. 40. 888 MONTREAL ST., KINGSTON. | JENNIFER MCKENDRY.

FIG. 41. ONE OF A PAIR OF GATEHOUSES, ROBERT GAGE, ARCHITECT, C. 1877, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, HWY 2, KINGSTON. | JENNIFER MCKENDRY.

FIG. 42. 2268 SYDENHAM RD., ELGINBURG VILLAGE, KINGSTON. FRONT GABLE IN PATTERN BOOK. | RESPECTIVELY, JENNIFER MCKENDRY; ILLUSTRATIONS BY DOWNING IN 1842 [COTTAGES RESIDENCES, P. 40] AND REPEATED IN 1850 [ARCHITECTURE OF COUNTRY HOUSES, P. 328].

FIG. 43. COCKED-HAT COTTAGE(?) 164 QUEEN ST., KINGSTON. | JENNIFER MCKENDRY.
into the main eaves. It works more like gable than dormer, because in the latter it is usually positioned independently in the roof itself.

Variations can be found in the front-peak window, the glazing pattern of which became more elaborate as time progressed (fig. 38). The round-arch seems to have been more popular than a rectangular or pointed form. The Samuel D. Purdy House of 1860 at 4403 Bath Road (fig. 3), for example, has a pattern of two round-arch glazing bars supporting a circular glazing bar nestled under the stone round-arch—a pattern also found on a frame house at 1566 Middle Road. In the case of 2130 Highway 2 East, the upper round-arch portion has a centre lozenge with curved sides formed by four part-circles. The lower rectangular portion, which today has only two panes, likely was originally further subdivided, as found for example on the Milton House (four panes) of 1876 facing Highway 15 on CFB Kingston land (fig. 29), or a frame house at 1861 Middle Road (twelve panes likely in a casement arrangement). The latter has a particularly elaborate pattern in the upper round-arch section, where two ogee arches are interlaced, one being upside down (fig. 38). The other, flanked to each side by a part arch, has points that align with the vertical bars of the lower rectangular portion of the window. The Medley House at 230 James Street, a stone house with a round-arch gable window, was built in 1857 in Barriefield Village. It has the proportions and feel of classicism and yet the ellipse-arch door transom has Gothic Revival pointed arches (fig. 39). The use of parapet end walls with corbels is very unusual for a front-gable Ontario Cottage.

Ogee arches traditionally belong to the Gothic Revival style, but this is contradictory when positioned within a classical round arch. It was inevitable, however, that a more consistent approach to medievalism would occur locally in the late nineteenth century, as appreciation for the medieval era intensified. A handsome example is found in an 1870s frame house at 888 Montreal Street (fig. 40). More has happened than substituting a pointed arch for a round one in the front-peak window. Now the angles of the front peak are noticeably steeper, as is the main roof. The trend toward a vertical emphasis is part of this general interest in medievalism but, for the Ontario Cottage, symmetry could not be so easily relinquished. However, there was an evident fascination with the ornamental aspects of the Gothic, as seen in the fanciful cornice and verge (or barge) boards on the eaves of the front peak and gable-end walls. The verge boards and occasional finial can sometimes outshine the front-peak window, as at 129 William Street of the early 1870s, where a simple angle forms a glazed triangle over the lower portion of the window. This was a fairly popular shape, even finding its way onto the fronts and backs of the pair of stone gatehouses built about 1877 by architect Robert Gage, next to Highway 2 at the Royal Military College (fig. 41). The gatehouses were sited at right angles to the highway, using front and rear gables created a formal appearance, whether the passer-by was traveling from or to Kingston.

Finials, pendants, and verge boards were sometimes teamed up with classical front-peak windows, such as 2268 Sydenham Road in Elginburg Village (fig. 42), recalling one of Downings’s 1842 and 1850 illustrations. This attractive frame house features a round arch window with a pair of round-arch panes supporting a circular pane. The cornice of the verandah with its cut-out board reinforces the decoration of the front peak.

Another variant in the 1870s and 1880s was the extension of the front-peak window into a doorway accessing the verandah or entrance porch roof, which acted as a balcony, for example at 2973 Orser Road.

But how many front gables are one too many? Downing had some unkind words to say on the subject in 1850:

The cocked-hat cottage is, perhaps, a little better, for it is an imitative exaggeration, not a downright caricature. This species of cottage has grown out of an admiration for the real and intrinsic beauty of the rural-Gothic cottage, of which gables are strongly characteristic features. But some uneducated builders, imagining that the whole secret of designing a cottage in the Gothic style, lies in providing gables, have so overdone the matter, that, turn to which side of their houses we will, nothing but gables salutes our eyes. A great many gables in the front of a Gothic villa of large size may have a good effect; but to stick them in the front of a cottage of 25 feet front, and, not content with this, to repeat them everywhere else upon the roof where a gable can possibly be perched, is only to give the cottage the appearance, as the familiar saying goes, of having been “knocked into a cocked hat.” A journey among the attic sleeping-rooms of such a cottage is like that geographical exploration of the peaks of all the highest mountains, made by beginners, in the corner of a map of the world.

Perhaps he would not have too harshly criticized 164 Queen Street (fig. 43) of the early 1870s with its three front gables, as the design in polychromatic brick seems well disciplined—surely not “knocked into a cocked hat.”

During the late nineteenth century, the Ontario Cottage with its front peak was losing favour to more complex house
forms, which embraced asymmetry. Before its final bow, it had a fling as a secondary wing on houses often favouring an L-plan. A good example is the late 1870s brick house at 69 Lower Union Street (fig. 44) with its spectacular verge boards on the part of the house projecting with its bay window toward the street and a secondary (but visually important) wing set back and positioned parallel to the street. This wing has a verandah, over which a gable holds a round-arch window. The general composition is also found in frame at 266 Mowat Avenue and 557 Union Street from the 1880s. These do not qualify as “Ontario Cottages” but do suggest a legacy. It can be argued that the front-peak cottage—which featured symmetry including a centred entranceway—could not survive the pressure of the Medieval Revival style, which stressed irregular forms.

The classic front-peak Ontario Cottage does not seem to continue into the modern era with the tenacity of the hipped-roof and gable-roof versions. It has, however, been revived in recent years as a type suitable for heritage districts such as Barriefield Village, for example 401 Wellington Street (fig. 45) in board and batten with a pointed-arch front-peak window, as well as 402 Wellington and 416 Regent Street in clapboard with a rectangular front-gable window. As for 405 Regent Street in stone, it has an unusual arrangement of a rectangular front-peak window flanked to each side with a triangular one. There are five modern, frame “Ontario Cottages” with a variety of shapes of gable windows on Green Bay Road in Barriefield.

CONCLUSION

It is important to remember that the differing opinions in secondary sources on what constitutes “the Ontario Cottage” were written long after these houses were built. It is easy to get caught up in such terminology in retrospect, although it serves a purpose as an attempt to categorize and make more understandable the bewildering variety of building types and styles in the nineteenth century. Downing, writing in the heyday of “the Ontario Cottage,” said it best: a cottage...
is a small house. Whether one sides with DiStefano’s or Kalman’s definition, or my proposal to include three variants, our appreciation and enthusiasm for these small houses, which have such a pleasing appearance mingled with useful functional qualities, will hopefully prevent their loss through demolition, unsympathetic alterations, or neglect. The signs are promising with the successful conversion of the early 1860s Rutton House at 80 Gore Road into a branch of the Pittsburgh Library (fig. 46). Visually compelling, the front-gable houses should not make us overlook the small simple buildings, which appeared as early as the 1780s with hipped- and gable-roofs. They were the longest and most consistently built, for example 113 Charles Street, a stone house with a hipped roof in 1849, or 711 King Street West, a frame house with a gable roof in 1844 (fig. 25). In 1850, Downing saw in these houses a “simple, truthful character, which is the greatest source of Cottage Architecture,” and lauded their “regularity, uniformity, proportion and symmetry,” and the fact that they were lived in by “industrious and intelligent mechanics and working men, the bone and sinew of the land, who own the ground upon which they stand, build them for their own use, and arrange them to satisfy their own peculiar wants and gratify their own tastes.”

The Last Word:
“that charming cottage”
– Lady Macdonald’s 1880s characterization of Daniel Fowler’s residence on Amherst Island.

NOTES

1. A version of this paper was presented as a public lecture on August 11, 2016, in the Heritage Resource Centre of Kingston City Hall National Historic Site.
4. Quoted in his autobiography found in Smith, Frances K., 1979, Daniel Fowler of Amherst Island, 1810-1894, Kingston, Agnes Etherington Art Centre, p. 148. The still-standing house, designed by Fowler, has a front gable.
5. One needs to be cautious in case such cottages were built in this area but have not survived. However, thatched roofs were not found here.
8. I find “Regency” applied to Ontario architecture a somewhat annoying term, as the British dates for the actual Regency, 1811-1820, do not correspond to the later dates of this style in provincial architecture.
11. Symmetry and simplicity of cottage design would seem to go against the idea of the picturesque, so prevalent in British planning in the late eighteenth century and into the early nineteenth, but North American scenery sometimes created that effect as a setting for rural or suburban cottages. Downing pointed this out in 1850 (p. 46 and 48).
14. DiStefano writes: “It is impossible to know who built the first Ontario cottage.” (p. 33), but surely Government House in Kingston is a contender (however there may have been other candidates at Niagara and York). The painting is by James Peachey in the Library and Archives Canada C-1511.
15. This measurement was established in Mcredy, Stephen, 1984, “Simcoe House,” Historic Kingston, vol. 32, p. 75-84 (see p. 77). Its one-storey height suggests it was a cottage, as opposed to a villa or mansion. Functionally, of course, it was not a farm house.
16. This has been noted by a number of authors, including DiStefano, “The Ontario Cottage: the Globalization of a British Form...” : 35. The Vidal painting is in the collection of the Royal Military College, Kingston. An oddity is that no chimneys are shown in the painting. One would typically expect a large central chimney or a chimney at each end. It was perhaps at the rear to service both the main house and a wing, as was the case for the Main Guard House (NMC S139), and the artist’s perspective hid it from view. Dixon’s map of 1815 shows the Commodore’s House in a U-shaped footprint (Library and Archives Canada MIKAN 4132047). It had disappeared by the time of a map of 1853 (WOS5-886 p. 732A). On June 11, 1815, a “Survey of His Majesty’s Buildings wharves etc. at the Naval Establishment at Kingston” (LAC MG12 Adm 106 v 1999) describes this building located within the dock yard: “32/Dwelling house for the Master Attendant, a log building clap boarded with a shingled roof. Its front is 45 ft and depth 22 ft. It has two wings each 21 ft long and 22 ft broad. It is in good repair except the roof which requires to be shifted from its having several gutters that can never be kept tight” (information forwarded by Susan Bazely). It is possible that the building was shared by others but known as the Commodore’s House when he was in residence.
18. [My Italic]Kungston Chronicle, December 26, 1829. The cottage was distinguished from “a very good farm house” also on the property of some 400 acres “on the Bay of Quinte,” 8 miles from Kingston (that is, to West St.). The property had been put up for sale by Payne as early as 1823 (Kingston Chronicle, May 23, 1823), and again by Mrs. Graham in 1841 (Chronicle & Gazette, June 26, 1841), when the “70-ft verandah,” “sufficient to protect from the most inclement season,” was again mentioned. The Gravams owned some property in the vicinity of the Little Catararau Creek (concession 1, lots 13, 14 and 15). Payne’s cottage was likely frame, as stone or brick would have been specified in the sales notices.


21. Fate has not been kind in Kingston to rows of workers’ cottages, some of which were two-storeys in either frame or stone and with either a hipped or gable roof. Gone are the Naval Cottages on Point Frederick (stone, 16 units, 1½ storeys, 1822 to 1910), the Marine Railway Cottages on Ontario St. at Gore (stone, 16 units, 2 storeys, late 1830s to c. 1910), Coverdale’s Cottages on Centre St. (stucco over frame, 5 units, architect William Coverdale, ½ storeys, 1840s to 1967), Horsey’s Cottages on Clergy between Brock and Princess (stucco over frame, 18 units, architect Edward Horsey, 1841 to 1862, when destroyed by fire), and Morton’s Cottages on King St. W. at Beverley (frame in 3 rows of 6 units each, architect William Coverdale, 1853 to 1897; the King St. row was rebuilt in brick and brick veneer after a fire on October 2, 1897).

Pattern books: Lamond, Robert, 1821, *A Narrative of the Rise and Progress of Emigration from the Counties of Lanark & Renfrew to the New Settlements in Upper Canada on Government Grant... with... Designs for Cottages...* Glasgow, Chalmers & Collins; Loudon, John Claudius, 1839 and 1883, *An Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture*, new edition, New York, Worthington; Allen, Lewis, 1853, *Rural Architecture... Farm Houses, Cottages and Out Buildings*, New York, Saxton—the 1852 edition was for sale in Kingston in March of that year (*Daily British Whig*, March 30, 1852); [Tarbuck, Edward Lance], c. 1856, *The Builder’s Practical Director or Buildings for All Classes*, London, J. Hagger—this book was mentioned in one of architect William Coverdale’s notebooks (private collection). The “Labourer’s Cottage” closely resembles one photographed in the 1960s on Front Rd., Kingston (Hazelgrove Fonds 493-8, Queen’s University Archives).

22. The roof is now complex with dormers but may have been plain when built. By 1871, there were four large bedrooms upstairs (plus a servant’s bedroom, which was likely in the wing), for which dormers were needed. *Kingston Daily News*, June 30, 1871.


24. It does not appear on a map of 1829. Certain aspects such as the doorway relate to other Kingston houses of the early 1830s, for example the Gildersleeve House (264 King St. E. at Johnson) and the Robert David Cartwright House (191 King E. at Gore). It was described in the 1843 tax assessment as one storey, although this does not eliminate the possibility of living space in the attic.


26. This was Daniel Fowler’s opinion (in Smith: 148). He felt the shade needed during the heat of a Canadian summer could be provided by a judiciously placed row of maple trees. He built a terrace instead of a verandah for his 1856 cottage on Amherst Island (see fig. 37).

27. *The Daily British Whig* pointed out that farmers could find revenue from building “cheap summer cottages” along the prettiest part of the Bay of Quinte (July 27, 1887, p. 3).


29. Lent: 22-25. His “Canadian Home” (p. 12) was a full two storeys plus attic and would have looked at home in a city setting. He did illustrate (but without a caption) a small, one-storey, hipped-roof cottage, for which the roof pitches extended to form the verandah roofs (p. 34) (fig. 11).

30. This is basically a commercial, undated, book on the heat of a Canadian summer could be provided by a judiciously placed row of maple trees. He built a terrace instead of a verandah for his 1856 cottage on Amherst Island (see fig. 37).


32. Library and Archives Canada C-1512. See also Elizabeth Simcoe’s sketches of Kingston in the late eighteenth century in the Ontario Archives 10007094.

33. Lamond: plate 1.

34. Photographed inside and out by the author in March 1978, at a time when it was boarded over and the rear wing (frame with rough brick and stone infill) was in poor condition. Likely demolished, its present fate is unknown (in 1978, it was thought that it would be dismantled and moved).

35. Not on a map of 1828, but on one from 1850.

36. The two-storey, double stone houses, 6-12 Rideau St., were added in 1841 between the lower houses, which date from the 1820s. 2-4 Rideau St. are on the 1947 fire insurance plan but missing on that of 1963.

37. *Kingston Gazette*, July 22, 1871, when in use as the hydrographer’s office. An extensive file can be found in Angus S054.2, box 1, file 12, Queen’s University Archives. Parts of the interior were photographed just before its demolition in 1964. See also Margaret Angus’s article in the Frontenac Historic Foundation newsletter of May 1985. Line drawings were made in 1824 of its elevation, plans and section, as well as the stable (NMC 5137). Described as “Cataraqui Cottage” in the *British Whig Special Number*, May 1895, it was included in Pense’s booklet of 1904 as an example of an early Kingston building. None of this attention guaranteed its survival in the 1960s.


39. Perhaps built at the time of lawyer George Macaulay’s marriage to Jane Hagerman in 1822.

40. Tender call in the *Chronicle & Gazette* for **Hales Cottages, May 5, 1841, and for sale as a range of 5 cottages or separately, in the Kingston Daily News, December 24, 1855.** The end unit at Centre St. was replaced by the time of the 1908 fire insurance plan. A view of 313 King St. W. with its original roof is in the John Nolen Papers, Cornell University, illustrated in the *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada*, 2006, vol. 31, no. 1, p. 44.


42. Restored from a historic photograph by Helen and Gerald Finley of Kingston.

43. Benjamin, Asher, 1830, *The Architect, or Practical House Carpenter*, Boston, L. Coffin, plate LII.

44. Restored in 1982 as a single-family house; currently with a recent addition and rented to a number of tenants. See McKendry, *Portsmouth Village*: 54-55.

46. Plaw in Sketches for Country Houses, Villas and Rural Dwellings..., plate 1, shows a one-and-a-half-storey cottage with a thatched roof and a front gable as early as 1800. What is striking as a prototype for the Ontario Cottages of mid-century is the symmetrical disposition of the front elevation (unlike the irregular design of most traditional country cottages). Plaw’s gable window, however, does not extend into the main wall.


48. The stable on Lily’s Lane (originally serving houses fronting Bagot St.) is not on maps of 1850, it may be on the 1865 Innis map of Kingston (copy in Stauffer Library, Queen’s University, Kingston), and is on the 1869 Ordnance Plan, WO78-4860-2, sheet 3, plan 16.


50. Middle Rd., Pittsburgh Township: 810, 1566, 1664 (addition?), 1861, 2130, 2311, 2478, concession 2, lot 10. Princess St. (Hwy 2 W.): 3562, 3606, 3728, 3761, 3791.


53. The Hay family emigrated from Scotland in 1857. Brothers Donald, John, and Alexander were stone masons.

54. Private collection. There are two sets of Murdock's house in Kingston appears to have been demolished by the time of an aerial photo of 1953. The site is now occupied by the new municipal Public Works building.

55. Smith: 147-148. Still extant at 14005 Front Rd., there is an original date-stone of 1850 over the front door. Fowler likely supplied a drawing of the house and pavilion for J.H. Meacham’s Frontenac, Lennox and Addington County Atlas of 1878, p. 50. The year of Lady Macdonald’s visit was not stated by Fowler, although he mentioned that the CPR was nearing completion. John A. Macdonald was invited to lay the cornerstone of St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church on Amherst Island on August 30, 1883, but apparently was unable to attend and the cornerstone was laid by the Revd. James Williamison, his brother-in-law (Library and Archives Canada, Macdonald correspondence, vol. 395, part II, August 10, 1883; Macdonald is not mentioned in the write-up of the event in the Daily British Whig, August 31, 1883).


57. Compare this glazing pattern with the library at 80 Gore Rd. and Hwy 15 (fig. 46).

58. The point-arch glazing pattern in the front gable of 239 James St. was installed by the owner in the 1970s, before a 1930s photograph was discovered showing that the pattern had been a simple rectangular system (but that the fanlight glazing pattern is original). Thanks to Bob Cardwell, the owner of this house, for drawing my attention to this.

59. 888 Montreal St. is not on the 1869 Ordnance Plan but is in Meacham’s Frontenac, Lennox and Addington County Atlas of 1878. It is shown with the front verandah wrapping around the side south wall on the 1908 fire insurance plan.

60. 129 William St. is not on the 1869 Ordnance Plan but seems to be on the 1875 print of Herman Brosius Bird’s-eye View of Kingston, original print at Queen’s University Archives, Kingston. 81 Lower Union St. of 1874 also has an angular top to the front-peak window.

61. “Market Battery – Entrance Lodges and Gateway between same, together with the side walls and a portion of returns, have been taken down to the level of the ground and the materials transported close to the future site on the Barriefield Road.” Department of Public Works, Ottawa, July 5, 1875, RG11 B1(a), vol. 540, subject 57, p. 20. Robert Gage was working for the government on Point Frederick at the time, for example on the Education Block, now known as the Mackenzie Building. The Market Battery was on the site of today’s Confederation Park opposite Kingston City Hall.


63. This expression meant to be soundly and swiftly defeated. 164 Queen St. is not on the 1869 Ordnance Plan but is on the 1875 print of the Brosius Bird’s-eye View of Kingston. It was probably built c. 1872 for R.M. Horsey, a merchant.

64. 69 Lower Union bears a strong resemblance to a house illustrated in The Canada Farmer, vol. 1, May 16, 1864, p. 132-133, although there were earlier precedents for the general form.

65. Such as 95 Charles St., which, in 1973, went from being a front-gable, 1½-storey stone house to a lower storey topped by a new frame storey, or loss through neglect as in a once-delightful frame, front-gable house on Battersea Rd., photographed by Jennifer McKendry in 1972 and used as the front cover of In Praise of Older Buildings (by Gerald Finley in 1976, Kingston, Frontenac Historic Foundation).

66. The handsome, Gothic Revival, glazing pattern with interlacing ogee arches in the front gable matched one now removed from the Blacklock House, 1060 Unity Rd.

67. 113 Charles St. is not on a map of 1842 but is on one of 1850. By 1875, it had a full verandah across the front (Brosius’s view). For 711 King St. W., see McKendry, Portsmouth Village: 54-55.