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HISTORY:
Armstrong’s Point, also known as Parish Lot 86, St. James, was formed by a meander of the Assiniboine River. This became a point of land which gave approximately a mile of frontage along the River. As well, the Point was physically isolated because of its location, and by the fact it was heavily treed, where land to the north, toward the Portage la Prairie Trail (Portage Avenue) was considered open prairie. Across the river, in western Fort Rouge, was even denser bush.

In Victorian minds, such an enclave had an air of exclusivity because of these factors. The other nearby point, Point Douglas, had an earlier history of settlement and subdivision, and therefore, was no longer prime subdivision material by 1880. Armstrong’s Point, far removed from the Winnipeg business district, had not yet borne the subdivider’s mark. Indeed, by 1880, only a small part of its 54 acre extant was being used by Elliott Armstrong as a farm. His father, James (1790-1874), a member of a Pensioner’s regiment, had held the property for nearly twenty years for his Captain, Joseph F. Hill. Hill had gone away to the Crimean War in 1854, and had left his property in the care of James Armstrong. Hearing that Hill had been killed in that war, Armstrong assumed ownership of the tract. After Armstrong’s death, the property was sold to Francis Evans Cornish, Winnipeg’s first mayor. The sale evidently spurred two local men, Joseph Doupé and John Bredin, to journey to London to locate Hill, whom they believed was alive. After they found him, Hill refused to sell his interest in the Point. Hill spent the next five years proving his claim, returning to Winnipeg during August 1880.

Joseph Hill sold Armstrong’s Point to a syndicate of speculators consisting of John McDonald and E. Rothwell in early April 1881 for $28,000. By late May of that year, J.W. Vaughan, a Dominion Land Surveyor, had subdivided the Point into 105 generous-sized building lots. The speculators had renamed the area “Victoria Place”. More officially, this became known as Registered Plan 119. Two streets ran the length of Victoria Place — a very wide...
Central Avenue, which served as a continuation of Furby Street to the River, and Assiniboine Avenue, which curved around the tip of the Point, forming extensions of Mulligan (now Sherbrook) and Langside Streets. Early sales of the subdivision were made to a number of prominent parties, including F.W. Stobart, William Osborne Smith, Arthur F. Eden, and David Young. The erection of large houses during 1881 by Stobart, Smith, and Eden, as well as residences for James Bannatyne, David Young and William Ramsey during 1882 gave the area the atmosphere of an exclusive neighbourhood, or perhaps a country seat where Winnipeg’s business moguls might find retreat from the real estate phenomenon known as the Boom of 1881-82.

Young, McDonald and Rothwell had first approached the City of Winnipeg in late June 1881 requesting the grading and ditching of the streets in Victoria Place. Evidently this was done, as the place attracted more buyers. A year later, the now numerous landowners of Victoria Place petitioned City Council for permission to erect “Gates and Turnstiles at the entrances of Assiniboine and Central Avenues”. The owners also asked to erect a gate on Central, between Assiniboine Avenue and the River, as well as gate-keeper’s lodge at Central Avenue facing Cornish Street. All was to be paid for by the residents. Board of Works concurred with this move, “insofar as it does not interfere with the rights of the public.” The measure was said to discourage marauding cattle from damaging the young plantings around the still new houses. That autumn, tenders were called for a Gate-keepers Lodge designed by architect James H. Rowan. It is not believed that this project was proceeded with, as a worsening post-boom depression was gripping Winnipeg. Such a project would have become frivolous to land owners who did not know how long they might own their Point holdings. The fact that it took from July to October to call for Lodge tenders was caused by a worsening realty situation. In the 1882 building number of the Manitoba Free Press there is no mention of such a structure being built. The “gates” were to remain a dream of some Point residents for nearly thirty years.

Throughout the 1890s, Armstrong’s Point languished as an elite residential district, and in many ways represented an isolated spot within the city. Garbage collection suffered from time to time, and fire protection could be horrendous, as illustrated by the destruction of Lendrum McMeans’ house on Assiniboine (site of 134 West Gate) in September 1894. While the fire
department fought its way through the mud on the street, McMeans’ house burned to the ground.\textsuperscript{16} Influential citizens lived here, this was not enough to get the Waterworks to provide service to the homes after midnight, even though the Waterworks stood on the Point!\textsuperscript{17} Even wandering cows, which had been the subject of the 1882 petition, were still bedeviling Point residents in 1892, when they finally petitioned for an extension to the pound limits.\textsuperscript{18} It is little wonder, then, that a minor item such as gates did not surface as an issue.

Parts of the Point were resubdivided into smaller lots during 1893.\textsuperscript{19} This allowed for further building on a small scale through the latter part of the nineties. Attempts to extend Assiniboine (east of Osborne Street) to join with the Assiniboine Avenue of Armstrong’s Point\textsuperscript{20} ultimately met with failure. Had this gone ahead, a riverside carriage drive from Main Street through to Maryland Street would have been inaugurated. Instead, Armstrong’s Point remained an isolated enclave. More aggressive land agents acquired pieces of the Point after 1900, and it was from their efforts that the area received the bulk of its existing structures. Late in 1902, agents acting for owner R.J. Manning attempted to sell nine, 35 foot lots which had been subdivided from lots 83 and 84, Plan 119.\textsuperscript{21} This measure, which would have introduced less substantial housing to the Point, never came to fruition, as the plan was not registered. The attempt was not without results.

In the spring of 1903, a syndicate obtained control of all the vacant property on the Point. A new subdivision was supposedly made, but the plan was not registered. The owners, however, placed building restrictions upon their property which stipulated set-backs of houses and minimum values of structures to be erected.\textsuperscript{22} An advertisement for the syndicate’s real estate wing, Glines and Company, advertised the area as being the “Faubourg St. Germain” (a natty Paris suburb) of Winnipeg.\textsuperscript{23} Here, the syndicate sought to emulate neighbouring Crescentwood, which had come into existence across the River the previous summer. It, too, had building restrictions which made Crescentwood an exclusive subdivision.\textsuperscript{24} At the same time, Central Avenue (now Middlegate) was reduced in width from 132 feet to 84 feet.\textsuperscript{25} This move made Central less obvious as the major Point thoroughfare, and though it was still 18 feet wider than Assiniboine, the two streets appeared nearly equal in width and importance, which gave an extra selling point for Assiniboine Avenue lots which did not front on the river. Street paving and sewers came
during 1904, thereby making residency seem more city-like. (Plate 2) While large-scale building did not take off until 1909, land transfers in the Point apparently did, thereby creating the desired effect for the syndicate. A further subdivision of existing lots took place in 1906, but was not registered until 1908. It became Plan 1352.

**THE GATES — AGAIN**

Apparently some move was made to get ornamental gateways built at Armstrong’s Point during the latter part of 1905. City Engineer’s staff prepared different plans for gateways in December 1905. Each had wrought iron gates which were supposedly functional. (Plates 3, 4, 5) It is not known why or at whose behest these plans were made. Nothing came of this effort until February 1907, when area residents petitioned the Board of Works for the erection of ornamental gates. In the meantime, the new Cornish Park came into existence on the old waterworks site during 1909, thereby creating more greenspace at the western end of Assiniboine Avenue where it connected to Sherbrook. This gave more impetus for something to mark the Point, which was enjoying its peak building year in 1909.

A new petition for “archways” was prepared by the residents during May 1910. While the petition was not presented to City Council until 6 June, City Engineers’ draughting staff had prepared two additional designs by 21 May to augment the 1905 offerings. (Plates 6, 7) These two were gateless versions of the earlier units. Accompanying all five designs were estimated costs, ranging from $12,500 down to $7,000. Works and Property Committee, in reviewing the plans on 25 May, recommended a seven-year assessment for Point residents to pay for the gateways. In his report to the Committee, City Engineer H.N. Ruttan, stated that “it is becoming a very usual practice in the United States to erect these gates over the streets, arranged in a manner similar to those in Winnipeg”. Ruttan had seen 20 or 30 such gateways on a recent trip to Chicago.

When the petition and estimates were presented to City Council at its meeting of 6 June 1910, a wrangle developed between members as to the appropriateness of the scheme. Some, such as Controller R.D. Waugh felt that the area residents were wealthy enough to pay for the arches
themselves. Alderman R.J. Shore felt that local improvements such as paved streets or sewers came before beautification. Others, such as Alderman Frank Fowler wanted the owners to pay for the arches in one year, instead of seven. In the end, the motion carried 9 to 7, with Design 4 (Plate 6) being chosen for the Point at an eight year assessment.

By early September 1910, City Engineering staff had prepared masonry specifications for the gateways. As well, details for the wrought iron fencing between the posts had been drawn up during August. (Plate 8) The gateways were to also be electrically illuminated. City Council appropriated $12,000 toward the erection of the arches at their meeting of 10 October 1910. Tenders for the work of erecting the gates were not called until 17 January 1911, and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder at the Council meeting of 13 February. The job went to the “Engineer of Construction”, a division of the City Engineer’s Department at a total of $7,036.86 with masonry and ironwork complete.

Work on the three gateways commenced in the spring of 1911, and proceeded through the summer. A slight change was made to the design of the gates by an addition of caps on the posts. This was done at an extra cost of $110.00, by stone contractors, Oliver and Manson. The work was completed by the autumn, and the actual cost of the gates was 5% below tender, or $6,674.00. The following summer, the lights on the gates were put into service for the visit of the Governor-General, the Duke of Connaught. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the Duke ever saw any of the gateways with or without their ornamental lamps.

The later chapters in the saga of the erection of the Armstrong’s Point Gates involved various assessment protests by area residents, as well as the ultimate change of street names in the Point. In the end, the Armstrong’s Point residents overpaid some $1,800 toward the cost of the gates. As important was the change of street names, Assiniboine Avenue and Central Avenue to the present-day names of West Gate, Middle Gate and East Gate. This was done in response to a petition circulated by resident H.W. Alan Chambré and presented to Mayor T.R. Deacon on 1 May 1914. In it Chambré et al cited the great necessity of changing the names to end the confusion of delivery men and others in finding the homes of area residents. The change was made effective under By-law 8727, passed on 15 June 1914. The final scenario came that
autumn when Chambré and others began demanding the renumbering of houses on the Point.\textsuperscript{53} Up to that time, only a few homes there had numbers, and the ordering tended to be quite erratic, making even the otherwise orderly \textit{Henderson’s Winnipeg Directories} into a confused jumble. Problems arose when not all residents wanted numbers on their houses, and others did not wish them changed.\textsuperscript{54} Eventually, the mess was cleared up.

After 1914, the Armstrong’s Point Gates entered into a quiet period of their existence. Little was heard about them for forty years, and during that time, their role as “street furniture” grew almost legendary. Such was the case in 1957, when it was found that the Gates required extensive repairs.\textsuperscript{55} While the City Engineer’s staff estimated the repair costs at between $30,000 and $35,000, the work was formed in 1958 for around $1,500.\textsuperscript{56} The gates once more went into obscurity until 1969, when the construction of the present Maryland Bridge necessitated the relocation of the western gate several yards to the south and nearer the Cornish Library.\textsuperscript{57} Lastly, in the late 1980s part of the eastern gate was demolished by an errant motorist with a car. The damage was subsequently repaired.

**STYLE**

The Armstrong’s Point Gates consist of three nearly identical units. Each is executed in the plain, Classical Revival style which was, in 1911, popular for many new buildings. Each pillar has recessed panels on all four faces, along with chamfered corners. Flatly curved caps adorn each pillar. The wrought iron work is of Greek-inspired design, highly modified to suit the modern usage of 1911.

**CONSTRUCTION**

These gate-posts consist of limestone blocks set atop concrete foundations. Deterioration of the bases had, by 1957, caused some of the pillars to lean dangerously. This problem was solved the following year.
DESIGN

Each gate unit consists of six pillars and two lengths of wrought iron railings. Provision has been made for passage of a sidewalk on both sides of the street, and this accounts for the four smaller pillars in each unit. The inside smaller pillars are connected to taller ones, which flank the roadway, via ornamental wrought iron railings. The larger pillars are set farther back than the smaller ones, making it necessary for the wrought iron and their supporting limestone block bases to curve back in a somewhat graceful fashion. The East Gate and West Gate units are identical. The Middle Gate is wider than its neighbours, both in point of apertures and in extent of materials. This, of course, reflects the greater width of Middlegate as a street.

Of the five initial designs for gateways, three of the proposals, done in 1905, featured functional gates which opened. These were also more elaborate units with quite ornamental wrought iron work. The two 1910 designs both favoured a lack of functional gates, stressing more the ornamental nature of the project. The design adopted was No. 4, designed in 1910, and was probably the least elaborate, and therefore most functional design from an engineering point of view.

INTERIOR - none
INTEGRITY
What little work has been undertaken on the Armstrong’s Point Gates has maintained the original design of these three units. The gates appear essentially as they did when they were completed in the summer - autumn of 1911.

STREETSCEAPE
Armstrong’s Point is a physical, compact enclave formed by a bend in the Assiniboine River. The gates serve to separate this enclave from neighbouring streets which have been laid out in the more conventional grid-iron pattern. The gates are also physical reminders of the wealthy district which once existed there, and which the gates sought to delineate.

A. ARCHITECT
The designer of the Armstrong’s Point Gates was Alan Harvey Cotman (1883-c.1957). Cotman was born in England on 28 June 1883, and came to Canada at the turn of the century. He came to Winnipeg about 1904, and lived with his cousin, Wallace Cotman Eade, an artist, who was then a draughtsman with the City Engineer’s Department. When Eade quit the Department to form the architectural firm of Eade Brothers in 1904, Cotman appears to have secured Eade’s job on 20 September 1904. By July 1907, Cotman was paid $3.25 per day and called “Chief Draughtsman” of the City Engineering Department. The “drawing and planning” of the Armstrong’s Point Gates in 1910 was carried out by Cotman. Indeed, there is no reason to believe that Cotman did not execute the 1905 designs as well, for the style of these designs are very similar to the 1910 versions. Also, it was stated in 1911 that the wrought-iron fence was “entirely the result of Mr. Cotman’s own ideas”. Cotman was a member of a distinguished English artistic family started by John Sell Cotman (1782-1842), an architectural draughtsman and landscape painter.

B. BUILDER
The Armstrong’s Point Gates were erected by a branch of the City Engineer’s Department known as the Engineer of Construction. This branch had been created in 1908, having charge
and control over all works being constructed in the City of Winnipeg. The superior to whom the Engineer of Construction reported was the City Engineer. In 1910-11, John W. Astley was the Engineer of Construction, while H.N. Ruttan was the City Engineer. At the time of the Armstrong’s Point Gates being built, the Engineer of Construction was allowed to tender bids against private contractors, on pending civic works. This was done in a number of instances such as street, bridge and building repairs. This was done to save money on civic works, as the City of Winnipeg had a large body of Works employees with varying skills, as well as a relatively new works plant and equipment with which to handle such work. In the case of the Armstrong’s Point Gates, Astley’s final construction cost was some 5 per cent below his tender. It is probable that the Gates were the most elaborate project (in terms of grandeur) ever undertaken by the Engineer of Construction branch.

John W. Astley was born in Barrie, Ontario, in 1844, and came west to Prince Albert, Saskatchewan in 1878 where he worked for a lumber firm. In later years, he was a civil engineer with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and was also taken prisoner at the Battle of Duck Lake in the North-West Rebellion. Astley was Winnipeg’s Assistant City Engineer from 1895 to 1898. He then journeyed to the Yukon during the Klondike gold rush. There he served as a constructional engineer with the Dominion Government. Returning south, he worked for the Canadian Northern Railway. He returned to Winnipeg in 1906, and two years later took the Engineer of Construction post with the City Engineer’s Department. In December 1915, he was elected to the City’s Board of Control. Astley worked for the Thomas Kelly and Sons construction firm as a superintendent from 1918 until he left Winnipeg in 1919. Astley died at Victoria, British Columbia on 7 March 1931.

PERSON/INSTITUTION
The Armstrong’s Point Gates and the surviving Point houses, represent the zenith of the fortunes of Winnipeg’s business class. The wealth garnered by careers in real estate, grain, the professions and other ventures came together prior to World War I in districts such as Armstrong’s Point or Crescentwood. Within their own ranks residents of these areas competed for living in the area known as “Best Residential District”. Crescentwood was defined by large,
distinctive houses and building restrictions which made the area into what appeared to be a large, homogeneous wealthy district. Armstrong’s Point, across the river and about one-fifth the completed size of Crescentwood, was more isolated because of its geography. The compactness of the Point lent itself to the erection of gates. In Crescentwood, the erection of such gates would have been meaningless because of the huge size of the subdivision.

The gates also had the effect of shutting out the world from Armstrong’s Point. In 1911, Winnipeg was a city which showed great divergence between the “haves” and “have nots” of society. While the gates were not an impenetrable physical barrier to the Point, they were, nonetheless, a psychological barrier to the large groups of working class and foreign-born people who made up the lower strata of Winnipeg’s population. Perhaps this effect was unintentional, and perhaps it was — there is no surviving ruling class literature which shows the creation of the Armstrong’s Point Gates in any other light than that of denoting a special area. The gates did maintain the isolation of the Point from the rest of Winnipeg. It is significant that when a peaceful march of strikers took place during the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919, the procession proceeded along Sherbrook Street, crossed the Maryland Bridge and moved along Wellington Crescent, all the while ignoring Armstrong’s Point, even though the march passed right by the western gateway. Thus, the enclave area nature of the Point was enhance by the gates.

Such gates and gateways were remnants in thinking from ancient walled cities and castles. Certainly, more substantially endowed gateways fitted into high walls might have formed a defensible bastion in earlier times. Instead, the effect at Armstrong’s Point is to make certain that the observer is aware that the thoroughfares there are not extensions of Sherbrook, Furby and Langside Streets. By 1905, those latter streets were filled with closely-built middle-class housing, and something more substantial than the width of a gravelled Cornish Street was needed to show the visitor that a character change in the area was about to take place. In other parts of Winnipeg, real estate companies were building less ostentatious pillars to mark their subdivisions, to give extra points in selling “classy” properties. In the public mind of the time, such pillars or gateways were associated with exclusivity and a certain high-class air.
EVENT
The erection of the Armstrong’s Point Gates led to minor changes to the Winnipeg Charter to allow taxation assessments to be levied for such quasi-public works by public bodies. Theoretically, after that time, citizens in any part of Winnipeg could henceforth petition the City for such ornamentation to enhance property values.

CONTEXT
The Armstrong’s Point Gates were the only such units erected by the City of Winnipeg to delineate a specific neighbourhood. There have been several other gateways built throughout Winnipeg over the last eighty years, but these have been erected by real estate developers to call attention to their subdivisions. Also, such private gateways were created at the beginning of land sales, whereby the Armstrong’s Point Gates set off an already established area. Also, the gateways served to set off Armstrong’s Point from the less affluent areas to the north.

LANDMARK
These three gateways are landmarks because of their handsome design, large size and uniqueness among the city’s list of “street furniture”. Of the several surviving gateways (mostly of realtor origin), these are the most elaborate units extant. In fact, many Winnipeggers know the term “The Gates” over the more formal “Armstrong’s Point” as the appellation for the area. Thus, these gateways have a very strong landmark sense in the minds of city residents.
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Plate 7 – Design No. 5, Armstrong’s Point Gateway, 21 May 1910. The final set of drawings done by Cotman featured elaborate wrought-iron work. (City of Winnipeg Archives, Works and Property Committee, 457, 1910.)
Plate 8 – Detail, wrought-iron work, Armstrong’s Point Gateway, 30 August 1910. This design repeated itself for the length of the gate units. (City of Winnipeg Archives, Board of Control, 05690, 1910.)