In the February issue we considered the building of cottages having comparatively narrow frontage, but plans for cottages that are less restricted in this respect are also worth careful study. Perhaps we should begin by considering those which have a frontage not wide enough to preclude their being used within, or very close to, town areas, where land is not so costly that a garden is impossible, and yet is sufficiently valuable to render impracticable anything but a small garden plot for each house,—the areas, in fact, on which most cottages are built. In such places the custom is to build the cottages in rows, each cottage as a rule having only the prospect afforded by the row of houses across the street. If the streets run east and west, the living rooms of cottages on the south side face north.

Let us see whether some substitute for the row could not be devised, eliminating some of its most unpleasant characteristics without increasing the frontage required or the cost of building. Interior and exterior photographs of a pair of cottages built at Starbeck in Yorkshire are given here. The design for these cottages was determined by considerations of the possibility of repeating them, arranged as suggested in Diagram Ten. As the outlook from such cottages must in most cases be very limited, it was obviously important that whatever outlook was to be obtained should be the best the site could afford. If the cottages at Starbeck were disposed on the site in the way shown in Diagram Ten and in the photograph of a model, the grave

Diagram Ten: See page 645.
defects of rows on either side of a street would be absent. Each living room would have windows on three sides, and the most limited outlook from any one of these windows would be across two gardens, or one garden and the street. From most points of view a more extended outlook would be commanded. Every living room would have a south window and in addition either an east or west window, and would get a very large proportion of sunshine. Every scullery would face south. Out of every three bedrooms, two would face the south, and the third would have an east or west window, so that an estate laid out on these lines would not have a sunless room upon it.

When laying out an estate on which cottages are to be built, it is necessary in each specific instance to determine first what will prove to be the most economical way of providing access to the back of the cottages. Broadly speaking, there are two alternative ways of
A PAIR OF COTTAGES AT STARBECK, YORKSHIRE: SEE DIAGRAMS 10 AND 11.

INTERIOR OF A COTTAGE AT STARBECK, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND.
BLOCK OF FOUR TWO-BEDROOM COTTAGES; FOR PLANS SEE DIAGRAM TWELVE.
MODEL MADE FROM DIAGRAM TEN, SHOWING BACKS OF COTTAGES.
A pair of concrete semi-detached cottages: for plan see diagram thirteen.

Group of eight cottages: see diagram sixteen.
DETAIL OF WORKING KITCHEN IN DIAGRAM FOURTEEN, SHOWING OVEN AND HOT PLATE.

FIREPLACE IN LIVING ROOM OF SAME COTTAGE, WHICH HEATS OVEN AND HOT PLATE IN KITCHEN.
PLANNING GROUPS OF COTTAGES

doing this, one being by means of back lanes running behind the houses and the other by means of passageways between the houses (one passageway to every two houses). Which of these is most economical can be determined by ascertaining whether the cost of the increased frontage of each pair of houses, caused by the addition of entries between the houses, overbalances the cost of providing a back road. In Diagram Ten each back road becomes a front road and additional cost is entailed, but these roads are not essential to the scheme at all. When the cottages are arranged as they are in Diagram Eleven, there is no need either to devote frontage to passageways between the houses or to make a back road, and the only way in which the cost would be greater than that of continuous rows would be by the additional end wall required for every pair of cottages, which would amount (varying with the locality) to between ten dollars and eleven dollars and seventy-five cents per cottage, so that it is obvious that a number of cottages could be built more cheaply on this plan than they could in rows. In many instances the expense for drainage would be less. To gain the greatest advantages of either of these suggestions (Diagrams Ten and Eleven) a little covered yard within four walls and under the main roof is especially desirable. Anything in the nature of a backyard or of projecting or detached outbuildings behind the cottages would be overlooked by the windows of other cottages even more than if the cottages were in rows.

It might be well to point out that though this suggestion is put
DIAGRAM FIFTEEN:
THE PARLOR-COTTAGE PLANNED TO AVOID NORTH PARLORS, TO SECURE AS MUCH SUN AS POSSIBLE, ALSO FOR COMFORT AND SAVING OF STEPS.
forward as an alternative to rows of cottages and not as an alternative to the customary arrangement of pairs of semi-detached cottages, it may even compare favorably with this infinitely more expensive arrangement, as there is no ugly wasteful gap between each pair of houses and the sun can reach the sides of the houses as well as the fronts. Attention might be called to the fact that with semi-detached houses, in addition to many other defects due to gaps between them, not only are the gaps useless in themselves for garden purposes, but they cause cutting draughts that often render of little value a considerable area of the rest of the garden, front or back. Where the arrangement shown in Diagram Ten is adopted, not only is the whole garden space open to sunshine, but each garden is much more sheltered than it is in any other arrangement. Each is, in fact, almost a walled garden, and very few people will fail to appreciate the abolition of the back road with all that the term implies. A glance
at the sketches and photograph of a model, the latter showing the backs of the cottages, will suggest how great a difference this arrangement would make in the appearance of the streets. Instead of monotonous rows or pairs of houses, with a long line of continuous shade, there would be presented to the passerby continual change of light and shade, of building and garden; the constant interest of the fresh recesses with variously arranged gardens, revealing themselves one by one; instead of the long strip of sky, wide spaces of cloudland would open to view as each garden opening was reached.

The cottages we are considering may be roughly divided into four main types: those which contain living room, scullery, larder, coal place, lavatory and two bedrooms; those with a third bedroom added to this accommodation; those with working scullery-kitchen and a living room, and lastly the type of building we may call "parlor cottages."

The first type can be planned so as to avoid all projections from the main building, and to attain that cubical form which, because it encloses the greatest amount of space possible to any given quantity of materials, is therefore the most economical. Diagram Twelve is given as an example. The second type of cottage at once introduces much greater difficulty in planning, as it is necessary to contrive three rooms over two, all the rooms to be of reasonable size and accessible without wasting space in landings. And the plans must not call for any increase in the ground floor accommodation in order to increase that of the upper floor. When grappling with this sort of problem the architect realizes why he should be thankful that the idea of projecting the outbuildings from the main building, or building them quite detached, is being abandoned, for putting them under the main roof increases his available floor area for the bedrooms.

Diagram Thirteen and the photograph of the cottages built according to it are given as examples of the second type, designed to be built in pairs. Various examples will be found in the quadrangles illustrated here, which are also one-living-room cottages suitable for building in rows. Apart from the question of whether to have a parlor and a smaller living room or a large living room and no parlor, no question connected with cottage planning has been so much discussed as has the problem of whether to build the staircase in the living room, as shown in the photograph of the interior of one of the cottages at Starbeck, or shut out from it. As a rule, the cottager does not like the staircase in his living room, and when every shovelful of coal is a consideration and more fuel will often be needed to keep warm in cold weather a living room which has the staircase in it, his point of view is easy to understand. On the other hand, a closed door at
the head of the staircase would do much to prevent heat escaping from the living room, and during the greater part of the year there is much advantage in being able to ventilate the living room by means of a window on the bedroom landing. Also, where the living room is necessarily small, the additional size given to it by adding the space occupied by the staircase (often five hundred cubic feet) should not be overlooked.

To illustrate the third type, Diagram Fourteen is given. It is a sort of halfway house between types one and two, and a parlor cottage. It is designed to meet the requirements of the man who cannot afford a cottage which has a parlor, living room and scullery, but has tastes and the kind of work which necessitate his having some place that is safe from interruption. This type, instead of having a living room and scullery, has a working kitchen and a living room. The defect of this arrangement is the same as if the range were in the scullery. In the latter case, as a rule, the family, not being able to afford two fires, lives in the scullery, and the living room is left unoccupied. So in the cottage we are considering, the cost of two fires is likely to prevent the living room from being really effectively used. This difficulty can be very successfully overcome by so planning the house that the oven and hot plate are in the kitchen and the open fire in the living room; both rooms thus become available, and only one fire is needed (see photograph of cottage at Letchworth). The plans of the cottages at Starbeck shown in Diagrams Ten and Eleven were adapted to this end.

The fourth type of cottage is the real parlor cottage, containing living room, scullery and parlor, of which many examples are given here. The chief disadvantage in this is that the parlor or "best room" in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred is practically unused, and becomes merely a sort of shrine of respectability, a home for the family Bible, china ornaments and the suite of best furniture. If, in such cases, it is provided at the expense of reduced size in the living room, it should not be there at all. There is another side to this question, which is so well put in "Old Country Inns," by Maskell and Gregory, that I cannot do better than quote:

"But it will be a bad day for England when the 'best room' disappears from the artisan's home. It is, by long tradition, his castle, his secret keep, the innermost temple of his religion. Every patriotic instinct of the poor man has its center within that little stuffy apartment. Home to the working man means the best room. The safety of the best room justifies all the national expenditure on a standing army and a huge navy. In the defense of that best room he is prepared to send his sons to lay their bones in some nameless
soldier's grave in the most distant corner of the empire. Take away the best room and the wage-earner has no home worth either working for or fighting for."

Each of the four types of cottages of which I have spoken may be sub-divided again for convenience according to their aspects. But these sub-divisions need not be considered in detail. Where the width of frontage assigned to a cottage makes such an arrangement possible, the advantages of having both scullery and living room facing south are obviously great. Efforts should be made to avoid north parlors, as the tomblike impression the parlor will probably give in any case will naturally be increased by a northern exposure. In cottages facing either east or west the ideal living room should run through from front to back, so that, as it does not receive south sunshine, it will get all that comes from both east and west. (See Diagram Fifteen.) As a matter of fact, as the sun is lower when in the east and west than when in the south, it penetrates further into the room, and thus the living room will have a greater number of sunny hours during the year than if the aspect were due south. Of course, if both parlor and living room are to be through rooms, a very generous allowance of frontage indeed is needed; in most cases this will not be possible. When neither living room nor parlor can be through rooms, they should be on different sides, so that one may get the sun at one time of the day and the other at another, the whole house being sunless only a very short time each day. See Diagram Sixteen and photographs of houses built to these plans at a contract price of less than fourteen hundred dollars each. It will be noticed that bicycle houses are provided in many of the cottages illustrated here. There are so few cottage homes now where no member possesses a bicycle or a perambulator that it has become essential to provide such a room in most cottages.

This reminds me that when enumerating the uses to which the parlor was put, I overlooked the fact that a very large proportion of them have in recent years established a substantial claim to consideration by housing bicycles and perambulators. But the best argument for the parlor is that its influence, on the whole, has been toward maintaining a demand by the cottage dweller for a higher standard of living. Perhaps the most important thing to bear in mind is that in so far as our efforts tend to raise the standard of the cottage itself and of the cottager's demands with respect to it, the influence will be for good; that such economies as can be made without loss in efficiency are for the benefit of the workman and for the whole community, but all economies made by lowering standards only result in loss to the community as a whole. Many people are
asking for poorer cottages on the plea that the rents of those provided for laborers are beyond their means, losing sight of the fact that it is not the wages earned that determine how good a cottage the workman shall live in, but that the kind of cottage and style of living he demands determine what his wages shall be, so that all effort to awaken him to an appreciation of a higher standard of living will tend toward increasing his efficiency and thus his earning capacity.

If the parlor goes, it should only do so in order to give place to something that will express a truer refinement in the lives of the workman and his family, something demanded by a broadening of their sympathies and tastes, some part of real life exchanged for the attempt to affect supposed symbols of gentility. But until this better thing can be substituted, the parlor should be retained wherever possible without undue sacrifice of realities, lest the cottager’s standards be lowered by the removal of an expression of something which does not ring true before the need is felt for something better in its place. The desire for a parlor is but a groping after something better, and symbolizes a stage of development which might be hampered if the symbol were taken away.

The time is not very far distant when there will be a bathroom in every cottage as a matter of course. I know it will be truly said if this were done now, a considerable proportion of these bathrooms would never be used for their original purpose, but it is only by providing them that the use and appreciation of them will grow.

I have arranged the cottage plans used in illustration of this article partly in quadrangles, primarily for the readers’ convenience in grasping each plan in relation to the aspects for which it is put forward, but partly for reasons which those who read my article in the January CRAFTSMAN will readily appreciate, and those who do me the honor of reading my next will also understand.