The former Superintendent’s House, built between 1842 and 1843, is a sombre stone building. Construction of the Superintendent’s House was contracted out under the supervision of the Royal Engineers in 1842-1843. This building initially combined the functions of lockmaster’s residence and office for the Royal Engineers. Around 1857, it was renovated to serve as residence for the superintendent of the Carillon and Grenville Canals, a function which it continued to serve until 1967. Since then it has remained vacant.

In 1972, it was transferred (with the Carillon Canal) from the Department of Transport to Parks Canada. See FHBRO Building Report 89-07.

**Reasons for Designation**

The Superintendent’s House was designated Recognized for its historical association with local development, its sober architectural design and its environmental significance.

The Superintendent’s House is one of the rare surviving structures that attests to the military and commercial role of the Carillon Canal, which was built between 1829 and 1833. The Superintendent’s House symbolizes the presence and the role of the military canals in the region since it is the primary visual element associated with this function. The Superintendent’s House is the key element of the site’s current heritage character.

**Character Defining Elements**

The heritage character resides in the two-storey rectangular structure topped by a gently sloping pitched roof, the massive chimney stack, the wood extension, the verandah which runs along the facades of the main building and the extension, the small second-storey verandah protected by a pavilion roof and the woodwork inside and outside the building.

The exterior walls are of squared stone masonry, terminating in quoins. This construction method must be preserved.

The aesthetics of the building as a whole are excellent and must be respected. The repetition of the same roof angle for these two adjoining structures establishes a visual
harmony of primary importance. The same is true for the rhythm of solids and voids in the main facade. The basic aesthetic of the rear facade is very good as well as the rhythm of the openings.

The rear verandah suffers somewhat from the fact that approximately two-thirds of its length has been removed. Reconstruction of this element would enhance the heritage character of the building. The rather massive columns of the front verandah detract from the excellent aesthetic contribution of this element. Consideration could be given to restoring the original proportions of the columns in future work.

The rural character of the immediate surroundings must be preserved.