

INTRODUCTION

1. SUMMARY

This report provides a synopsis of research conducted in the autumn of 2008. Research includes an examination of sources relating to horticulture at Beaconsfield specifically, and to Prince Edward Island generally during the years that the Peakes and Cundalls lived at Beaconsfield, that is 1877-1916. Research also includes a geophysical survey conducted by Mr. Jason Jeandron of Archaeological Prospectors (New Brunswick) on 17 October 2008. During this period of research, regular consultations with Dr. David Keenlyside (Executive Director, P.E.I. Museum and Heritage Foundation) took place, and Mr. Boyde Becke and Dr. Edward MacDonald served as historical advisors.

This report provides some interpretation of the sources, and offers general recommendations for further work leading to the creation of a heritage landscape on the grounds of Beaconsfield. This report should be treated as the first phase of a heritage landscape project. Further research and discussion of the issues addressed here are necessary before any final decisions can be made.

2. PREVIOUS STUDIES

In 1986, Geoff Hogan produced *Proposal: A Victorian Garden Plan for Beaconsfield*, which recommended creating a heritage garden in the Victorian style at Beaconsfield. Hogan recommended a recreation of a parterre garden based on the plan designed for Government House in 1856 (figure 78), the introduction of a croquet lawn, a reconstruction of the fence that once surrounded the property, and the planting of several shrubs. The present parterre garden to the west of the house is a result of this proposal.

The proposal itself was modest, and reflects an approach to landscape restoration that has since been superseded, i.e. the inclusion of modern plant varieties, and a compilation of disparate features. However, Hogan strongly emphasised the heritage value of the grounds and their significant potential in enhancing the site as a whole.

Given Geoff Hogan's passion for the natural history of Prince Edward Island, his involvement in early attempts to create a garden at Beaconsfield, as well as his untimely death, it is recommended that any landscape design include the incorporation of a plaque in some part of the grounds commemorating his efforts.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Re-evaluate function of site

3.1.1 Office space vs. heritage site

It is recommended that the grounds of Beaconsfield be redesigned to reflect a historically accurate landscape in keeping with the period of the house while it was a private residence. This requires not only redesigning the grounds, but redefining their function. When Beaconsfield was acquired by the Heritage Foundation in the 1970s, the building was treated principally as office space, equipped with a genealogy room and other administrative offices. At that time, the goal was rehabilitation of the building and grounds. This is evident from the landscape plan prepared for the site by the Department of Tourism, P.E.I. in 1973, which recommended the addition of modern plants and picnic tables. The building has subsequently been reconstructed to reflect a Victorian home, re-establishing its historic value. However, the grounds have continued to be treated as land surrounding a modern administrative building and have not progressed beyond the stage of rehabilitation. It is recommended that the grounds be reconstructed to a level comparable to that of the house.

3.1.2 The wider heritage district

Beaconsfield should be treated as part of wider heritage district, including the site itself, Government House, Fort Edward, and possibly surrounding historic homes on West Street. This was recommended in 1993 in the report produced by John Zvonar for the Government House Garden Committee. Zvonar concluded:

“It is important to consider Government House and its grounds as part of a larger district, from and to which views are very important.”¹

“This historic house and grounds [of Beaconsfield] provide a compatible and promising southern edge on the road towards Government House although its site has lost its own historic integrity.”²

In his final recommendations, Zvonar advised that the Government House Garden Committee consider the development of the wider area around Government House. He added that “a comprehensive landscape conservation study is necessary to re-establish the historic integrity of [Beaconsfield], and to augment that of the district.”³

In its *Management Plan* for 2005, Argowan was also advised to improve its connections with other heritage sites in Charlottetown, and to co-ordinate interests.⁴

3.2 Identify historical requirements

Any changes made to the grounds at Beaconsfield should at all times be based on verified historical evidence, whether documented or physical. Decisions should not be made based on guesswork or modern preferences. In making any decisions, a full awareness of what is appropriate and what is inappropriate is necessary.

3.2.1 Remove historically inappropriate features

Currently the area around the main entrance of the house includes several historical anachronisms, such as modern electric lighting, a concrete drive and a parking lot. As Rudy and Joy Favretti have stated in *Landscapes and Gardens for Historic Buildings*: “There is nothing that will destroy the mood and motif of your site more than a series of parked cars or even a single one.”⁵ It is recommended that the parking lot, concrete, and modern lighting be removed and replaced with historically appropriate features and materials.

Currently there is a parking lot at the south-east corner of the property. Since some parking space is needed for staff and visitors, it is recommended that this be the sole parking area, and that it be blocked from the view of visitors approaching the house at the main entrance.

A significant amount of space to the south of the house is taken up by a large wheelchair ramp and plank walkway. It is recommended that this be replaced with a more compact ramp, and that the plank walkway be removed where it is unnecessary.

The parterre garden recommended by Geoff Hogan currently exists to the west of the house. While it is based on a standard 5-bed design created for Government House in 1856, it has no historical precedent at Beaconsfield. It is often untidy, and appears disconnected within the wider expanse of lawn. It is recommended that this be removed so that a more integral design can be incorporated. If desired, this same parterre garden can be incorporated elsewhere on the grounds where it can be better integrated into the overall design.

¹ Zvonar, p. 2

² Zvonar p. 12

³ Zvonar p. 22

⁴ *Management Plan*, pp. vii, 27-8

⁵ Favretti and Favretti, p. 87

3.2.2 Incorporate historically appropriate features

Evidence suggests that there was modest horticultural activity on the grounds of Beaconsfield while it was a private residence. The wide expanse of lawn that currently exists appears to reflect what existed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Unfortunately, this does little to attract visitors to the site or to emphasise the heritage value of the house. Since little appears to have existed on the grounds, or at best there is insufficient evidence to determine what existed, this makes a full restoration of the grounds impossible. It is therefore recommended that the grounds be designed to reflect a Charlottetown garden of a particular era, creating a compilation of features based on evidence of Beaconsfield and other contemporary gardens in the area. Since most heritage gardens in Charlottetown currently reflect the Victorian period, it is recommended that the grounds at Beaconsfield reflect the Edwardian period, that is the early twentieth century.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

A number of sites in the Charlottetown area have already conducted studies of varying detail in an effort to create heritage landscapes. It is recommended that attempts be made to share as much information with these sites as possible, and to encourage relationships that may eventually lead to a formal heritage landscape society.

1. GOVERNMENT HOUSE

The Government House Garden Committee oversees the development of the landscape at Fanningbank. In the late 1980s and early 1990s three reports were presented to the committee, providing recommendations as to the restoration of the site's grounds. These include:

- Sally Coutts; *Government House Grounds, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island* (1987?)
- Linda Fardin; *Fanningbank, Charlottetown P.E.I.: Period Landscape Development Proposal* (aka *Landscape Preservation Study for Fanningbank, Known as Government House National Historic Site, Charlottetown, P.E.I.*) (Restoration Services Division, 1988)
- John E. Zvonar; *Fanningbank, Government House National Historic Site, Charlottetown, P.E.I.: Landscape Preservation Study Report and Recommendations* (1993)

Several of the recommendations from these reports have already been implemented, while the committee continues to oversee continued development of the grounds.

2. ARDGOWAN

In the early 1980s, the buildings and grounds at Ardgowan were rehabilitated by Parks Canada so that the property could be used for administrative purposes. The grounds were developed to reflect the type of landscape that might have surrounded the home in the mid-nineteenth century, based on contemporary evidence. However, as the site's primary goal is not to serve as a heritage site, its grounds only minimally reflect a historic landscape.

Brief reports related to the rehabilitation of the grounds at Ardgowan can be found in the following:

- Thomas Gribbon and Judith Tulloch; "Ardgowan - The Restoration of an Island Garden"; *Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology*, vol. 18 nos. 1-2 (1986) pp. 99-105
- Thomas Gribbon and Judith Tulloch; "Ardgowan: The Restoration of a Landscape Garden"; *The Island Magazine*, no. 13 (spring/summer 1983) pp. 28-31
- Annette MacKinnon; *Ardgowan National Park* (Parks and People Association, 1983)
- *Ardgowan: National Historic Site of Canada - Management Plan* (Parks Canada, May 2005)

Ardgowan is a particularly useful resource for national guidelines related to the restoration and maintenance of heritage landscapes.

3. OTHER SITES

Other sites in the area, such as Province House and the Experimental Farm at Ravenwood, are also potential locations for grounds restorations. Although there is interest in preserving the landscapes of these sites, little has been done to date. The creation of a wider heritage landscape society may help to preserve

these sites. Ultimately, this would benefit Beaconsfield, as it would lead to a stronger voice amongst heritage sites generally.

BACKGROUND

1. HORTICULTURE IN P.E.I.

One of the earliest horticultural enthusiasts in the province was the anonymous writer “Agriculture” who wrote a newspaper column in the 1830s called “Hints on Gardening, &c. Suited to Prince Edward Island.” In it the author identified vegetables, fruits and flowers that would have been well known to people in Britain, and which the author thought most suitable for growing in the local soil and climate.¹ The author provided simple instructions on how to grow and maintain the plants he recommended. It should be noted, however, that the plants that he discussed were not necessarily what people *did* grow in P.E.I., rather what he thought *could* grow. Nonetheless, he assumed a general knowledge of fruits, vegetables and flowers commonly found in a British garden.

“Agriculture” seems to have viewed himself as a voice crying out in the wilderness. In his final column in 1838, he responded to complaints that his helpful hints were too urbane for a primarily farming community. He asked: “Why should the farmers here not advance as in every other civilized country? Why should they not improve their condition when they can?” He concluded his column indignantly by stating that many of his recommendations could easily be followed, were it not for the fact that “the Garden seems in this Island to be thought unworthy of any notice.”²

In the 1840s, immigrant John Lawson echoed the same opinion when writing to friends and family in England. He wrote that horticulture in P.E.I. was certainly not what his correspondents were used to, stating: “I am constrained to confess, that the taste for gardening is of slow growth.”³ He wrote that in previous decades, it took little to be considered a gardening enthusiast, when “a few horse-shoe geraniums, a myrtle or two, and perhaps an artemesia, gave the possessors a consequence and a reputation for a taste for the elegancies of life, that was quite gratifying to the favoured few. The first fuschia created a sensation.”⁴ Lawson went on to enthuse about what *could* grow in the province, probably hoping to entice his correspondent with visions of new world opportunities.

Public spaces were also notably uninspiring, as regular complaints about the muddy squares in Charlottetown attest during the nineteenth century. When Queen Square fronting Province House was redesigned under the direction of Arthur Newbury in the 1880s, it appears to have been a giant leap forward for flowers. It is very unfortunate that his efforts have since been eradicated.

1.1 Private homes

That is not to say that gardens were universally eschewed in the province in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There are certainly exceptions, and some notable amateur gardeners made significant efforts to cultivate and beautify the grounds of their homes. The grounds of early nineteenth-century homes like Holland Grove (figure 1) and Warblington (figure 2) reflected a distinctive Georgian taste for the picturesque landscape of open and rolling vistas across long unbroken lawns surrounded by large trees. Flower beds were minimal, and the total effect was singularly green in colour. This would also have been the original style of the surrounding landscape at Fanningbank, built in 1834, and Fairholm, built 1838-9. While the goal of the style was to have a “natural” landscape, it was a decidedly Enlightenment understanding of nature, that is highly controlled.

¹ For example, the author advised readers to try growing round-leafed spinach as opposed to “the prickly sort grown in Britain.” “Hints...”, *The Colonial Herald*, 20 Jan. 1838, p. 1 col. 2

² “Hints...”, *Colonial Herald*, 16 May 1838, p. 4 col. 4

³ Lawson, Letter XVI

⁴ Lawson, Letter XVI

The common Victorian style eschewed the pretence of representing the natural and focussed instead on the new, the exotic, the mechanical and manipulated. It was, like popular styles generally in the nineteenth century, a reflection of the Industrial Revolution and its glorification of the manufactured and artificial. Flower beds with contrived patterns were popular. Victorian gardens also included an eclectic mixture of geographical styles, from oriental to Italian renaissance. Exotic plants newly available to the western world were popular, as were plants with large-leafed foliage. Typical features found in the Victorian garden were curved paths and drives, circular beds of tightly-packed annuals in a mix of colours, as well as urns, and clumps of trees. Carpet bedding was popular, requiring plants of the same height and general size laid out in patterns, which required a high level of skill and maintenance. Carpet bedding is still the ubiquitous feature of most municipal parks.

These standard features were to be found throughout the established homes of P.E.I. The grounds of many residences illustrated in what is commonly known as *Meacham's Atlas* of 1880 demonstrate this standard Victorian style, including Fairholm (figure 3), Willow Cottage (figure 4) and Tulloch (figure 5). A combination of features could be found at homes like Westbourne (figure 6) and at the home of Judge R.R. Fitzgerald (figure 7).¹ Standard Victorian features abound in Arthur Newbury's design for Queen Square.²

Some popular Victorian features lingered on into the early twentieth century, which can be seen at the homes of Arthur Newbury³ (figure 8) and William Louson (figure 9). However by this point some gardens, particularly those of the larger homes, were starting to reflect a reaction against the rigidity of Victorian bedding styles. During the Edwardian period, carpet bedding came to be replaced by colourful perennial borders, and a renewed taste for the "natural" emerged, leading to artfully designed woodland and waterside gardens combining native and exotic plants. The appeal of the "natural" garden was reflected in the cottage garden style, meant to replicate the rustic but functional garden one's grandmother might have had in her rural idyll. It is exactly this sort of grandmother's garden that was described so well in Lucy Maude Montgomery's article "A Garden of Old Delights" in 1907.

This more informal Edwardian style of planting can be seen in the local gardens of William Louson (figure 10), at Riverside on West Street (figure 11), and at other homes in the area (figures 12 and 13). While Edwardian beds and garden areas were planted to look informal and native, the overall landscape was highly structured and architectural, using permanent features such as pergolas, exedras, buildings and walls both to divide and tie together individual planting areas. For those with the space to do it, areas of different heights were popular, incorporating terraces and rock gardens.

1.2 Agriculture

Like "Agriculture," John Lawson noted that the inherent conservatism amongst local residents, whose apparent unwillingness to change or adopt new methods of farming, was potentially damaging. Lawson wrote: "Our farmers or the majority of them, are, I think, fully aware that the potato is not now to be relied upon, as it used to be, as one of the staple productions of the island, for export or for the sustenance of cattle during the Winter - and have accordingly betaken themselves to the raising of Turnips, particularly Swedes, which stand keeping over the Winter best - carrots, parsnips and beets."⁴

Despite Lawson's regular attempts to put an optimistic spin on his observations, not much seems to have changed over the subsequent decades as each successive Lieutenant Governor opening local agricultural exhibitions invariably began with a lament over the unwillingness of residents to grow new products or

¹ Henry Cundall would have been familiar with Judge Fitzgerald's property. Occasional notes in his diary indicate that he attended croquet, lawn tennis, anniversary and other types of parties at the Fitzgerald home.

² The Public Archives houses numerous photographs of the grounds of Queen Square, showing urns, carpet bedding, a fountain, large-leafed plants, etc.

³ Henry Cundall was a friend of the Newbury family and was made godfather to Adele Newbury in 1890 (Cundall diaries, 24 Nov. 1890). He would have been familiar with the Newbury home and gardens.

⁴ Lawson, p. 57

adopt new agricultural practices being used in other parts of the country. A lack of crop rotation, an over-reliance on growing potatoes, and the resulting soil damage were regular themes.

“Agriculture” and John Lawson do not appear to have been alone in their views on the state of agriculture in the province. Practices and knowledge were generally viewed as poor, prompting the creation of the Central Agricultural Society in 1827. In the following few years, other local societies emerged as well. The mandate of the Central Agricultural Society was to arrange for seed and tools to be shipped to the province and distributed to smaller localised societies for further distribution. However, standards appear to have declined amongst the Society as well, as a letter from “Agriculture” to the editor of the *Colonial Herald* in 1838 suggested. The writer complained that the seeds imported by the Central Agricultural Society were overpriced and of poor quality, calling for an independent importer, who would take responsibility for the quality of seed.¹ Other problems also plagued the Society, which became the Royal Agricultural Society of Prince Edward Island in 1845.

Annual agricultural exhibitions were held in Prince Edward Island at both the provincial and county levels. Prize lists for the various competitions, including those for crops, fruits, vegetables and flowers were published in newspapers and in pamphlet form. In 1883 for example, 4,000 pamphlets including prize lists for the Provincial Exhibition were produced.²

Although farming dominated, flower devotees also existed, and Holland Grove was an early centre of horticultural enthusiasms. The Charlottetown Horticultural Society began at Holland Grove in 1851, under the patronage of its residents John and Sarah Grubb.³ For a time, strictly horticultural exhibitions and competitions also took place.

1.3 Seed businesses

In the usual way, many early residents in P.E.I. brought seeds with them when they emigrated, and grew what had been familiar to them in their country of origin. John Lawson encouraged one of his correspondents to tell his wife to bring with her to Canada any plants and seeds that she could, ensuring flower gardens to rival any she could have in England.⁴ Local newspaper advertisements show that it was also typical for individuals to receive seeds sent by ship from friends and relatives overseas, and then advertise them for sale out of their homes.⁵ Residents were also able to write to nurseries in other countries to buy seeds and bulbs. These practices were surely helped by the efforts of “Agriculture” and his column “Hints on Gardening &c.” The process of ordering from overseas, however, was often rather primitive, as the column’s author advised readers that when ordering bulbs from Holland, it was best simply to note basic things like the desired colour, as variety names were too arbitrary.⁶

Residents could also order plants, seeds and bulbs by mail from nurseries closer to home, such as the Nova Scotia Nursery and the Halifax Nursery, both in Halifax,⁷ William Rennie Co. in Toronto⁸ and the James Vick Seed Co. in Rochester, New York.⁹ As the nineteenth century progressed, it became more common for local agricultural warehouses, hardware stores, department stores, book sellers and pharmacies to sell vegetable and flower seeds. Businesses like Haszard and Moore, Carter and Co. and Patterson Brothers sold various items like stationery, books, clothing and hardware, as well as seeds. By the last quarter of the

¹ *Colonial Herald*, 11 July 1838, pl. 3 col. 3

² “Report of the Commissioners of the Provincial Exhibition, 1883” p. 6

³ Hennessey, “Painting...” p. 28

⁴ Lawson, Letter XVI

⁵ For example, a certain P. Walker advertised in 1838 that he had just received turnip seed from Aberdeen, which he was willing to sell to interested parties, while George Weldon was selling unnamed seeds from his home, which had recently arrived from overseas. (*Colonial Herald*, 25 July 1838, p. 1 col. 2).

⁶ “Hints”, *Colonial Herald*, 16 May 1838, p. 4 col. 2

⁷ *Frederick’s Prince Edward Island Directory... 1889-90*, pp. iv, 124

⁸ *The Herald*, 8 April 1885, p. 2 col. 8

⁹ *The Island Argus*, 27 Dec. 1870 p. 3 col. 2

nineteenth century, more local plant nurseries were being established, providing their own catalogues and mail order services. James Gay and Son operated a nursery in Pownal (figure 14), and there was also the Sussex Nursery in Summerside, operated by W.H. Culbert and F.L. Theal.

2. HORTICULTURE AT BEACONSFIELD

2.1 West End House: 1839 - 1875

Before Beaconsfield was built, West End House, which is now on the opposite side of West Street, stood on the site. In describing what is presumably West End House to his wife in England, John Lawson wrote of a property “opposite to the Government House, from which it is separated by a creek.” Lawson intended to rent the house, which included “out-houses and stables. It is situated and fronts on the harbor, and commands an extensive view of it and the rivers running into it; has a flower and kitchen garden, and is unconnected with any other building.”¹ Watercolours made in the 1850s during the time that the Beazeley family lived in the house suggest a tidy lawn with simple round beds of elegant shrubs and low flowers (figures 15 and 16). Photographs from the 1860s hint at what may be a large round bed to the west of the house, and what appear to be the stakes and dying vegetation of a vegetable garden to the south (figure 17).

2.2 James and Edith Peake: 1875 - 1882

James Peake bought the property in 1875 from J.S. Carvell with West End House still on the site, although it is not clear in what form the gardens existed at this stage. There is disappointingly little material to indicate what existed on the grounds of Beaconsfield during the time that the Peakes lived there. With the removal of West End House, and construction of Beaconsfield, it is unlikely that much of the original gardens survived. In any case, the most southerly part of the property seen in figure 17 was not included in the land sold to Peake.

The source that may give the closest indication of the intended layout for the grounds of Beaconsfield comes from W.C. Harris’ landscape plan for the McLennan-Hunt house in Summerside, which he designed in 1876, but which was never built (figure 18). The McLennan-Hunt house was designed around the same time that Harris designed Beaconsfield, and the plans indicate almost a mirror image of Beaconsfield and the orientation of its grounds. It is probably safe to assume that at this early stage in his career, Harris had similar ideas in mind for Beaconsfield.

The “Panoramic View of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 1878” shows the property as a whole (figure 19). It clearly indicates the house, stable, and smaller outbuilding to the east of the house. A few trees appear, with no indication of gardens. This image is of limited value, not only because it provides little detail, but also because it is clearly a combination of reality and the artist’s own fantasy, as the shorelines bear little resemblance to what existed at the time.

Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne attended a dinner at Beaconsfield hosted by Edith Peake’s father Lieutenant Governor T.H. Haviland in 1879. While the newspapers of the time provided regular descriptions of almost every inch of decoration in Charlottetown during the royal visit, descriptions of the grounds at Beaconsfield are minimal. Given Peake’s rapidly declining income and household staff, it is unlikely that he had the resources to maintain a garden of any great significance beyond this point. The only clearly datable image from this period appears in *Meacham’s Atlas* (figure 20). Here, the property is still identified as “West End House.”

¹ Lawson, p. 12

2.3 Henry Cundall: 1883 - 1916

2.3.1 Images

The Peakes left Beaconsfield in November of 1882 and in October of the following year Henry Cundall and an assortment of female relatives moved in. Cundall lived at Beaconsfield until his death in 1916. A larger number of illustrations and documents related to the property survive from this period. Cundall was an amateur photographer who took pictures of the house himself. He also referred in his diaries and correspondence to photographs and drawings made of Beaconsfield by other people.

No image can decisively be dated, although it is possible to determine a tentative chronological progression by comparing the growth of trees and changes to the buildings on the property. Figure 21 shows a group of people playing tennis on the lawn to the west of the house. There are trees on the north side of the house, and no other vegetation visible in the picture. This photograph shows the distinctive fence that included moderately ornate pickets as well as posts topped with decorations in the shape of birdhouses. Presumably this fence surrounded the property on both Kent and West Streets from its earliest stage. It also ran from the south side of the house to the southern end of the property. A section of this fence still exists on the north-east corner of the house's annex, suggesting a working yard around the stable separated from the main grounds by fences to the north and west of the stable. This would be in keeping with the Harris design for the McLennan-Hunt House, which indicates a working yard beyond the house, separated by a high fence running directly from the side of the house (figure 22).

Figure 21 has been dated variously as 1890 and c. 1910. Given the absence of any trees, shrubs or other plants on the lawn, an early date is more likely. A general date may also be inferred by the fact that people are playing tennis on the grounds. According to Henry Cundall's diary, tennis was already being played regularly on the grounds before he moved into the house in October 1883.¹ Cundall also referred to a tournament taking place there on 13 July 1883; apparently Beaconsfield served as a site for the Charlottetown Tennis Club for a brief period.² By the spring of 1884, his references to tennis at Beaconsfield cease, and payments to the Victoria Park Tennis Club begin to appear in his accounts, suggesting that the Tennis Club had moved away from the site and the lawn was no longer used for tennis.

A final clue may be the apparent absence of any coverings on the windows of the house. It could possibly indicate that the house was unoccupied, i.e. the Peakes had moved out but the Cundalls had not yet moved in. Cundall described work done at the house in preparation for his family moving in, noting in his diary on 14 September 1883: "Evans putting up blind rollers." The Cundalls moved into the house the following month.

Figure 23 is another image of Beaconsfield that is difficult to date, although it bears many similarities to figure 21. Like figure 21, it shows no vegetation to the immediate west of the house; the only tree shown appears at the north-east corner of the house. What appears to be insulating straw around the base of the verandah may also be what surrounds the verandah in figure 21. There is what may be part of a driveway at the north-west corner of the house, and a path running along the west side of the verandah, curving around to what is likely a gate through the fence near the stable. A high board fence is also visible to the east of the house. Although it is difficult to determine, the fences in this image may have the same birdhouse-style features on the posts that appear in figure 21. A significant difference is the cupola atop the stable, which does not appear in figure 21, but does appear in later photographs. Ultimately, while it is quite detailed, it is difficult to determine the reliability of this image, as it is clearly an artist's rendition. The overall perspective of the house is incorrect, and there appears to be an extension on the south side of the house which is not known ever to have existed.

Figure 24 is a photograph taken from the area of Fanningbank's gate house across Government Pond. It looks south-east towards Kent Street, Beaconsfield, and other houses along West Street. There are groups

¹ 14 May, 6 June, 13 July, 8 Aug., 23 Aug. 1883

² Several sites served the Charlottetown Tennis Club during this period. Further research would indicate when public games were being played at Beaconsfield.

of large trees to the east of Beaconsfield, along Kent Street and in the north-west corner of the property. There are also smaller trees closer to the house. There is a rail fence running along the shoreline at the west end of the property, and a plain board fence separating the grounds of Beaconsfield and neighbouring Westbourne. Westbourne itself still appears in its original position; the house was rotated and moved to the east edge of the property in 1915. Edgewater, the large house to the south of Westbourne, does not appear in this picture; it was built c. 1905. There is also a board fence along the north side of Kent Street and a rail fence around Government Pond, which were replaced with the construction of the Victoria Park Roadway, completed in 1896.¹ The photograph can tentatively be dated between the start of the roadway's construction in 1894 and 1905.

Figure 25 is a colourised postcard looking west, with Beaconsfield in the centre of the image.² The image shows Victoria Park Roadway, so is no earlier than 1896. The road originally ran as far as Fort Edward, was later extended to Brighton Road when a fence was added, and later still lighting was added. Further research into when these later additions were made would help to date the image. As well, this postcard is one of a series of postcards, which can be found in the Public Archives. It may be possible to date the collection as a whole.

The postcard shows that the board and rail fences in figure 24 had been replaced. Beaconsfield's birdhouse fence extends the length of Kent Street, with one carriage gate and one pedestrian gate. This is in keeping with figure 24, which does not show any opening where the west entrance of the current circular drive exists. The fence also runs south along West Street, and a gate post is visible near the stable. There also is what may be a fence running in front of the north side of the stable, but this is difficult to determine. The stable has a cupola and flagpole, suggesting the photograph was not taken before 1901, as the flagpole was added in this year. The stable also has a door and window openings on the north side.

Figures 26, 27, 28 and 29 were all taken from Fort Edward looking east across the water to Beaconsfield, or from a similar angle between Fort Edward and Beaconsfield. There are many photographs in the Public Archives taken from these angles, as the cannons were regularly used for special occasions, including the Queen's birthday on 24 May.³ Military parades also regularly took place along this route. These photographs are most easily dated by whether or not the Victoria Park Roadway and Edgewater exist. For example, figure 26, on which is written the year 1894, clearly pre-dates 1896 as there is a breakwater rather than a fence and roadway along the water's edge. The remaining photographs in this group show the Victoria Park Roadway. Also, while figures 26 and 27 do not show Edgewater, figure 29 does. These images are useful in that they show the developing maturity of trees on the property, locations of some of the smaller vegetation, and also the construction of the fence along the water's edge.

Figure 30 was taken from roughly the same location as figure 21, but shows Beaconsfield at a later date, as the trees to the north of the house are larger, and smaller trees at the south-west corner of the house are evident, which do not exist in figure 21. There is a trellis against the verandah, and what appear to be small shrubs or flowers surrounding the verandah, rather than straw insulation. There are staked plants visible to the south, as well as large trees, although it is not clear if the latter belong to Beaconsfield or Westbourne. The plants indicate that some degree of gardening was taking place on the site, although there is still a large expanse of lawn. The birdhouse fence of figure 21 exists, although here the gate to the stable yard is closed. A horse is visible behind the fence, possibly Henry Cundall's horse Charley or mare Fannie, and a man is standing in front of the gate, possibly Cundall's man servant. There is a cupola and flagpole on the stable. This photograph is therefore likely no earlier than 1901, as in August 1901 Henry Cundall wrote in his diary that he added a flagpole and wind vane to the stable.

¹ Henry Cundall surveyed the land for the construction of the roadway. On Sunday 24 May 1896, he wrote in his diary: "In afternoon took a walk along the Park road now being opened up to the public."

² PARO acc. 3003 item 18 is the same image in black and white. It does not have the same scuff marks as the colourised postcard, and may be closer to the original photograph.

³ See for example PARO acc. 2301 item 81 dated to 1889, and acc. 3218 item 214 dated to the late 1890s. Dates given are not always accurate, as many of these images clearly show the Victoria Park Roadway.

2.3.2 Maintenance

Just as it is not known how the grounds looked when the Peakes lives at Beaconsfield, it is not known who tended them. More is known about how the grounds were maintained during the Cundall period. In July of 1884, that is the first summer that the Cundalls lived at Beaconsfield, Henry Cundall referred in his diary to a Mr. Fletcher, a “landscape gardener,” who worked on the grounds for two days, but then left for Halifax and Boston. As this was the same summer that the Halifax landscape gardener George Fletcher was involved in work on the landscaping for Queen Square, it is likely the same person.

At this time, it appears to have been the norm for the household staff to include a cook, a housemaid, a servant boy, and a man servant, the latter being responsible for the heaviest manual work. This included jobs like making repairs to the fences, gates, stable and just about everything else on the property, and also planting and maintaining the gardens. Every spring, Henry Cundall helped with the gardening to some degree, but it is not clear from his diary accounts if he was more of a help than a hindrance.

Cundall appears to have been moderately interested in horticulture, but on a purely amateur level. Whenever on holidays, either in Halifax, Toronto, Montreal or Europe, he made a point of visiting public gardens; however, his diary descriptions tended to focus on tidiness and the number of trees rather than on specific plants or designs. He also visited the local agricultural exhibitions every autumn, but generally had little to say about them. As he grew older and had more time to read, he occasionally mentioned the books he bought or borrowed from the local library. The areas that seem to have interested him most were history and biography. He made only one reference to having read about horticulture when in 1890 he read a “blue book on fruit culture” (22 Nov. 1890).

2.4 Post-Cundall

Henry Cundall died in 1916 and left Beaconsfield to be used a women’s residence.¹ Figure 31 shows a plan of the property as it existed the following year, 1917. It indicates a 2-storey stable, with a 1-storey extension on the south end. The stable is at the property’s east edge on West Street. There is also a 1-storey outbuilding on the West Street side, to the east of the house. The plan also indicates that by this time Westbourne had been rotated and moved closer to West Street, and Edgewater had been built.

In his 1986 proposal, Geoff Hogan referred to a photograph of Beaconsfield and dated it to c. 1920. He described it as showing “a three-tiered, low hedging of indistinguishable plant material.”² Hogan did not identify this photograph, although it may be figure 32, which is undated. While this photograph shows a significant growth in vegetation, the path around the verandah is the same as that in figure 23. There is a building evident to the left of the house, which may either be the outbuilding indicated in figure 31, or perhaps West End House across the street, which would only be visible if the fence around the property had been removed. As well, the iron railing around the top of the house evident in all previous photographs has been removed.

In 1936, Henry Cundall’s trustees allowed Beaconsfield to be used as a nurses’ residence for students attending the P.E.I. Hospital School of Nursing. During this period it was known as the Cundall home.³ Figure 33 was taken from roughly the same angle as figure 32 although likely later as the tree at the north-west corner of the house is larger, and the plants around the verandah have changed. This photograph also shows a plain rail fence at the bottom of the image, replacing the high birdhouse fence. The fence running along the west side of the stable has also been removed and the stable itself has been moved back from the street.

¹ Specifically, the bulk of his estate was left “in trust to establish and maintain a refuge and temporary home in Charlottetown for the care and training in industrial and Christian ways of friendless young women and girls.” *The Guardian*, 3 Aug. 1916, p. 3 cols. 4-5.

² Hogan, p. 1

³ Callbeck, p. 28

2.5 Agriculture

Most residents of Charlottetown held common lots outside town for farming, including Henry Cundall. While he grew fruits and vegetables at Beaconsfield, he also owned two common lots that he used for pasture and hay. In May 1885 he bought 1¼ acres from Mr. Palmer. Records show that Cundall owned block 11, lot 10, which appears in figure 20 as belonging in 1880 to Henry Palmer. This is at the present corner of North River Road and York Lane, well within walking distance of Beaconsfield. In his diaries Cundall made regular seasonal references to these lots, describing cutting, coiling and bringing hay to be stored in the stable at Beaconsfield over winter. In 1908 he mentioned growing clover and timothy - with some ox eye daisy inadvertently mixed in. Cundall also referred to growing wheat and having it ground at local mills. Henry Cundall appears to have kept the gate to these lots locked, although this may have been redundant given that the fence seems to have been in annual danger of being stolen.

RECOMMENDATIONS - AREAS

1. PERIOD/STYLE

It is recommended that the grounds at Beaconsfield reflect primarily an Edwardian style of landscaping. It appears that all attempts to create a heritage garden in Charlottetown have focussed on Victorian styles, and have invariably included typical mass plantings of annuals and carpet bedding. These are particularly prominent in places like Rochford Square and Queen Square to the north of Province House. An Edwardian garden at Beaconsfield would be unique, and would provide a compliment to the heavy focus on the Victorian. At the same time, creating an Edwardian garden allows for some desirable features of the Victorian style to be incorporated. This would have been a natural development for any landscape that evolved over time. Earlier features and styles would have been retained as new ones were introduced, creating an overlap of styles and features, as in the Louson garden (figures 9 and 10). Focussing primarily on the Edwardian period would also provide new ways to emphasise the Cundall family's residency, since the interpretation of the house focuses primarily on the Peake's residency.

The Edwardian landscape style is highly architectural in design, usually incorporating a central focus such as a water feature, statue, grouping of beds or lawn, and the remaining areas of the grounds clearly demarcated but held together as a whole by means of the central feature. The grounds as a whole would often be surrounded by a wall, fence or hedge, creating a sense of enclosure and completeness. The emphasis on architecture was also apparent in the inclusion of popular structures such as terraces, pergolas, arbours and exedras. Rock gardens were also common features. Large perennial borders were popular, and plants tended to be big and colourful, planted informally in the "cottage garden" style. These are all features that can readily be incorporated into the existing landscape at Beaconsfield.

2. LAYOUT

W. C. Harris' original plans for Beaconsfield are not extant; however, his contemporary plans for the McLennan-Hunt house (figure 18) demonstrate a house and grounds very similar in design. This plan can serve as the basis for a landscape recreation, as it includes features that likely would have been intended for Beaconsfield as well. These include:

- front entrance with carriage drive, paths and ornamental beds
- central lawn, with surrounding treed areas on the site's perimeter
- working yard
- vegetable garden

3. PROPERTY BOUNDARIES

3.1 Other sites

A wooden fence was the most common method of surrounding a property during the Victorian period, as wood was the cheapest and most convenient material to use. Judging from illustrations, most P.E.I. homes in the nineteenth century surrounded their properties with simple low rail or picket fences. These can be seen at homes like Willow Cottage (figure 4), Tulloch (figure 5), Fairholm (figure 34), the Mackieson house on Pownal Street (figure 35) and in figure 36.

Wrought iron became more common as the century progressed, first becoming popular in Britain in the 1830s. It does not appear to have become a common method of fencing in P.E.I. although it did appear around some homes such as those along Water Street (figure 37).

Gates of local properties tended to be as simple as the fences they accompanied, which can be seen in illustrations cited above. By the Edwardian period, it was more common for larger homes to add large and

ornate gates to a surrounding wall or fence. This trend can perhaps be seen on a smaller scale at the Mackieson house (figure 38) and at Fairholm, where a more elaborate gate (figure 39) replaced the one shown in figure 34.

3.2 Beaconsfield

3.2.1 West and Kent Streets

Paintings and photographs indicate that when West End House stood on the site, so did very simple board and rail fences (figures 15 and 16). It is not known when the birdhouse fence was erected, although clearly some kind of high fence existed when Henry Cundall took over the property, as he purchased padlocks to secure its gates (22 Jan. 1883). In June 1886 he made references to setting up fence posts at Beaconsfield but it is not known if this meant repairing existing posts, or entirely replacing the existing fence with something new.

Geophysical evidence suggests a possible fence or tree line at the original north-west corner of the property, that is before the point of later infill. There are several photographs that together give a clear idea of where this fence stood and how it was constructed, including those already mentioned above. Figures 25, 40 and 41 show that the fence edged the property, followed by a strip of grass, then a sidewalk, then a narrow boulevard, and then the road. Cundall's diaries also indicate that there was a trench around the property. Figures 40 and 41 give a clear indication of how this fence was constructed, and there is also an extant piece of fence on the north-east corner of the house's annex.

As noted above, some photographs indicate where the original gates stood. These indicate that there were only two gates on Kent Street, a carriage gate at the north-east corner, and a smaller pedestrian gate, probably where the pedestrian walkway exists now. There is no evidence of an entrance where the western end of the circular front drive currently exists, suggesting there was originally only one carriage entrance on the north side of the property. Henry Cundall commonly referred to the gates as the "small front gate," "large front gate," "small back gate" and "large back gate," suggesting that there was one carriage entrance and one pedestrian entrance on Kent Street, and also one of each on West Street.

Figure 42 gives a good idea of the design of the carriage gate and surrounding posts. This design can be made out in less detail in figure 25, on both the Kent Street and West Street sides.

According to Ruth Hartz McKenzie, who in 1979 recorded her memories of living on West Street, the birdhouse fence still existed in 1916 when Henry Cundall died.¹ As later photographs indicate, this fence was eventually taken down and replaced with a very simple rail fence. Eventually this too was removed.

3.2.2 Shoreline

The fence running along the shoreline seems to have changed little over the decades. Ruth Hartz MacKenzie mentioned an 1844 photograph showing "a wood breastwork of horizontal boards supported by vertical boards, a type of banking" in front of West End House.² Figures 15 and 17 show a simple rail fence along the water's edge. These images indicate no access to the water from the grounds.

Ruth Hartz MacKenzie wrote that at some point after West End House was on the property, "heavy horizontal timbers were used [along the water's edge] and replaced by the property owners about every 18

¹ McKenzie wrote that at the time Cundall died, "facing Kent and West Streets, there was a high and very fancy board fence with bird-house-like decorations on top of the posts" around Beaconsfield. (McKenzie p. 7)

² MacKenzie p. 8. This photograph has not been located.

years.”¹ The deed of 29 September 1875 between J. S. Carvell and James Peake identifies the boundaries of the property, referring to the “wooden breastwork” at the shoreline.²

Several later photographs mentioned above show a rail fence along the length of the shoreline during the Cundall period. Figure 26 shows openings to the water from three of the properties along West Street, but not including Beaconsfield. Figure 24 shows the breastwork, similar to that along the Victoria Park Roadway in figure 43. This is topped by a picket fence, with no opening to the water. Figure 44 also shows the fence with no access to the water from Beaconsfield. Figure 29 indicates ladders to the water from other properties. It also indicates that the fence at Beaconsfield had been changed, compared to figure 26.

Ruth Hartz Mackenzie described the breastwork and fence along the shoreline, noting that “In my day [the timbers of the breastwork were] topped by a white picket fence and boardwalk.”³ It is not clear when exactly “my day” was meant, but figure 43 gives a clear indication of how the timbers and pickets were constructed. In 1908, Henry Cundall described his breastwork as being made of logs, with stone and earth beneath. (14 Nov. 1908). In the same year he referred to the fence above the breastwork along the shoreline being whitewashed. (1 July 1908)

Figure 45 was taken at a much later date, but provides a clear image of the fence at the shoreline. Since this postcard refers to the site as the “Cundall Home,” it probably dates from the time that Beaconsfield was a nurses’ residence. Figure 46 also gives a clear picture of a simple rail fence along the water. This fence was likely removed when the City installed a concrete breastwork in 1959.⁴

3.2.3 Westbourne boundary

In November 1892 Henry Cundall referred to a fence that his neighbour at Westbourne, Benjamin Hartz, erected along the boundary between the two properties. He wrote in his diary that Hartz possessed an agreement between Jedediah Carvell and James Peake indicating that Westbourne’s coach house marked the northern boundary of the Westbourne property, which Cundall determined as being 5½ inches to the south of his own stable. Cundall disputed Hartz’s fence line, but apparently they finally agreed on a boundary line.

Apparently this fence was crooked (20 May 1907) and was replaced in 1907 with a plain board fence that Henry Cundall described in some detail in his diary (May 1907). This is likely the fence that Ruth Hartz MacKenzie described as a “a plain, easy-to-scale board fence”⁵ and which probably appears in figure 47. This photograph is dated 1913 and shows Ruth Hartz MacKenzie and pony Dolly in the backyard of Westbourne, with a plain board fence sans birdhouses in the background. This was a typical board fence found on many properties, including the Young House at 22 West Street (figure 48).

3.3 Recommendations: West and Kent Streets

A significant amount of thought should be given to determining how the property will be bounded. Whatever method is chosen will set the tone for how the site is presented to the public, and will likely be permanent. Boundaries will also serve the following important functions:

- define the geographic parameters of the property
- create a sense of containment
- screen undesirable views surrounding the site

It is not recommended that the grounds remain unbounded as they currently are, as the property currently appears undefined. An unscientific survey conducted by this author has determined that many people,

¹ MacKenzie p. 8

² deed, book 4 p. 815 line 1

³ MacKenzie p. 8

⁴ MacKenzie p. 8

⁵ MacKenzie p. 7

including residents and tourists, are not aware that Beaconsfield is a heritage site open to the public. There is currently nothing to distinguish it from other large residences in Charlottetown, and little of visual interest to attract visitors and draw them onto the grounds. A defining boundary around the property and attractive entrance would work together to make visitors feel that on entering the grounds, they are stepping back in time to a place that is apart from the modern world.

3.3.1 Option 1: Birdhouse fence

The birdhouse fence should definitely be incorporated to some degree as part of any landscape project. It is one of the few features that is actually known to have existed on the property, and its identifiable design is uniquely that of Beaconsfield. As well, there is excellent extant evidence for the construction and design of the birdhouse fence, including photographs and the remaining part of fence that is still attached to the house. The latter indicates the height of the fence, and spot removal of paint would make it possible to determine the type of wood used. As well, although he was not describing the Beaconsfield fence itself, Henry Cundall wrote to the new owner of Glenaladale in Tracadie in 1884 that cedar posts placed ten feet apart and spruce boards would make the best fence for any property (16 Aug. 1884). Cundall regularly used cedar posts himself for the fence around his pasture lot. All of this evidence together would make it entirely possible to reconstruct this fence.

There are several benefits to re-introducing this fence to the site. A fence of this height would be an accurate representation of the Edwardian taste for enclosed gardens, and would help to create the “secret garden” atmosphere popular during this period. Figure 44, for example, gives a sense of the pleasant atmosphere that once existed at Beaconsfield, when the fence united the house, trees and grounds together as a whole. This same sense of secluded elegance is portrayed at Tulloch (figure 5). A fence of this height would also help to define the historical character of the property as separate in time and space from its unattractive surroundings, blocking out most of the exceptionally jarring view of the government buildings and parking lot across Kent Street.¹ This unsightly view can be thought of as the modern-day version of the drill shed and bog that once existed in the same general area.

A fence would also allow for the inclusion of gates, which can be closed when the house is closed, or left open to allow the public to use the grounds if preferred. Having specific openings to the grounds would help to emphasise to the public that they are entering a specific place with a specific purpose. Pre-determined entrances and exits also make it easier to guide the public along a specific route, which makes interpretation of the grounds more effective. Recreating the gate design in figure 42 should be considered. While this gate is more garish than tasteful, its uniqueness is of clear historical value. Along with the birdhouse fence, it would instantly be identifiable as that of Beaconsfield, and would likely become a significant public attraction in itself.

3.3.2 Option 2: Plants and borders

Alternatively, a border of either perennial flowers, hedging or shrubs could be used to indicate the original line of the fence around the property. Flowers and flowering shrubs would provide a colourful display that changes throughout the seasons. These would be attractive, but would be less historically accurate than a fence. Several ornamental shrubs are possible, including those identified in local sources. John Lawson, for example, named “woodbine, the common honeysuckle, the trumpet honeysuckle, megereon, the guilder rose [and] the acacia” as those which he thought to grow particularly well in the province.²

¹ In her report of 1988, Linda Fardin similarly recommended that Government House block out or remove cars, parking lots and asphalt that spoiled the view towards Beaconsfield, and recommended the reconstruction of the site’s 19th-century fences or the use of plantings to block out undesirable views. (Fardin, figures 62, 63, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84)

² Lawson, Letter XVI

3.3.3 Option 3: Combination

An alternative plan is a combination of both fence and plants. A birdhouse fence would provide historical accuracy, while flowers or flowering shrubs planted alongside the fence would provide colour. Evergreen climbers such as ivy could soften the look of the fence, while fragrant and colourful climbers like honeysuckle and rose would provide added appeal. Climbers and other plants that add dimension to a fence would also add to the “secret garden” effect, enticing the public through colour and fragrance to discover what lies beyond.

One of the possible disadvantages of a fence would be that it may attract graffiti and other damage. Plants would help to minimise this if vandalism is a concern. It is common for heritage sites to plant thorny shrubs like hawthorn and rose in areas where graffiti and other unwanted traffic may be a problem. These kinds of shrubs could be planted on the street side of a fence, with flowers and climbers on the inside.

3.4 Recommendations: Shoreline

The most historically accurate treatment of the shoreline would appear to be to do nothing, or to add a simple rail fence. This, however, is rather dull, and the large rocks currently at the water’s edge are somewhat intimidating. As well, the land closest to the water has been filled in during recent decades. Since in reality this area never actually existed during the time that the Peakes and Cundalls lived at Beaconsfield, there is greater freedom to create something more interesting in this area. Serious consideration should be given to developing programmes and events that allow approaching the site from the water, which would significantly expand the potential for visitors. To do this, access from the water to the grounds would be necessary, including a dock. A boardwalk along the water’s edge is also a possibility, as Ruth Hertz MacKenzie described. Such a boardwalk could be constructed to extend from the Victoria Park Roadway boardwalk along the shoreline of Beaconsfield, with a clear end at Westbourne so that the public is not encouraged to walk further onto private property. A low fence in the style of figures 24 or 45 could also be reproduced if desired, providing an opening that provides access to the water or boardwalk.

3.5 Recommendations: Westbourne boundary

Although it is not particularly exciting, it is recommended that a plain board fence be reintroduced along the Westbourne boundary, as this is a very well documented feature of the grounds. Such a fence need not be overly high, and can extend only as far as the original shoreline. This would be accurate, while leaving sufficient remaining space to be able to see the attractive view southward across the neighbouring lawns of West Street and the harbour. The look of the fence could easily be softened with plantings in front of it, including climbers.

It will be necessary to decide what the boundary between Beaconsfield and Westbourne is meant to accomplish. This should be decided in consultation with Westbourne’s residents. Keeping the public from wandering onto neighbouring properties is important, but it may also be desirable to allow access for Beaconsfield staff. If that is the case, a small gate would be possible.

4. INTERNAL BOUNDARIES

4.1 Other sites

Evidence suggests that as P.E.I. gardens were generally simple in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, little effort was made to demarcate or compartmentalise specific areas, as might have been found in more elaborate landscapes. Simple and low hedging can be found in homes like Ardgowan,¹ Warblington (figure 2) and Poplar Air (figure 49).

¹ Henry Cundall was familiar with the grounds of Ardgowan. In his diary he noted that on Tues. 21 August 1879 he walked with fellow surveyor John Ball out to Mt. Edward Road. Two months earlier, Ball had completed his survey of Ardgowan.

It was common throughout the Victorian and Edwardian periods to use stones painted white to line flower beds and paths. Figure 50 shows painted stones laid along paths. This use of painted stones can also be seen at properties like Judge Duffy's house in Brighton (figure 51), where the main driveway was lined, and the Charlotte Ladies' Residence (figure 52), where all of the flower beds appear to have been lined with stones.

4.2 Beaconsfield

Figures 21, 23 and 30 all show a fence running from the south side of the house parallel to the west side of the stable. This is probably what Henry Cundall referred to in his diary as the "lawn fence" (18 May 1907, 8 June 1909). He regularly distinguished between "the lawn," by which he meant the area to the west of the house, and "the yard" (23 May 1892, 9 June 1896, 12 June and 14 Oct. 1907). Figure 26 shows that this fence extended south beyond the stable to meet the Westbourne fence, presumably running past the extension on the stable that appears in figure 31.

The extant part of fencing on the east side of the house suggests that a fence also ran eastward from the north-east corner of the house's annex, likely creating an enclosed working yard around the stable, much like the one indicated in W.C. Harris' plan for the McLennan-Hunt house. The extant part of fencing has openings at the top and bottom of the post, which may indicate either mortis holes, or slots into which moving beams could be inserted to secure a gate. Figure 25 indicates that this fence met the West Street fence close to one of the gates on West Street.

There is no further evidence to indicate any other attempts to define areas within the grounds, such as specific garden beds. There is no evidence to suggest that the lawn was divided from the entrance grounds by a fence or other border, as at Tulloch (figure 5) and the home of George Anderson (figure 53).

4.3 Recommendations: Stable yard

It is recommended that the birdhouse fence be recreated to define the original working yard. This area could then serve as the sole parking area, which should be hidden from view from the rest of the property. The birdhouse fence would be an excellent way to achieve this. Some modified version would be required on the west side of the carriage house, which now protrudes westward into the area where a fence would have originally stood. A recreated gate may be possible here instead.

4.4 Recommendations: Gardens

Painted stones would be a simple and inexpensive way to define certain areas of the grounds. They would be particularly effective in shady areas, such as along paths laid out under the trees lining Kent Street, in the entrance area, or in the shaded corner of West and Kent Streets. Images like figure 51 could serve as a guide, indicating how stones were used in different locations. Painted stones should, however, be used in moderation.

It would also be possible to define particular areas using methods that are typical of Edwardian gardens generally. As mentioned above, the Edwardian style was architectural, in that it incorporated built features like pergolas, which helped to define one area from another. Like latticework, pergolas and arbours also allow for greater use of fragrant climbers such as honeysuckle, rose, or sweet pea. Shrubs and hedges of varying heights are also effective in creating contained areas.

5. ENTRANCE AREA

5.1 Other sites

One of the most common features of nineteenth-century landscape design was the circular drive at the main entrance of a house. This could be laid out as either a semi-circle or full circle. This layout required two gates so that carriages could enter and leave the property easily. An alternative was the full-circle design, as seen in the illustrations of Warblington (figure 54), Government House (figure 55), the McLennan-Hunt house (figure 18), Westbourne (figure 6), Willow Cottage (figure 4) and Tulloch (figure 5). This required only one gate for a carriage, allowing the driver to make a full circle and leave through the same gate. For larger properties it was common to have a carriage drive that split into two branches, one allowing the driver to drop passengers off at the main entrance of the house, and the other leading beyond to the stables. This is also a feature of the drives at Government House and the McLennan-Hunt house.

Normally, the most formal part of a property would have been at the main entrance. It was common for the circles created by carriage drives to be planted ornately so that guests would be impressed. This was the obvious intention of the McLennan-Hunt house landscape plan (figure 18), with its ornate paths and beds lining the carriage drive to the house. Less elaborate but similar intentions can be seen at Warblington (figure 54), Willow Cottage (figure 4), Tulloch (figure 5), Westbourne (figure 6), the Duffy house (figure 51) and in figure 36.

Urns were a popular feature in Victorian gardens, particularly on lawns or as part of a formal entrance area. They might be used simply as a decorative feature, or as planters. Urns as lawn features can be seen at Westbourne (figure 6), Fairholm (figure 3), May Flower Mills (figure 56) and the home of David Stirling on Water Street (figure 37).

5.2 Beaconsfield

While there is currently a semi-circular drive at the main entrance of Beaconsfield, it is not clear that this is the original design. Figures 24 and 25 indicate that there was only one carriage gate, which was at the eastern end of Kent Street, and one pedestrian gate. Figure 25 suggests that the single carriage drive entering from Kent Street was closer to the corner of Kent and West Streets than the current entrance. Geophysical evidence also suggests that this is the case. Geophysical evidence also suggests that there may originally have been a different pedestrian path leading from Kent Street. This single carriage entrance suggests that the original design may have been a full circle, like that of the McLennan-Hunt plan. This may explain why figures 23 and 32 seem to indicate part of a drive at the north-west corner of the house, but no gate.

It is not known what material was used for the carriage drive, although Henry Cundall noted in his diary that the paths at Beaconsfield were gravel (27 June 1907). The carriage drive may also have been gravel. In 1907, Henry Cundall referred to work being done on the sidewalks around Beaconsfield, which may have been when concrete sidewalks were first laid. In his diary he noted that the city also made concrete steps at his small gate on Kent Street, and a concrete path leading from the steps to the public sidewalk (28 Aug. 1907).

Figures 19, 20 and 31 indicate that there was a small outbuilding at the edge of West Street to the east of the house. Figure 57 indicates that by 1956 this building had been removed. It is not clear if this building would have stood within the stable yard or within the front entrance area. It is unlikely that it would have stood in the front entrance area, although photographs that include this area seem to indicate that it might have been obscured by trees.

There is no extant evidence to identify what type of gardens existed at the main entrance area. It is likely that some form of standard bedding existed, similar to that found in illustrations in *Meacham's Atlas*, and photographs of other contemporary properties.

5.3 Recommendations

Because the paths, drives and beds of this area would probably have been laid out when the house was first built, it would be appropriate to incorporate standard Victorian designs and features here. It is unlikely that this area would have changed significantly during the time that the Cundalls lived here. By focussing on a Victorian style at the entrance and an Edwardian style on the rest of the grounds, the site itself can provide a chronological transition from the Peake to Cundall periods.

5.3.1 Parking lot

It is essential that the parking lot currently at the main entrance of the house be removed. All parking should be contained within an area that is hidden from view from the rest of the site.

5.3.2 Carriage drive

Further archaeological work may help to determine the original location of drives and paths. Excavation may also uncover the material that was used in the area. However, this is not imperative, as there is already enough evidence to assist in the design of an entrance area typical of the period. Barring any further evidence, it is recommended that the McLennan-Hunt plan be used as a basis for the design of the entrance area. The current semi-circular drive can be replaced with a drive that has one entrance more in keeping with photographic evidence. This would require a fully circular drive, and a second drive branching off past the house to the stable yard. A pedestrian walkway evident in figure 25 can be retained and incorporated into a new design.

Further research would determine what materials would be appropriate, such as gravel or stone. While it will be necessary to use a material that makes shovelling and other maintenance possible, the main priority of a carriage drive should be as a heritage feature rather than as a modern functioning driveway.

5.3.3 Carriage drive gardens

Like the proposed grounds of the McLennan-Hunt house, the grounds at the entrance of Beaconsfield should be designed to impress. This area should make a statement that visitors are entering somewhere special. This can be done in a number of ways. A combination of urns and circular beds can be incorporated, similar to those of Westbourne (figure 6). Alternatively, a more intricate pattern of beds of low-lying flowers and groundcover can be incorporated into a carriage drive and paths, as in the McLennan-Hunt design. Bulbs can also be planted en masse in this area, as at the Duffy home (figure 51), providing early colour.

5.3.4 Foundation

Thought must be given to the areas around the foundation of the house. Foundation planting became popular in the Victorian period, combining both deciduous and evergreen shrubs, or flowers and flowering shrubs such as roses. However, while it would be historically appropriate to have shrubs or flower beds near the foundation of the house, this can cause damage to the building. Shrubs too close to a building can cause excessive moisture and rot, while flower beds can cause the grade around the building to rise. Annual flowers with shallow roots are generally the least threatening. Anything that is planted in place of the north parking lot should be planted far enough away from the house (ideally three feet) in a bed sloping away from the wall. Sodding over this area and placing urns in front of the house would be the least damaging.

5.3.5 North-east corner

The remaining area of this part of the grounds, that is the north-east corner at West and Kent Streets, is shaded for most of the summer. It is recommended that this be designed as a semi-formal strolling area similar to that in the McLennan-Hunt plan. A simple pattern of paths or single path can be incorporated into the carriage drive design that leads into this area. Spring bulbs such as tulips, hyacinths or bluebells

can be planted, with shade-tolerant plants such as rhododendrons, ferns, hostas and lily-of-the-valley filling the rest of the area. This area could be planted in either a formal pattern, or in a more informal Victorian “Gothic” style, with an abundance of ferns, vines, and other shade-tolerant greenery. A single bench could be placed as in the top right corner of the McLennan-Hunt plan. Alternatively, Fairholm (figure 3) and the home of George Anderson (figure 53) show rustic benches in equivalent shaded areas. As a focal point, the post office slab that currently lies on the site near West Street could be incorporated into the overall layout either of this area or that of the carriage drive beds. Alternatively, one or two urns could be placed here along the lines of the illustrations identified above.

6. CARRIAGE HOUSE YARD

6.1 Other sites

The yard around a stable would have been a working area, and generally not particularly attractive. As a result, it would normally have been screened from view, and was rarely photographed, particularly at larger homes where ornamental gardens drew more attention. This area would have served a variety of functions, such as unloading of hay and other materials, storing wood, housing compost, drying clothes, disposing of refuse, etc. There is little specific evidence of the working yards of P.E.I. homes, although the plans of Government House (figure 55) and the McLennan-Hunt house (figure 18) indicate that they were standard features, even in the grandest homes.

6.2 Beaconsfield

There appear to have been two fences running perpendicularly away from the house to create a screened working area around the stable at Beaconsfield. Maps and drawings indicate that there were originally two buildings in this general area, that is the stable and a smaller building at the edge of West Street. According to Henry Cundall’s diary, the stable in its original position had a cellar with a separate hatch (30 Aug. 1887, Sept. 1908) and a hay loft (2 Aug. 1907, 29 July 1908). Cundall also regularly referred to filling the ice house, by which he probably meant the small outbuilding to the east of the house (Dec. 1886, January 1895, February 1896, February 1902, February 1903, February 1904, 30 Jan. 1909). He also noted that he let others use his ice house for storing food (13 July 1907).

Figure 30 shows a horse looking over the fence to the west of the stable. Cundall also regularly referred to chickens, cows and cats on the property. While the cows usually spent the summers at Cundall’s or a neighbouring pasture lot (2-4 Aug. 1884, May-June 1893, etc.), this area also appears to have been used as a paddock. Cundall regularly referred to repair work done around the property, and in 1892 mentioned that old planking in the yard was removed and filled in with ashes (23 May 1892). It is not clear what this planking was for, but ashes were commonly used to fill in ruts made by carriage wheels and other ground holes.

Beaconsfield became a women’s residence around 1919, and according to Ruth Heartz Mackenzie, it was about this time that the stable was moved back from the street and enlarged.¹ The area to the west of the stable that appears to have served as a paddock was lost at that point. Figure 57 shows the stable after it had been enlarged, with the southern extension removed, and the entire building moved back from the street. This plan also shows the smaller outbuilding east of the house no longer existing.

Sewer repairs in recent years has uncovered a significant amount of underground debris, suggesting that this part of this area was also used as a rubbish tip. Geophysical study also indicates a large amount of debris in this area. Any area used as a tip would certainly have been screened from the main entrance.

¹ Mackenzie wrote that “the old stable had been enlarged and moved to the west so it could be partially heated from the house furnace and used in the winter as a gym for the girls.” (Mackenzie, p. 7)

6.3 Recommendations

Full consideration needs to be given to the use of this area. A parking lot is probably necessary; however, a working yard in keeping with the period of the grounds would provide an interesting insight into the daily workings of a period garden. It may be possible to combine these functions in this area to some degree.

Whether this area is used as a parking lot, working yard or both, it should be screened from view from the rest of the property. The most historically accurate way to screen this area would be to reconstruct the birdhouse fence at its full height. If desired, a fence along the north side of the carriage house yard can be accompanied by a parallel hedge or row of evergreen shrubs. A common feature of Victorian landscaping was to plant upright shrubs on either side of entrances to gardens or other defined areas. An attractive evergreen shrub could be planted to define the entrance leading from the area north of the house to the parking lot.

Consideration should be given to reinstating the small outbuilding along West Street. This could be reconstructed to represent the original ice house, while at the same time providing a much-needed storage area for garden equipment, pots, tools, etc.

There is currently a large wheelchair ramp and walkway at the back door of the house on the south side. This takes up a significant amount of space and could be reduced to provide more useable area. Much of this area could serve as a period working area, i.e. a potting area, tool area, etc.

However this area is ultimately used, it should be given equal attention in terms of landscaping. For example, the back porch can easily be made more attractive by adding hanging baskets or fragrant climbers on trellises around the door such as jasmine, thornless roses or honeysuckle. As it faces south-east, this is also an ideal area to plant morning glories.

7. VERANDAH

7.1 Other sites

7.1.1 Trellises

In the nineteenth century, vines and other climbers were commonly used to cover outbuildings, posts, dead trees, or other permanent features. Vine-covered structures became a deliberate feature as the gardenesque style grew in popularity. Vines were also commonly grown around porches and verandahs, and trellises increasingly became a way of displaying climbers for their own sake, particularly at entranceways of garden areas or a house. This common feature can be seen at Warblington (figure 54), Valmont (figure 58), Arthur Newbury's home (figure 8) and in figure 50.

7.1.2 Urns

Urns were a common feature of Victorian gardens, used as accents within a lawn or at entranceways, but also as decorative and functional features on porches and verandahs. This can be seen in figure 36.

7.2 Beaconsfield

Figures 31 and 57 suggest that the north verandah originally extended to the east side of the enclosed main entrance porch; however, no photograph or other evidence indicates that a verandah ever existed on the east side.

Figure 23 shows straw or something similar around the verandah. This also appears to be the case in figure 21. Figure 30 indicates that this was eventually replaced by earth and that shrubs were planted along the west side of the verandah. By the time of figure 32, shrubs appear to have become established.

The verandah appears to have been undecorated originally, although at some later point, lattice work was added. Figure 30 shows this on the south-west side, accompanied by what appear to be dead vines that may have grown on strings. Figure 32 shows an abundance of horticulture around the verandah, although this photograph dates from a period after Henry Cundall's death.

7.3 Recommendations

It has been recommended that urns be considered as a decorative feature for the foundation on the north side of the house. On the west side of the house, it is more feasible to plant shrubs as the verandah protects the foundation. Fruit-bearing shrubs could be planted along this area, in keeping with figure 30. Trellis supports that also appear in this photograph can be added to provide support for climbing fruits or vines.

The verandah can be further decorated with hanging baskets and pots that replicate W.C. Harris' designs for the McLennan-Hunt house verandah (figure 59). Alternatively, the pots seen in figure 8 can be replicated, although these may appear too heavy and cluttered if accompanying shrubs, vines and other plants around the same area.

8. TREED AREA - KENT STREET

8.1 Other sites

In keeping with Victorian trends emanating out of the picturesque style, the grounds of larger homes were commonly surrounded by large trees, creating an enclosed environment. This may have been a natural result after clearing, suggested in the painting of Warblington (figure 2), but it was also a deliberately planned style. It was clearly the effect that W.C. Harris envisioned for the McLennan-Hunt house (figure 18), which shows the property enclosed on almost all sides by spruce, cedar, maple, elm and birch trees, similar to that of Tulloch (figure 5).

From an early date, residents noted the native trees in the area. John Lawson enthused about the dark green fir trees, as well as the "red berried sumach, the splendid tree cranberry" and other trees common to the area.¹

8.2 Beaconsfield

Figure 15 suggests that whatever trees may have originally stood on the site were removed when West End House was built. Likewise, it is most likely that new trees were planted after construction of Beaconsfield was completed, and the stretch along Kent Street appears to have been lined with trees from at least this point onward.

Not long after Henry Cundall took possession, he began pruning and removing some of the trees on the property (24 Oct. 1883, 6 Aug. 1884, 10 July 1885). Figures 21 and 30 show large trees on West Street at the north-east corner of the property. Figure 24 indicates that the row of trees on Kent Street extended westward to the shoreline. Certainly by the late nineteenth century there was a thick border of substantial trees running all along Kent Street and overhanging the fence that all but obscured the house from the street during the summer (figures 25, 42 and 44).

Figure 32 shows a tree and shrubs at the north-west corner of the house, which do not appear in earlier photographs. Figure 33 shows the same tree at a later date. This photograph also shows at least one tree at the south-west corner of the house, which appears at an earlier date in figure 30.

Figure 47 shows a large tree in the background, which is probably the same tree at the extreme right in figure 30. Ruth Hartz MacKenzie recalled climbing onto the Beaconsfield grounds as a child via a clump

¹ Lawson, Letter XVI

of large Balm of Gilead on the north-west corner.¹ Presumably this meant the north-west corner of Westbourne, which can be seen in the aerial photograph of 1935 (figure 60).

This and other images indicate that at some point trees were planted along the northern corner of the shoreline as well, including figures 28, 29, 45, 46 and 61. However, a 1958 aerial photograph indicates that by that date they had been removed, along with many trees on the western end of the Kent Street boundary (figure 62). This is also evident in figure 63. By 1990 new trees planted on Kent Street had reached a substantial size (figure 64). The renewal of trees along Kent Street may explain why geophysical evidence suggests a tree line other than the one that currently exists.

Some photographs, such as figures 40, 41 and 42 are clear enough that some of the types of trees can be identified. In 1900 Henry Cundall referred to poplar and lime trees on the property. In 1908 he referred to a grove of big-toothed poplar trees, and to removing dead branches from trees near the house and entrance gate (15 and 18 June 1908). Presumably it is these poplar trees that were trimmed. In the same year he also referred to a single birch tree, limes and mountain ash trees on the property, as well as maple trees across the street at West End House (20 Oct. 1908).

A full site plan would help to identify the age and types of trees currently on the grounds.

8.3 Recommendations

Most, if not all of the trees around the property appear to date from the period after Henry Cundall's death. Several of them were planted in the twentieth century as part of Arbour Day celebrations. However, it is not recommended that any trees be removed. Aside from their inherent natural value, these trees have a historical value of their own which can be incorporated into the interpretation of the site.

There is no evidence to indicate that gardens existed amongst the treed areas of Beaconsfield. At the same time, there is no evidence to indicate that they did not. This creates a number of possibilities for the Kent Street boundary. The McLennan-Hunt house plan (figure 18), Fairholm (figure 3) and the home of George Anderson (figure 53) typify the Victorian trend towards using shaded areas like this for footpaths, benches, and objects of visual interest. As the Edwardian taste for less formal and regimented gardens developed, shaded strolling areas like these might have been retained, but enhanced by plantings that gave the area a more wild and natural look. In the early twentieth century, these kinds of "woodland" gardens were very popular, incorporating native wildflowers, groupings of bulbs, grasses and creepers that might have been planted amongst clumps of trees. It is recommended that this area incorporate this combination of Victorian structure of paths and permanent objects, with a more informal Edwardian planting style. This kind of overlap would have been a natural development of a home's landscaping, and would allow this area to serve as an interpretative transition between the Victorian style recommended for the main entrance grounds, and the Edwardian style recommended for the southern boundary.

9. LAWN

9.1 Other sites

If illustrations are an accurate reflection of local taste, the picturesque style of open lawn was an extremely common feature of nineteenth-century homes in the province. This has already been noted for sites like Fairholm, Fanningbank and Warblington. The lawn at Fanningbank originally sloped down to the water, until the Victoria Park Roadway was opened in 1896. An open lawn with unbroken views also features in the home of George Anderson (figure 53) and Brantford (figure 65). It was clearly meant to be a feature for the McLennan-Hunt house as well (figure 18).

These large lawns without trees, shrubs or garden beds to obstruct views also provided ideal sites for games like lawn tennis, croquet or even archery (figure 58). Lawn tennis was a popular pastime, and alongside

¹ MacKenzie, p. 7

local tennis clubs, several homes devoted space to a tennis court. Croquet was also a popular outdoor activity. W.C. Harris identified part of the lawn of his landscape plan for the McLennan-Hunt house simply as “croquet lawn” (figure 18). Illustrations of Poplar Air (figure 49) and Green Park (figure 66) suggest that croquet was commonly played on the lawns of many homes. Larger homes like Ardgowan might have devoted a permanent area to croquet, complete with a low hedge border, while smaller homes may simply have set up equipment wherever there was space (figure 50).

9.2 Beaconsfield

9.2.1 The view

It seems clear that although West End House was originally built with its main entrance facing Kent Street, its view of the water and Fanningbank was a significant feature. Comparing figures 15 and 17 suggests that windows on the west side of the house were eventually converted to French doors and a verandah added. This would have taken advantage of the impressive view across the sloping lawn to the harbour. When Beaconsfield was built in place of West End House, it was oriented in the same way, with the main entrance on Kent Street, but the primary view being that of the water. Other contemporary houses on West Street were also built to face the water; however, as the water became a less important feature, some of these houses, including Westbourne, were eventually moved or altered to face the street.

A major element of Beaconsfield’s view was the sweeping lawn that sloped down from the house to the water. This would have been matched on the other side of the harbour by the impressive sloping lawn stretching from Fanningbank to the water. It seems quite likely that in designing Beaconsfield, there may have been a deliberate attempt to reflect the picturesque stateliness of Fanningbank’s waterfront landscape.

9.2.2 Uses

Evidence suggests that a large portion of the grounds to the west of the house was devoted to lawn throughout the Peake and Cundall periods. In his diaries, Henry Cundall makes frequent references to owning a lawn mower and having the lawn at Beaconsfield mowed (13 July 1883 etc.). Figure 21 indicates that the lawn directly west of the house was used for tennis, if only for a brief period. This large open area also seems to have been used for social functions on occasion. For example, in June 1899, a garden party fundraiser for the P.E.I. Hospital was held on the grounds. In June 1901, the Young Men’s group of St. Paul’s Church held a garden party on the grounds (figure 67). Unfortunately, newspaper accounts of the event do not extend beyond describing the grounds as “beautiful” and “spacious.” Similarly vague compliments had been printed in newspapers when Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne visited in 1879. It is difficult to know how to interpret these descriptions, since while the grounds are certainly spacious, photographs do not suggest anything particularly “beautiful.”

9.3 Recommendations

Like the birdhouse fence, the open expanse of lawn to the west of the house is one of the few features of the grounds that can be verified. It should therefore be a feature of any landscape design. Unlike the lawn of Government House, which is no longer connected to the water, Beaconsfield’s sloping lawn remains unbroken, and the open view to the harbour should be enhanced.

It is recommended that the parterre garden that currently lies to the west of the house be removed and replaced with sod. This garden was planted in the 1980s and has no historical precedent in its current location. It lacks context and breaks the view of the lawn stretching from the house to the water. Its design can be incorporated elsewhere if desired, and would be particularly well suited to the main entrance area, were this area to reflect a Victorian style. If the Government House plan of 1856 is used to reproduce this garden elsewhere on the site, the 1856 plan itself should be identified in whatever method of interpretation is used.

Any shrubs on the west lawn that break the site line to the water should be relocated elsewhere on the grounds. If they are not appropriate varieties for a historic recreation, they can be replanted around the parking lot. Every effort should be made to find good homes for any shrubs that are removed.

A central lawn sloping from the house to the water can also serve as a way to tie together the other sections of this part of the property. A common element of Edwardian landscapes was a central feature such as a pool of water, statue, avenue or lawn that pulled together the gardens and other surrounding areas as a whole.

While there may not be enough lawn space to reproduce a tennis court, it would certainly be possible to use part of the grounds for croquet. The McLennan-Hunt plan (figure 18) proposed a croquet lawn in much the same spot relative to the house as that used for tennis at Beaconsfield. Equipment for croquet can be used or removed when necessary, and can allow games to extend both across the lawn and into the treed area along Kent Street.

10. WESTBOURNE BOUNDARY

There is little evidence to indicate what existed along the south boundary of the property west of the house. Photographs suggest that this area was used for fruit and vegetable gardens, and possibly ornamental flower beds. This also seems most likely given its position relative to the rest of the property. Fruit and vegetable gardens would not normally have existed at the front of a house, and like the stretch along Kent Street, the main entrance area at the north and east sides of Beaconsfield would not have provided enough sun. The stable area at the south-east corner had a significant amount of sun, but it appears to have served as a paddock for cows, horses and chickens, making gardens in this area impractical. The south side of the property would have been shaded to some degree by Westbourne until the house itself was moved east to the edge of West Street, but would still have received enough sun for fruits and vegetables to grow.

10.1 Other sites

10.1.1 Fruit

While fruit trees such as pear, apple, cherry and peach were common in other parts of Canada, evidence suggests that fruit-growing was a relatively slow development in P.E.I. in the nineteenth century. John Lawson noted a lack of fruit growing generally, noting the most prominent fruits being “currants, black and red; gooseberries, garden and wild; Kentish cherries; damson, and a few other kind of plum; and some tolerably good cooking apples...strawberries, delicious in flavor, may be had in profusion, in the month of July...raspberries equally good for their kind.”¹ Lawson also informed one of his correspondents that should grafted fruit trees, black thorn, or ornamental shrubbery be desired, a certain “Cairns, who lives at Dunstaffnage,” should be able to provide them.² To a friend in Lancashire he recommended bringing grafts of apple, pear, cherry, plum, quince or any other fruit common to an English garden. He noted that the province was in particular need of good cherries and plums, and that green gage plums should grow well. He also noted that the local conditions were particularly well suited to growing gooseberries.³

Lawson ultimately saw the lack of fruit growing as a consequence of low motivation rather than poor soil or climate, noting a particularly good apple orchard near Murray Harbour as evidence of potential success. Although the optimistic Lawson foresaw an increase of orchards as residents came to see the attractions of growing fruit, agricultural society reports suggest a slow increase of orchards throughout the middle of the century, frequently commenting on the poor showing of fruit at local and provincial exhibitions. In 1882 for example, there were only 62 fruit entries in the Provincial Exhibition, which was not considered a large

¹ Lawson, p. 11

² Lawson, p. 36

³ Lawson, Letter XVI

number by the exhibition's commissioners.¹ The following year, there were 108 entries.² By 1900 there was a Fruit Growers' society, the meetings of which Henry Cundall attended. However, according to his description, these meetings may have been more social than instructional.

A few large homes, however, like Warblington, had substantial orchards at a relatively early date. Nurseries of sufficient size, like James J. Gay & Son in Pownal, had orchards (figure 14). By the end of the century, orchards of varying sizes seem to have become a fairly regular feature of medium-sized and large properties. Henry Cundall noted in his diaries that John Newson and Benjamin Wright sold apples, the latter having a large orchard (1 Oct. 1890, 6 Nov. 1907). In 1893 he also mentioned being given plums from the orchard of Louisa Dawson's family (6 Oct. 1893).

As John Lawson's accounts suggest, fruit shrubs seems to have been more common than orchards, probably because of their smaller size, and the fact that many have grown wild in the province. Grapes appear to have been an uncommon occurrence, and the Charlottetown vineyards of C.A. Hyndman and William Heard usually received special note.³ When Henry Cundall was ill in 1893, Mr. Heard gave him some of his own grapes to enjoy (6 Oct. 1893).

10.1.2 Vegetables and herbs

Vegetable gardens and herbs were ubiquitous features of nineteenth-century homes. Only in the densest parts of large urban centres would one be likely to find a home without some kind of food being grown. John Lawson noted the distinct lack of vegetables being sold at markets, "owing to almost every house of respectability being provided with a kitchen garden, of larger or smaller dimensions." Lawson noted, however, that some rural residents were starting to bring their produce to markets in towns, including "early potatoes, lettuces, cucumbers, green peas, French beans, sweet herbs, ... [and] beets, carrots, turnips, cabbages, turnips solely for winter use, may be had in the autumn."⁴ In discussing growing conditions, Lawson noted that winter conditions were particularly well suited to foods like the Gigantic Asparagus, sea kale and rhubarb.⁵

Unlike flower gardens, vegetable and herb gardens were viewed as functional, and little imagination was devoted to their layout. As a result, they tended to be rectangular, plain, and crowded, with some ornamental flowers mixed in to add colour. Figure 48 gives an example of this. This vegetable garden used every available space, mixing tall vegetables like corn and beans with low vegetables and flowers. Figures 68 and 69 also show typical vegetable gardens, planted in orderly rows, with some flowers mixed in.

Nurseries, warehouses and other merchants sold vegetable seed for home use. Some businesses specialised in particular types of vegetable. James Gay's nursery in Pownal, for example, specialised in cabbages. George Carter of Charlottetown proudly advertised his "Haszard's Improved" turnip seed, which won prizes for a number of years.

10.1.3 Flowers

Early accounts like those of "Agriculture" and John Lawson identify common flowers that were cultivated in the province from an early date. While Lawson noted that something like a geranium was initially a cause for excitement, he added that the gardening repertoire had expanded by his day to include things like "arineas, and aloes cactus, and camelias, bigonias, bigonians [sic], and the whole alphabet of flowers in the windows of every house."⁶ The later Victorian taste for large foliage is evident at the Arthur Newbury

¹ "Report of the Board of Commissioners Appointed by the Government to Manage the Provincial Exhibition of Agriculture and Local Industry for the Year 1882" p. 11

² "Report of the Commissioners of the Provincial Exhibition, 1883" p. 11

³ See for example "Report of the Board of Commissioners Appointed by the Government to Manage the Provincial Exhibition of Agriculture and Local Industry for the Year 1882" p. 11

⁴ Lawson, p. 10

⁵ Lawson, Letter XVI

⁶ Lawson, Letter XVI

home (figure 8), in what is likely George Haszard's conservatory (figure 70) and in figure 13, which show commonly used plants like castor bean and coleus. These types of plants became less popular into the Edwardian period, and tended to be replaced by ones that provided more bloom than foliage. By the early twentieth century, long-standing favourites like hollyhocks, nasturtiums and poppies also came to be seen by those at the forefront of fashion as too ordinary, although they were ubiquitous features in any "cottage garden" design. Hollyhocks, nasturtiums, gladiola and other "cottage garden" standards can be seen at Fairholm (figure 39), the Warwick's cottage (figure 72) and in what is probably George Haszard's garden (figure 71).

Some seed merchants also specialised in particular flowers. As well as turnips, George Carter appears to have specialised in sweet peas, and offered an impressive list of varieties. George Haszard not only sold a wide variety of dahlias, but also won several prizes for them in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere. In 1898 his dahlias were featured in the *Canadian Horticulturist*. The Public Archives holds a series of stunning photographs of Haszard's prize-winning dahlias c. 1900.

10.2 Beaconsfield

John Lawson noted that West End House had a flower and kitchen garden. The faint outlines of gardens seem to be detectable in figure 17, which shows West End House in the 1860s. These gardens likely did not survive the removal of the house and the construction of Beaconsfield. As well, part of this southern section of the property would have been lost when the property was divided and Westbourne was built.

Geophysical work was not conducted on the southern boundary of the property. Documented evidence indicates that a tall board fence divided Beaconsfield and Westbourne, and photographs show that some kind of plants grew parallel to it. Figure 26 indicates small trees or shrubs growing in this area, while the presumably later photograph in figure 28 show larger shrubs or young trees growing on the lawn side of the lawn fence, and other plants growing along the Westbourne fence. Figure 30 shows some of these trees at a later stage, which may be fruit trees, and staked plants growing along the Westbourne fence. These plants are of medium height, and may be peas or beans.

While this area seems to be the most likely area where fruit and vegetables grew, utilitarian plants like these tended to be separated from view from the rest of a property, as in the McLennan-Hunt plan (figure 18). Nonetheless, this part of the Beaconsfield grounds does not seem to have been separated in any way from the rest of the lawn, which may indicate that the entire grounds west of the house was considered separate and less formal than the grounds at the main entrance. This kind of division is evident at Tulloch (figure 5), where only a small portion of the grounds at the front of the house was treated as purely ornamental and divided from the rest of the property.

10.2.1 Fruit

Henry Cundall first mentioned planting fruit trees himself at Beaconsfield in May 1887. While it is not known if any fruit trees already existed on the property; there are no fruit trees visible in figure 21. In 1900 Cundall referred to storm damage that uprooted his favourite plum tree and an old apple tree.

In October 1902 Cundall wrote about boys stealing fruit from his damson plum tree. By this point he was referring to the fruit trees as his "orchard" although it is not known how many trees would have constituted an orchard in his mind (20 Oct. 1902). Figure 30, probably taken no earlier than 1901, shows at least three small and medium-sized trees. Cundall added two Bismark apple trees to his orchard in the spring of 1907 and three plum trees in the spring of 1908 (25 May 1907, 12 May 1908). In the autumn of 1908 he referred to a damaged apple tree that he considered already old although it is not known how old or where this tree was (16 Oct. 1908). This may be the apple tree that had been partially uprooted in 1900.

Cundall regularly mentioned buying other fruits, although this does not necessarily mean that he was not growing these types himself. In the autumn of 1903 he bought apples from Beer and Goff (26 November 1903) although he was clearly growing apples at Beaconsfield. In 1908 he referred to buying Gravenstein apples from Beef and Goff, which suggests that he was growing some varieties and buying others. In 1893

he wrote that he had an old wild cherry tree taken down on his pasture lot (23 Aug. 1893), but there is no indication that he was growing cherries at Beaconsfield. A number of times he mentioned either buying cherries or being sent cherries by his cook when she was on holiday (10 Aug. 1892, 20 Aug. 1907, 4 Aug. 1908). In May 1902 he mentioned buying limes from James Gay's market stall (2 May 1902).

Henry Cundall also referred in his diaries to fruit shrubs, although as with his fruit trees, he only refers to them as being on the lawn. Fruit shrubs he mentioned are white and red raspberries, red currants and strawberries (6 and 8 Aug. 1892, 27 April 1901, 22 May 1907, 26 July 1907, 23 May 1908, 29 and 30 July 1908, 28 July 1909).

Henry Cundall used the manure from his animals for both his pasture lots and the gardens at Beaconsfield, hauling it in the spring and spreading it in the autumn (May 1908, 13 and 27 Oct. 1908, 20 May 1909).

There are currently two trees at the south-west corner of the house, which are relatively new.

10.2.2 Vegetables and herbs

Henry Cundall regularly referred in his diaries to the annual spring routine of buying garden seeds, preparing beds and planting at Beaconsfield. A number of times he wrote that he bought seeds from Haszard and Moore, and spring entries in his account books suggest that this was his usual source. However, by 1907 he seems to have switched to Carter and Co. (21 May 1907, 3 Jun 1908). His references to assisting his hired man in laying out beds and planting seeds tend to extend over a number of days, indicating that it was a big project that took almost a week each spring. This suggests substantial gardens of annual plants. Unfortunately he did not indicate where on the property these gardens were. Normally, a vegetable garden would be in close proximity to a house's kitchen or back door, as in the McLennan-Hunt plan (figure 18). If nothing was grown inside the stable yard, the area indicated in figure 30 suggests a garden that was accessible from the back door and through the lawn fence gate.

Cundall mentioned several vegetables that he grew, although he did not identify varieties. Vegetables that he mentioned were early and late peas, radishes, beets, parsnips, onions, carrots, squash and other unidentified "root crops" (11 June 1896, 18 May, 22 June 1901, 16 May, 31 May 1902, 28 May 1907, 10 Sept. 1908, 8 and 28 Oct. 1908, 4 June 1909).

10.2.3 Flowers

Although Henry Cundall's diaries suggest that he grew flowers as well as fruits and vegetables, again there is nothing in his accounts to indicate where they were grown. There is also almost nothing to indicate what flowers he grew. Cundall noted that in 1885 he won first prize for his China asters at the Provincial Exhibition (7 Oct. 1885). In April 1901 he mentioned the early blossoming of his honeysuckle.

10.3 Recommendations

Given the fact that no other location can be identified for the original garden beds, it is recommended that the southern boundary of the property be used for fruit, vegetables, herbs and flowers. Given the insubstantial evidence for this area, it is possible to be more adventurous in creating a design. It is recommended that this area be designed to represent a border of elegant Edwardian gardens.

10.3.1 Fruit

The fruit trees that currently stand at the south-west corner of the house are not contemporary to the Peakes or Cundalls. On the other hand, they are attractive and healthy. With the addition of one or two more fruit trees they could provide the basis of a small orchard, if space allows.

Figure 30 suggests that at some point shrubs were planted along the west verandah. It is recommended that fruit-bearing shrubs be planted in this area. Consideration should be given to what was being grown at the

time that the Cundalls lived at Beaconsfield, but also to colour and height. Other ornamental plants can be planted in combination along the verandah, creating an area that is both ornamental and functional.

10.3.2 Vegetables, herbs

It is recommended that the remainder of this area be devoted to vegetables, herbs and flowers, incorporating some of the most typical garden features of the Edwardian period. Given that this area slopes towards the water, it would be possible to create a modest terrace, bounded on one or both sides by rock gardens. Both of these features were particularly popular in Edwardian landscapes.

It would be possible to divide this southern stretch into separate terraced beds, or create a few extended beds. Thought must be given as to how the public would be able to view the gardens in this area from various vantage points without trampling the beds themselves. However the beds are laid out, there should be some method of keeping the public from walking into them, such as a low hedge, rock or brick border, or other edging.

Alternatively, it would be possible to create a distinct kitchen garden to the west of the carriage house, with some kind of medium-high border around it, such as hedging or a modest fence. Such a garden would include vegetables, herbs and flowers for cutting. Ideally, the alley between the house and the carriage house would be designed to recreate a working yard area, providing access to the kitchen garden from the back door of the house.

10.3.3 Flowers

Ornamental flowers should also be planted in this area. These can either be planted separately or mixed with vegetables and herbs. Whichever is preferable, flowers should be planted for greatest effect. The creation of a typical Edwardian perennial border with tall, colourful and fragrant flowers would be most striking, particularly in contrast to a parallel lawn sloping from the house to the water.

10.3.4 Other

The area directly to the west of the carriage house is currently being used for a compost pile. A compost pile should certainly be retained, but not in this area. It is unattractive, and such a thing would not have been in view of visitors while Beaconsfield was a residence. Ideally, a part of the parking lot next to the carriage house would be reclaimed to recreate a traditional working yard, where a compost pile could be housed. However, if this is not possible, the compost pile can be surrounded and hidden with a tall hedge, fence or other appropriate material.

11. WATER'S EDGE

11.1 Other sites

Like Beaconsfield, many properties in the province were built along the shoreline. Illustrations of Victorian homes like Brantford (figure 65) show grounds that consisted of lawns stretching to the water with little - if anything - growing other than grass and a few trees. This would also have been the case at Fanningbank before the Victoria Park Roadway was built. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the appeal of natural settings like woodland and seaside gardens led to more imaginative plantings like the gardens found at the cottage of Elsie and Harry Warwick at Bay Fortune (figure 73). Perhaps the best known example of the typical Edwardian seaside garden is the New Hampshire garden of Celia Thaxter, described and illustrated in her 1894 book *An Island Garden*.

11.2 Beaconsfield

While photographs indicate a fence along the water's edge at Beaconsfield, they do not indicate any gardens, which would have been consistent with other comparable properties in nineteenth-century P.E.I.

11.3 Recommendations

When James Peake bought the property from J. S. Carvell, it measured 293' from the corner of West and Kent Streets to the breastwork at the shoreline, then 146' 7" along the shoreline to the south-west corner of the property, then 255' from that point to the south-east corner of the property on West St., and then 181' 9" to the corner of the West and Kent Streets.¹ When Henry Cundall measured the southern boundary adjoining Westbourne in 1907, he measured approximately 258' 8". (4 May 1907) In 1959 the shoreline was extended to its present location. Geophysical evidence gives some indication of where the original shoreline may have been.

Given that the current shoreline is not contemporary to the Peakes or Cundalls, this area provides some scope for creative design. It is recommended that a small seaside garden be planted at the south-west corner of the grounds as an extension of Edwardian gardens on the southern boundary. A garden at the water's edge should not extend northward beyond the south-west corner of the property, otherwise it would break the line of view of the water across the lawn from the house. If it is decided to reintroduce a boardwalk along the shoreline extending from the Victoria Park boardwalk, a seaside garden in this corner would also serve as a terminus at the Westbourne boundary.

Like the treed area along Kent Street, a seaside garden would provide an opportunity to feature native P.E.I. plants. It would also allow further use of local historic sources such as Lucy Maude Montgomery's article mentioned above, Francis Bain's notes on local natural history, and others. In his diaries, Henry Cundall mentioned picking pink and white mayflowers and ferns (5 May 1892, 17 June 1893) and wild mushrooms (21 Aug. 1894).

¹ deed, book 4 pp. 814-5

RECOMMENDATIONS - STRUCTURES

There is no evidence to suggest that structures other than those already covered existed on the grounds during the Peake and Cundall periods. However, because it is recommended that the site be designed to reflect the gardens of a particular period, it would be possible to incorporate features drawn from other local sites. Any such features should be kept to a minimum so as not to clutter the site, and should be chosen based on practical and historic value. They should also be removable, should later evidence for the grounds come to light.

Below are some of the features that may be considered.

1. GREENHOUSE

1.1 Other sites

It was not uncommon in the nineteenth century for larger homes to have a greenhouse in order to grow tropical plants, as well as fruit and vegetables throughout the year. It was certainly a standard feature of large estates elsewhere. However, it does not seem to have been a common feature of homes in P.E.I. during this time. According to the reports produced for the Government House Garden Committee, one of the unidentified buildings that once stood on the grounds of Fanningbank may have been a greenhouse.¹ Perhaps the only other conservatory of the era existed at Fairholm, which appears in a painting done by George Thresher and reproduced in a lithograph of 1841 (figure 74). This greenhouse was also mentioned by John Lawson, who wrote: "There are but two conservatories in the whole Island, and the success of the proprietor of one of these - my friend the Hon. T.H. Haviland the Colonial Secretary - would have prompted other of his class, one would have thought, to have followed his example. Independently of keeping a number of very beautiful exotics through the winter, Mr. Haviland has had his grapes ripen very early in the season; he has also ripened oranges."²

In what appears to have been Lawson's regular attempt to minimise the rustic appearance of local life to potential immigrants, he continued by stating that he would be happy to see more such conservatories, writing: "I shall be delighted when I see some man of taste - of true taste - build a house with a spacious conservatory and grapery, nor do I the least doubt, when a few examples are set, and the advantages known, that, in the course of a half dozen or so of years to see them almost half universal."³ However, as with his hopes for an end to the tyranny of the potato, more grand residential conservatories do not seem to have materialised. What appears to have been more common was for homes to devote some part of the house to a small conservatory. W.C. Harris' plans for the McLennan-Hunt house show an enclosed conservatory at one corner of the house, rather than an open verandah (figures 18 and 59). This may also have been the sort of area that Henry Cundall meant when he referred to visiting Edward Bayfield's conservatory in 1899.

Larger commercial nurseries might have been more likely to have greenhouses, although there is also little evidence concerning this. The *Meacham's Atlas* illustration of James Gay's nursery in Pownal does not show a greenhouse, although this does not mean that one did not exist. Figure 70 shows a small greenhouse, which probably belonged to George Haszard, of Haszard and Moore fame.

1.2 Beaconsfield

There is no evidence to suggest that a greenhouse existed at Beaconsfield. However, it is not impossible that a design similar to the McLennan-Hunt house conservatory was originally intended for Beaconsfield.

¹ Coutts, p. 3

² Lawson, Letter XVI

³ Lawson, Letter XVI

Insurance plans indicate an extension on the south side of the stable which was eventually removed. It is not known what this was, although it can vaguely be seen in figure 26.

1.3 Recommendations

It is recommended that serious consideration be given to constructing a period-appropriate greenhouse on the grounds. If a garden is to be maintained permanently, it will be necessary to have a place for potting, winterising and other activities that cannot be conducted in the house or carriage house. Given that space and finances are limited, a small greenhouse would be sufficient as long as it is in a location that receives sufficient sun. A site plan would help to identify the best location.

The greenhouse in figure 70 shows that a significant amount of work can be done in a small space, and could serve as a basis for a design.

2. GAZEBO

2.1 Other sites

Summerhouses and gazebos were popular features in Victorian gardens, although evidence does not suggest that they were particularly common in P.E.I. According to reports produced for the Government House Garden Committee, a gazebo or pavilion originally stood on the grounds of Fanningbank. These reports recommended reintroducing this feature to Victoria Park.¹ Perhaps the most prominent example of this type of structure was the bandstand that once stood in Queen Square. A similar bandstand still exists in the Halifax Public Gardens.

2.2 Recommendations

While there is no evidence that a gazebo or summerhouse existed at Beaconsfield, it is a practical and appealing feature that should be considered. Any such structure should be relatively small and inconspicuous. It should also be based on an actual design, either a local one, such as a modification of the Queen Square bandstand, or a standard period design. Whatever the design, any structure that is introduced near the waterfront should be designed in consultation with the Government House Garden Committee.

If a gazebo or summerhouse is included, it is recommended that it be placed at the north-west corner of the property, near Kent Street. This location would provide visitors with ideal views of the grounds, water and possibly Government House. Locating a gazebo in this area under trees would also provide maximum shade for visitors in the summer, would not take up valuable sunny space where gardens could be planted, and would not obscure the view of the water across the lawn from the house. A gazebo would also serve a functional purpose for public events such as strawberry socials or musicales. If visible from Kent Street and the Victoria Park boardwalk, as well as the water, it would encourage passers-by to visit the grounds.

Placing a gazebo in this unobtrusive location would also compliment any efforts to design the Kent Street boundary as a transition area between Victorian and Edwardian. While gazebos and summerhouses were popular Victorian features, they were sometimes relegated to more obscure areas of the grounds in the Edwardian period in favour of pergolas. A hidden or “neglected” atmosphere could even be enhanced by planting climbers and vines to grow over the structure.

3. PERGOLA

Perhaps the most popular architectural feature of Edwardian gardens was the pergola or arbour, which was usually covered with vines and climbers such as clematis, honeysuckle or roses. Pergolas could function as an entrance point, or might serve as the main feature of a garden. On larger grounds, they could extend to form a walkway of several hundred feet, often leading towards a specific feature, such as a rose garden, pool, open glade or summerhouse. If large enough, pergolas could also serve as boundaries between distinct gardens areas.

¹ Fardin, p. 45, Zvonar pp. 13, 23

3.1 Other sites - Beaconsfield

To date no evidence has been found that identifies a typically Edwardian pergola in P.E.I., although simple arbours were not uncommon.

3.2 Recommendations

While a pergola is quintessentially Edwardian, it may not be appropriate for the grounds at Beaconsfield. The most appropriate and least obtrusive way to incorporate a pergola or modest arbour would be as an entranceway to a specific part of the grounds.

3.2.1 Option 1: Entrance to lawn

It may be desirable to separate the area to the west of the house from the main entrance to the property. If this is the case, a pergola or more simple arbour would be an effective method, which would clearly identify the transition from one area to another, without obstructing the view between areas.

3.2.2 Option 2: Westbourne boundary

If the southern boundary is planted in an Edwardian style, a pergola may be an appropriate method of identifying distinct beds. This would be particularly effective if a vegetable garden were to be planted directly west of the carriage house. An arbour between this and a more formal flower garden would clearly delineate the two areas. In this location, any structural feature would be furthest away from the north-west corner of the property, making both a small pergola and gazebo possible without cluttering the grounds.

Alternatively, it would be possible to incorporate a pergola near the south-west corner of the property, leading from a formal garden to a more open, seaside garden area. This would be preferable only if a gazebo were not added in the north-west corner of the grounds, making a more elaborate Edwardian pergola possible.

RECOMMENDATIONS - OBJECTS

1. FLAGPOLE AND WIND VANE

1.1 Other sites

Flagpoles might occasionally have been found on the grounds of larger grounds in P.E.I. This is evident at homes like Fairholm (figures 3 and 75) and Green Park (figure 66). Figure 29 appears to show a flagpole on the grounds of every house on West Street. Nor was it uncommon for flagpoles to be attached to a stable. This can be seen in illustrations of Brantford (figure 65) and May Flower Mills (figure 56). Alternatively, a stable might be topped with a wind vane. This appears in illustrations of Valmont (figure 58) and Fairholm (figure 75).

1.2 Beaconsfield

Figure 17 indicates that a flagpole of similar style to that at Green Park (figure 66) stood on the grounds before West End House was moved. There is no evidence to indicate if a flagpole existed on the grounds while the Peakes lived at Beaconsfield.

Henry Cundall's accounts note the purchase of a flagpole in June of 1887, but as Cundall owned and was responsible for several properties, it is not certain if this flagpole was for Beaconsfield. However, Cundall regularly noted in his diary that he raised a flag at Beaconsfield in recognition of Queen Victoria's birthday and Dominion Day (23 May 1892, 24 May 1894, 1 July 1907). Figure 29, which includes Edgewater, shows a flagpole near the water. The later figures 45 and 46 show what appears to be the same flagpole at the water's edge.¹

In 1901 Cundall noted in his diary that he again bought a flagpole. In this case it was clearly for Beaconsfield, and probably for the stable. At the same time, Cundall also retrieved some flags that he had loaned to a colleague. Throughout August he also removed a wind vane and its pole from his old home on King Street, painted it, and had it attached to the end of the stable at Beaconsfield (July-Aug. 1901). This wind vane does not exist in figure 21, but can be seen in figure 30.

Cundall also erected a temporary flag pole and flew the British ensign in August 1902, in honour of the coronation of Edward VII. (Aug. 1902). He noted that on his lawn flagpole, he normally flew the union jack (23 May 1892, 9 Aug. 1902).

1.3 Recommendations

It is not recommended that a flagpole be reintroduced to the west lawn. This would not be particularly attractive, and would obstruct the view from the house to the water. It is recommended instead that a flagpole and wind vane be considered for the carriage house.

2. SEATING

2.1 Other sites

The "rustic" style of bench was particularly popular in the nineteenth century, which was designed so as to appear to be made out of twigs. Despite their rustic look, these benches might have been made of any available material, including wrought iron. This style of seating could be found at Fairholm (figure 3), and the homes of R.R. Fitzgerald (figure 7), George Anderson (figure 53) and Arthur Newbury (figure 76).

¹ Note that this location is no longer the water's edge.

2.2 Beaconsfield

No evidence has been found to determine what, if any, kind of seating existed at Beaconsfield. However, the verandah appears to have been a favourite spot for Henry Cundall to relax, particularly in his later years. His diaries include several evocative references to sitting on the verandah reading a book in the sunshine, or enjoying the view with visitors and watching the sun set over the water.

2.3 Recommendations

Any design for the grounds at Beaconsfield will need to include public seating. It is recommended that the rustic bench style be used for seating in the shaded areas, that is along Kent Street and in the north-east corner of the property. Any seating in these areas would be primarily functional, but should be based on a period-appropriate design. Possible locations for functional seating are discussed elsewhere.

Seating on the verandah would provide excellent views of the grounds and water, and here it may be possible to use Edwardian-style wicker chairs of the sort seen in figure 36.

There is currently a semi-circular stone bench on the lawn to the west of the house. If suitable, this bench can be retained and placed in the most appropriate location.

There is currently a bench and trellis along the Westbourne boundary of the property. Given that it is recommended that this area be designed in an Edwardian style, it may be possible to enhance this seating to represent an exedra, or recessed seating area. Like the pergola, the exedra was a popular architectural feature of Edwardian gardens.

3. HAMMOCK AND SWING

There are several other smaller items that could be used to enhance the atmosphere of a private residence at Beaconsfield. Figure 58, for example shows Valmont in Summerside with a hammock on the verandah. After the Peakes moved out but before the Cundalls moved in, Henry Cundall mentioned in his diary that when visiting the house in the summer of 1883, he found a Mr. D. Stewart either playing tennis or swinging in a hammock (8 and 22 July 1883). It may be possible to add a hammock to the verandah, combining a sense of comfortable elegance with excellent views of the grounds and water.

A swing in the treed area along Kent Street is also a possibility. Figure 77 gives a sense of how this might look, placed amongst a clump of trees and ground cover. Items like these would provide added interest, character and functionality to the grounds.

NEXT STEPS

The remainder of this report discusses the next steps of implementing a heritage landscape. Remaining research and preparatory work can be conducted over the winter of 2009 and bids can be invited from landscape architects. Ideally, work on the grounds could begin in the spring of 2009.

1. COMMITTEE

A committee should be formed to oversee a heritage landscape project at Beaconsfield. This committee should decide as a whole on the general requirements and preferences to be included in a final landscape plan. It can also advise on the hiring of any necessary staff, and on the selection of carpenters, landscape architects, etc. It should also be able to provide useful suggestions as to locating appropriate plants, seeds, materials, equipment, funding, etc.

As well as other necessary members, it is worth considering the inclusion of the following as members of the committee:

- a member of the Government House Garden Committee, who can act as a liaison with Government House in order to develop a heritage landscape district
- an employee or past employee who has knowledge of the development of the grounds since it was acquired by the Heritage Foundation
- a historical advisor knowledgeable about local history during the period that will be represented

1.1 Audience and function

The first task of the committee should be to decide who the intended audience(s) of the grounds will be, and what the function(s) will be. These must be clearly defined before any decisions can be made regarding a landscape design, and should be considered in the following way:

- a) Which demographics should the site attract? What functions will attract these demographics?
- b) What functions should the grounds serve? What audiences will be attracted to those functions?

Possible functions to be considered can include those identified below.

1.1.1 Historical interpretation

First and foremost, the grounds should be viewed as having heritage value equal to that of the house. Historical accuracy, professionalism and interpretative value should be the main priorities. Public appeal should also be considered, but it should not compromise the main objective of creating a landscape that is of real historical value. How this historical element of the grounds is to be interpreted will depend on how they are laid out and how the public are to be guided through them. For example, if the grounds include both Victorian and Edwardian areas, it would be preferable to devise a method of interpretation that takes visitors through them chronologically, and explains how they differ.

The committee should decide what method or methods of interpretation would be the most effective. Questions that should be considered can include:

- Will docents conduct tours, or will tours be self-guided?
- If docents are used, will they be costumed? Will they be responsible for particular aspects of the grounds? Will they represent specific people who lived at Beaconsfield?
- Is a single interpretative map on the grounds preferable? This can be expensive and detract from the landscape.

- Are smaller explanatory plaques placed at intervals preferable? These can also be expensive, can detract from the landscape, and can obstruct the flow of traffic.
- Are brochures preferable? Since the public often do not read brochures, and leave them lying around, brochures should be available on request, but not mandatory.
- Is a combination of the above preferable?

1.1.2 Public events

The committee should consider what types of outdoor events would be desirable before deciding on a final design. For example, if Beaconsfield wishes to hold events that require space for a large group, then a sufficient amount of lawn is necessary as opposed to garden beds. If boating or other events that require access from the water are possible, then the final design must include features like a dock. If evening events are desirable, then lighting will be a major consideration. If events that involve displays, music or serving tables are desirable, a gazebo or other feature that provides shelter will be important.

1.1.3 Programming

The committee should consider what types of programming can be designed around gardens and other outdoor features before deciding on a final design. For example, programmes that involve children would require interesting and attractive plants that they can enjoy growing, eating or studying. Anything that involves children also requires sufficient space for them to run and play, and areas that can withstand a certain amount of trampling.

2. DESIGNATED PROJECT SPACE

It will be necessary to devote some on-site permanent space to a landscape project and to future maintenance of the grounds. This space should be able to accommodate the following:

- a) permanently house all materials related to the grounds, including:
 - research and archaeological reports
 - photographs and other documented evidence
 - surveys, site plans, restoration designs
 - plants, materials, methods and other databases
- b) permanently house administrative documentation, including:
 - contacts and resources
 - volunteer information
 - grant, donation and other funding information
- c) provide working space, including:
 - planting, potting, winterising
 - storage space, i.e. tools, deliveries, other equipment

3. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER SITES

The creation of a local heritage landscape district has been discussed above. Efforts should be made as early as possible to initiate contacts with other local heritage sites. As part of this process, uniform signage, tours and other features should be discussed that tie sites in the Beaconsfield area together.

Ultimately, Beaconsfield should strive to be a part of a Charlottetown-wide heritage garden association. This would be beneficial to all sites concerned, allowing sources, information and ideas to be shared amongst sites. Working in conjunction with other sites would also help each site to identify and emphasise its own unique features.

4. FURTHER RESEARCH

The research conducted for this report should be viewed as preliminary, as it is far from exhaustive. Research related to the grounds of Beaconsfield and to contemporary gardening in P.E.I. should become a permanent part of the site's ongoing research practices.

Appendix C, which includes Cundall's personal records, is not a formal transcription. It is recommended that all of these documents, including Cundall's diaries, letters and accounts be transcribed and printed as a permanent on-site historical source. Ideally, this material should be digitised and featured on Beaconsfield's web site.

4.1 Beaconsfield grounds

There is a moderate amount of material related to the grounds of Beaconsfield that is known to have existed. It is not currently known if this material still exists, but further research may uncover some of this material. Sources to examine can include the following:

- After Henry Cundall and his family moved into Beaconsfield, Cundall took several photographs of his relatives, servants and the house. He then appears to have had these photographs developed at Tanton Studio (Sept. 1885). While these pictures of his sisters may be those contained in the Duvernet Collection at the Public Archives, this collection does not include any photographs of the house or grounds.
- Henry Cundall noted in his diary that in November 1885, Arthur Newbury photographed Beaconsfield for the government (28 Nov. 1885). This photograph has not been identified.
- Henry Cundall wrote that in February 1895, a "Miss Rogers," friend of his sister Penelope, completed a sketch of the harbour from Beaconsfield's drawing room. This Miss Rogers regularly won prizes at the annual exhibition for her paintings. According to Cundall's diaries, she eventually moved to England.
- In August 1908 Henry Cundall noted that a Mr. F.E. Johnston - or Johnson - visiting from Younkers, N.Y. took several photographs of the trees and grounds from both the ground and the house.
- W.C. Harris' original plans for Beaconsfield may still exist.

As well, there remains a significant amount of material in the Public Archives and elsewhere that may prove useful to a landscape project. For example, much of the photographic material in the Public Archives is either uncatalogued or unidentified, but could be directly relevant to Beaconsfield. A more extensive search is needed to identify potentially useful material.

4.2 Plants

Appendix B is a preliminary list of plants that are suitable for use in a heritage garden at Beaconsfield. This list currently includes all the plants mentioned by Henry Cundall as having grown at Beaconsfield, and the plants listed in George Carter and Co.'s seed catalogue for 1902. Further research is required in order to create a comprehensive list of appropriate plants for Beaconsfield. It will also be necessary to verify the plants identified in the sources, i.e. to ensure what varieties they are, as common names of plants often change over time, and from place to place. Ultimately each plant in the list should be identified by its botanical name. It would also be useful to include descriptive information such as height, colour and flowering time of each plant, which may help to identify the ideal location for each plant.

The list included in Appendix B is in searchable database form, which should be maintained as the list is expanded. It is recommended that this list eventually be added to Beaconsfield's web site.

Sources to examine can include those identified below.

4.2.1 Local sources

Many of the images included in this report show plants that were grown in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The originals of these images are generally much clearer than the photocopies included in Appendix A, and should be examined in order to identify plants more specifically.

While illustrations may indicate plants generally grown, they do not help to identify varieties. Documentary evidence should be used for this, particularly when botanical names are provided. The most detailed source identified so far is the 1856 garden plan for Government House in the Confederation Centre collection, which provides some common names of plants, and some botanical names (figure 78). This plan should be fully transcribed and the varieties of flowers identified. However, like the “Hint on Gardening &c” column of the 1830s, this plan indicates plants there were recommended for use, not necessarily plants that were used.

Other useful local sources include:

- county and provincial exhibition prize lists in newspapers
- nursery and seedsmen advertisements in newspapers
- horticultural and agricultural society records
- exhibition commission reports in *PEI Legislative Assembly* reports
- Government House reports in *PEI Legislative Assembly* reports
- records pertaining to Arthur Newbury’s Queen Square gardens
- Experimental Farm records
- records identifying horticulture at other sites

4.2.2 General sources

Contemporary sources of a more general nature can include:

- gardening periodicals, i.e.
 - *The Canadian Horticulturist*
 - *The Horticulturist*
- *PEI Magazine*
- seed catalogues outside P.E.I. (i.e. Rennie and Vick)

4.3 Materials

All structures, objects, pathways - and possibly tools and equipment - must be made of period-appropriate materials. This requires identifying historically accurate materials so that all currently inappropriate materials can be replaced, and any new features be made of appropriate materials.

It is possible to have many of the necessary features made locally. Sites like Orwell Corner and Ardgowan, where restoration work has already taken place, can be consulted in identifying qualified local tradesmen.¹ Sources to examine for appropriate materials can include those identified below.

4.3.1 Local sources

Photographs and other illustrations provide useful information. For example, wooden stakes were most commonly used for staking plants; figure 30 shows tall wooden stakes in the Beaconsfield garden on the southern boundary.

¹ For example, all of the hardware for Ardgowan was hand made locally. (Gibbon, *APT* p. 105) (Gibbon, *Island Magazine*, p. 29)

Other useful local sources include:

- newspaper announcements of shipping arrivals, which identify goods being carried, i.e. farm equipment, nails, iron, etc.
- store catalogues and newspaper advertisements, which identify goods sold, i.e. brickwork, lumber, hardware, farm and garden equipment, garden furniture, etc.
- advertisements in directories and almanacs, i. e. *Harvie's Prince Edward Island Almanac*
- City of Charlottetown records of municipal works, i.e. Streets, Parks, Public Works; Lighting; etc., which identify when board sidewalks on Kent and West Streets were replaced, when macadamisation and concrete was put in, when gas and electrical lighting was put in, when sewer work was done and what materials were used, etc.

4.3.2 General sources

There are many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sources of a general nature that can be examined, i.e. periodicals, store catalogues, landscaping manuals, etc.

5 ARCHAEOLOGY

It is worth considering further archaeological investigation of the grounds, particularly in areas that are known to have seen a high level of traffic, or for which there is no other evidence. Ardgowan conducted extensive archaeological investigations preceding its landscape reconstruction.¹ Seeds found in the soil were analysed at the Seed Biology Laboratory of Agriculture Canada, where standard crops like carrots, mustard and rhubarb were identified, as well as some shrubs.²

6 SITE PLAN

Before a design can be decided or any physical changes made, a detailed to-scale site plan must be prepared, identifying all the relevant features that currently exist, with a corresponding photographic record. This site plan should be provided to all landscape architects before proposals are submitted.

6.1 Arborist

It is recommended that an arborist examine the trees that are currently on the site. An arborist should be able to identify the trees, determine their health, and possibly give an estimate of age. It may also be possible for an arborist to identify some of the trees in old photographs of the site.

7 FUNDING

If supplemental funding is necessary, possible sources should be identified and approached. This can include gifts in kind, grants and public donations. Individual donors can be encouraged to contribute either to the project generally, or to a particular aspect. For example, the trees planted in Charlottetown during the first Arbour Day in 1884 were each paid for by a local resident.³ A similar public fundraiser could be developed for the landscape project at Beaconsfield.

8 MODERN REQUIREMENTS

While it is recommended that the grounds be recreated to reflect those of a private home, they are clearly intended for public use. This will require the incorporation of several modern features that would otherwise not exist as part of a private home, including those identified below.

¹ Gribbon, *Island Magazine*, p. 30

² Gribbon, *APT*, p. 100

³ Hennessey, "Arthur Newbury...", p 26

8.1 Signage

Signage is necessary to identify areas like entrances, exits, the parking lot and washrooms, and also to direct the public along certain routes throughout the grounds. It may also be preferable to incorporate interpretative signs throughout the grounds.

All signs should be clearly visible, but unobtrusive. Signs should be made using period appropriate lettering. For example, if the grounds reflect the Edwardian period, something like *art nouveau* or Arts and Crafts lettering may be appropriate.

The main sign identifying the site as a whole should be simple and uncluttered, clearly visible, and in keeping with the style of the house and grounds. The current sign is an appropriate size and design, but is the same colour as the house, which makes it fade into the background. A different colour, or eye-catching plantings around the sign may make it more visible and enticing.

Thought must be given to how signs will be placed and fixed. Signs that are securely fixed to permanent structures such as walls and fences, rather than their own posts, are less likely to be removed or vandalised.

While it is important that a clear and attractive map of the grounds be available to visitors in some form, it is recommended that interpretative signs be used to a minimum. If these are used on the grounds, they should be visible, but as unobtrusive as possible, and should not detract from the overall effect of the landscape. Ideally, they should be close to ground level, but high and clear enough that they can be read without straining or bending.

8.2 Parking

The issue of parking has been mentioned above: no parking should be allowed near the entrance of the house, and any parking area should be hidden by a high barrier such as a fence or hedging. The committee will need to assess how much and what kind of parking facilities are required, as well as how visitors will enter and leave the site. As well, if visitors park in the carriage house area, there will need to be a clearly marked route that allows them to walk from the parking area to the main entrance of the house and the grounds.

8.3 Circulation

Consideration must be given to how visitors will move around the grounds. Signage and clearly laid out paths will encourage visitors to travel along certain routes, and help reduce the tendency to wander into restricted areas. Defined paths will also encourage visitors to follow whatever interpretative route has been devised, which will ultimately be more fulfilling than simply wandering randomly through the property.

In devising paths, entrances and exits, it should be kept in mind that people naturally walk along a route that is most convenient to them, and get frustrated if they are steered in a confusing or unnatural way. Curved paths around the perimeter of the grounds, with adequate visual attractions, seating and interpretative information are more likely to be followed than awkward paths at right angles that do not lead to anything of interest. The paths identified in the W.C. Harris plans of the MacLennan-Hunt house may be a suitable basic design to follow. A full circle around the perimeter of the grounds may be the most practical, with exit paths leading off at appropriate places.

Function will determine the size of paths. Where the greatest traffic is expected, such as at the main entrance, walkways up to six feet wide may be necessary. In areas of less traffic, such as through treed areas or within gardens, paths of two to three feet may be adequate. Paths need to be wide enough to encourage visitors to use them, allowing at least two people to walk together, but not so wide that they take up excessive space.

Consideration should also be given to creating barriers to dissuade visitors from taking certain routes, such as through the middle of flower beds, or into staff-only areas. Barriers of appropriate material, such as thick and impenetrable hedging, wood or wrought iron may be necessary.

8.4 Seating

Seating of appropriate design and materials should be provided on the grounds in comfortable and attractive locations. Seats should be placed out of the way to the side of paths at appropriate intervals, where there is a particularly attractive view, or where shade is provided. The McLennan-Hunt plan provides an appealing view of this kind of seating tucked in amongst trees. Seating areas can be enhanced with some kind of appropriate object, such as an interpretative plaque, sundial, etc. Seating areas can be made particularly appealing by ensuring that they are close to fragrant plants such as roses or honeysuckle.

8.5 Lighting

Beaconsfield is surrounded by street lighting of a Victorian style similar to that seen in figure 24. However, the light provided by these fixtures is artificially orange and glaring.¹ The modern lighting in the government parking lot across Kent Street is particularly bright and unattractive. A consequence of the excessive lighting is that it affects how the grounds of Beaconsfield are lit. To be entirely historically accurate, the grounds would be in darkness at night, which for purposes of safety and security may not be desirable. There is also modern globe lighting on the grounds, which is stylistically inappropriate. Thought must be given to how the grounds should be lit within the context of both historical accuracy and modern requirements. It is recommended that the modern lighting on the grounds be replaced with a lighting system that can be increased and decreased depending on need. Options in terms of style can include the following:

- Chinese lanterns were popular features of garden parties in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They were used in the garden by the Peakes in 1879 when Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne dined at the house, and also by the Cundalls when hosting public garden parties.
- The Arts and Crafts style was very popular during the early twentieth century. It is noted for creating a warm light, and for its natural designs that are particularly well suited to the outdoors.

Whatever style is selected, it should be remembered that the current style of street lighting is Victorian gaslight. Outdoor lighting on the grounds should not look too incongruous with this.

8.6 Garbage

One modern requirement on the grounds will be garbage disposal. Garbage receptacles should be placed strategically around the grounds, preferably near seating, entrances and exits, and parking. Bins should be plain, unobtrusive, but clearly visible. Any attempt to create “heritage” designs for garbage bins should be avoided, since garbage bins themselves are a historical anachronism.

9 ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

The committee should decide on what historical features it considers imperative as part of the final design. It should identify which specific plants, structures, objects and materials must be used.

9.1 Plants

Once research has been completed, there will be an extensive list of plants from which to choose. Plants should be selected in the following order of priority:

- 1) Essential: varieties known to have been grown at Beaconsfield by the Peakes or Cundalls, i.e. China aster, Bismark apple
- 2) Preferable: varieties known to have been grown by Henry Cundall elsewhere while living at Beaconsfield
- 3) Desirable: varieties known to have been grown at other specific locations contemporary to the Peakes or Cundalls
- 4) Desirable: varieties supplied by local merchants, i.e. Carter’s sweet peas, Haszard’s dahlias, Gay’s cabbages

¹ This was also noted in Zvonar’s report for Government House, p. 12

9.2 Structures and objects

It is necessary to identify any permanent features that are considered essential to a final plan. These should be selected based on the same criteria as plants. These can include:

- fences and gates
- outbuildings
- paths
- other objects, i.e. birdbath, sundial
- modern requirements

9.3 Materials

Once essential structures and objects have been identified, it will be necessary to identify the appropriate materials to be used. Materials selected should be based on historical accuracy, but also functionality. For example, while gravel may be the most historically appropriate material for a carriage drive, it may be deemed too difficult to keep clear in the winter.

10 MAINTENANCE METHODS

The committee should consider how the grounds are to be maintained over the short term and long term. Ideally, the grounds will be maintained using historically accurate methods. This can be more expensive initially as appropriate tools and equipment are acquired. It also requires further research and training of staff or volunteers who will be doing the work. However, it provides greater interpretative value to the site. Allowing the public to see these methods in practice gives them a further glimpse into the period, and helps them to appreciate that landscapes are of equal historic value to buildings. Using traditional methods is also usually more enjoyable and interesting for those doing the work. Conversely, using modern methods does not require the same initial investment of equipment and training, and is less labour-intensive. However, it is of no historic value, and usually results in a less authentic-looking landscape.

If the committee decides to incorporate historically accurate gardening methods, it will be necessary to identify methods, tools and equipment appropriate to the period chosen. Henry Cundall's records make frequent mention of the methods used at Beaconsfield, referring to objects like the two pumps that existed, including one in the stable, his lawnmower, his cellar water tank, various wagons, sleighs and other vehicles, pieces of equipment, etc.

Other sources to consult for appropriate methods and equipment can include:

- photographs and illustrations (the Public Archives photographic collections include numerous photographs of farm and garden work)
- "Hints on Gardening &c. Suited Prince Edward Island" in *The Colonial Herald*
- local newspapers (for example *The Patriot* is an agricultural newspaper, and is a good source for methods, equipment, etc.)
- commissioners' reports on agricultural exhibitions and activities in *PEI Legislative Assembly* reports
- local almanacs, especially *Harvie's Prince Edward Island Almanac*

THE RECONSTRUCTION

1. PRELIMINARY PLAN

Once all of the above has been determined, the committee can create a preliminary plan of the grounds that can serve as a guide for a reconstruction. This plan need not be overly detailed or sophisticated, but should indicate a general idea of what is desired, and should identify all definite requirements that must be included in any final plan, such as particular plants, garden areas, structures and other features. If specific individual areas are to be developed, these areas should be clearly defined and identified.

Also, plans should be drawn for any features that will need to be constructed, such as a fence, trellis, seating, lighting, pergola, or gazebo. These plans should be as detailed as possible, including any required measurements, sizes, materials, colours, etc.

In developing a plan for the site, it should be kept in mind that while it is possible to design specific areas individually, representing different styles and periods, the entire landscape should work as a whole that is well balanced and unified.

2. PRIORITIES

Funding or time restrictions may make it necessary to approach creating a heritage landscape in stages. It is therefore necessary to prioritise the areas to be designed, so that work can begin on the most important areas first. The following order is recommended:

- 1) **Boundaries:** Identify which areas need to be bounded, and what materials will be used, i.e. fence, hedge, flower border. These will clearly define the property as a whole, and help to identify the individual sections within it.
- 2) **Main entrance:** Although this is the most important area in that it provides the public's first impressions of the site, it is currently the most inappropriate, and detracts significantly from the appeal of the site. If it is necessary to redesign the grounds in stages, this area should be redesigned first.
- 3) **Carriage house parking lot:** Any changes necessary to accommodate the removal of the parking lot at the main entrance should be made either alongside or immediately after the redesign of the main entrance area.
- 4) **Kent Street side:** After the main entrance, the stretch along Kent Street is the part of the grounds that the public sees most. This area should be tackled next.
- 5) **Westbourne boundary:** Although this area provides the greatest scope for gardens, it is the least visible from the street, and could be left until a later stage.
- 6) **Waterfront:** This area can be addressed at the final stage.

If it is decided that separate areas of the grounds can be prioritised, these priorities should be identified on the committee's preliminary plan.

3. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Once all of the above decisions have been made, the committee can invite landscape architects to submit bids for the project. All bidders should be interviewed and asked to provide examples of previous work. Candidates should be able to demonstrate experience and an understanding of period design, rather than simply familiarity with modern landscaping or rehabilitation of grounds surrounding heritage buildings. Local landscapers will be more familiar with the plants and growing conditions of the area, and possibly local horticultural history. On the other hand, it may not be possible to hire a local firm that is adequately qualified to design a heritage landscape.

Candidates should be requested to submit a preliminary plan as well as a cost projection for maintaining the proposed plan. In order to aid candidates in creating a preliminary plan, each candidate should be supplied with the following information:

- a site plan
- a summary of the goal of the project and the intended function(s) and audience(s) of the grounds
- a list of acceptable plants, features and materials
- a list of any plants, features or materials that the committee considers essential
- a list of modern requirements
- the committee's preliminary plan, identifying prioritised areas
- any construction specifications

Once a candidate has been selected, their submitted plan can be refined by the committee where needed. Any necessary changes can be discussed with the successful candidate until a final plan is decided. Arrangements can then be made for work on the grounds to begin.

4. RESOURCES

The costs, timeline and what work is to be included should be provided to the committee as part of each candidate's submission. The successful candidate may wish to take responsibility for all aspects of the reconstruction. If the successful candidate does not intend or is not able to provide all aspects of the project, the committee will have to arrange for some work to be completed separately. This may include:

- design, construction and painting of fences, outbuildings, etc.
- design and construction of signage, lighting, etc.
- identifying nurseries that supply appropriate varieties of seeds, plants and bulbs
- identifying companies that provide appropriate materials, tools, equipment, etc.

It may be possible that much of the above can be donated to the project by companies or individuals. It is worth publicising a request for donations at an early stage. The committee should ensure that all donations are what donors believe them to be. This is especially true for seeds, plants and bulbs, which may not necessarily be the variety that the donor thinks.

5. SUPERVISION

While the actual landscaping and construction is taking place, an advisor should be on site to supervise the work in order to provide any necessary assistance, to ensure that the work meets the necessary requirements, and that it stays on schedule. The advisor should also be able to report to the committee as work progresses.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

The committee will need to determine how the grounds will be maintained over the long term. It is imperative that the grounds be maintained on a regular basis, and that there be secure funding and staff to make this possible. Untidy or neglected gardens will detract significantly from the appeal and heritage value of the site, whereas well-tended grounds will encourage visitors to visit them, and treat them with greater care and respect.

1. GROUNDS MAINTENANCE

1.1 Cost projection

The committee should develop its own cost projection for the ongoing maintenance and support of the grounds. It should identify what tasks need to be done on a yearly basis, the projected time required, and what purchases may be necessary. This should be compared to the cost projection submitted by the successful landscape architect.

1.2 Grounds maintenance

The grounds will need to be tended throughout the year, although work will be less intensive during the winter months. Requirements for each season should be clearly identified.

During the less busy seasons, continuing research, locating and securing plants, seeds and other additions to the gardens, developing programming for the gardens, initiating new contacts, etc. can be done. Any fences, arbours, or other wooden structures can be painted, and general repairs can be made in the spring and autumn when work in the gardens is less intensive.

1.3 Maintenance manual

As the final design for the grounds is developed and put in place, a maintenance manual should be assembled that covers work required in each season. This manual should be clearly and simply written so that staff or volunteers can follow it with minimal supervision. The maintenance manual created for the grounds of Ardgowan may provide a suitable format.

It should be kept in mind that maintenance procedures will likely need to be refined once the actual care of the grounds becomes reality. As well, features may be added or removed over time, such as the incorporation of historically accurate methods of gardening. Any maintenance manual will need to be updated on a regular basis.

- 1 Zvonar, p. 12
- 1 Zvonar, p. 22
- 1 Favretti and Favretti, p. 87
- 1 MacKinnon, title page
- 1 MacKinnon, p. 6
- 1 Gribbon, *APT*, p. 99
- 1 *Ardgowan Management Plan*, p. 19
- 1 MacKinnon, p. 8
- 1 For example, the author advised readers to try growing round-leafed spinach as opposed to “the prickly sort grown in Britain.” “Hints...”, *The Colonial Herald*, 20 Jan. 1838, p. 1 col. 2
- 1 “Hints...”, *Colonial Herald*, 16 May 1838, p. 4 col. 4
- 1 Gribbon, *APT*, p. 104
- 1 Zvonar, p. 2
- 1 Henry Cundall was familiar with the grounds of Ardgowan. In his diary he noted that on Tues. 21 August 1879 he walked with fellow surveyor John Ball out to Mt. Edward Road. Two months earlier, Ball
- 1 **Insert** here how Cundall visited Fitzgerald’s house a few times
- 1 Henry Cundall was a friend of the Newbury family and was made godfather to Adele Newbury in 1890 (Cundall diaries, 24 Nov. 1890). He would have been familiar with the Newbury home and gardens.
- 1 “Painting a History...” p. 26
- 1 “Painting...” p. 27
- 1 “Painting...” p. 28
- 1 Vas, p. 24
- 1 “Painting...” p. 28
- 1 “Report of the Commissioners of the Provincial Exhibition, 1883” p. 6
- 1 For example, a certain P. Walker advertised in 1838 that he had just received turnip seed from Aberdeen, which he was willing to sell to interested parties, while George Weldon was selling unnamed seeds from his home, which had recently arrived from overseas. (*Colonial Herald*, 25 July 1838, p. 1 col. 2).
- 1 “Hints”, *Colonial Herald*, 16 May 1838, p. 4 col. 2
- 1 *Frederick’s Prince Edward Island Directory... 1889-90*, pp. iv, 124
- 1 City of Charlottetown: Real Estate evaluations; PARO R.G. 20, vols. 224-5
- had completed his survey of Ardgowan.
- 1 Henry Cundall surveyed the land for the construction of the roadway. On Sunday 24 May 1896, he wrote in his diary: “In afternoon took a walk along the Park road now being opened up to the public.”

- 1 Callbeck, p. 28
 1 *Revisited* p. 7
 1 Callbeck, p. 28
 1 McKenzie wrote that at the time Cundall died, “facing Kent and West Streets, there was a high and very fancy board fence with bird-house-like decorations on top of the posts” around Beaconsfield.” (McKenzie p. 7)
 1 MacKenzie p. 8. This photograph has not been located.
 1 MacKenzie p. 8
 1 MacKenzie p. 8
 1 MacKenzie p. 7
 1 Cundall letterbooks (PARO acc. 4158, reel 4, 16 Aug. 1884)
 1 In her report of 1988, Linda Fardin similarly recommended that Government House block out or remove cars, parking lots and asphalt that spoiled the view towards Beaconsfield, and recommended the reconstruction of the site’s 19th-century fences or the use of plantings to block out undesirable views. (Fardin, figures 62, 63, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84)
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 102
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *Island Mag* p. 30
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT*, p. 102
 1 Henry Cundall would have been familiar with Judge Fitzgerald’s property. He notes in his diary that on Fri. 25 July, 1879 that he attended a “large croquet and lawn tennis party” at the home of R. R. Fitzgerald. In the evening of Wed. 13 May 1896, he “drove Pen out to Judge Fitzgerald’s to meet Rev. G. C. Wallis, Mrs. W and Miss Hawley, a large party assembled.”
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 105
- 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 102
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *Island Mag* p. 30
 1 *Revisited* p. 7
 1 *Revisited* p. 5
 1 Ed; “The Master of Beaconsfield, part 1”, *Island Mag*, no. 33 (spring/summer, 1993) p. 3
 1 Cundall’s diary, 14 May, 6 June, 13 July, 8 Aug., 23 Aug. 1883.
 1 Hogan proposal, p. 6
 1 “Report of the Board of Commissioners Appointed by the Government to Manage the Provincial Exhibition of Agriculture and Local Industry for the Year 1882” p. 11
 1 “Report of the Commissioners of the Provincial Exhibition, 1883” p. 11
 1 “Report of the Board of Commissioners Appointed by the Government to Manage the Provincial Exhibition of Agriculture and Local Industry for the Year 1882” p. 11
 1 Baldwin, p. 40
 1 Coutts, p. 3
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 103
 1 *Revisited* p. 7
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 105
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *Island Mag* p. 30
 1 *Ardgowan Management Plan* (2005) p. 19
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *APT* p. 105
 1 Gribbon, “Ardgowan...” *Island Mag* p. 29
 1 *Revisited* p. 9
 1 *Revisited* p. 9
 1 *Revisited* p. 2
 1 *Revisited* p. 2
 1 PARO R.G. 6.6, series 2, subseries 1, box 15: Cundall vs. Peake, 1885 - “Payments made on account of Beaconsfield House and amount due under mortgage from James Peake and wife to J.S. Carvell and assigned to late William Cundall”
 1 PARO R.G. 20, vol. 132-70

