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The Setting

Most visitors are impressed by Rusholme Road. Even those not usually moved by turn-of-the-century developments can’t help but enthuse over the quality of the streetscape between Bloor and College. Although the homes tend to be large, even massive, their size does not detract from the park-like setting.

Most buildings share a generous setback from the front property line. Some retain the luxury of a side yard, and these openings allow the rising and setting sun to penetrate the street — thereby ensuring a healthy green.
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View to the north from Hepburne, Rusholme Rd. numbers 316 and 318 appearing on the right — Photo: City of Toronto Archives (SC 157-3)

Compare this with other streets of the time. Some boast homes as impressive as those on Rusholme. But with their density, their lack of side-yard openings, they seem to present a solid wall of masonry to the street. So tightly packed are the houses that they appear to be in grandiose competition with each other, often inhibiting our ability to “read” the individual homes.

Not so on Rusholme. Here, the “breathing spaces” between the buildings erase any conflicts in style.

Seventeen houses were constructed on these three blocks of Rusholme between 1884 and 1901, evenly distributed on lots between Bloor and College. These lots had been subdivided in 1883 and recorded at the Land Registry Office as “Registered Plan Number 405.” Of these homes some surely designed by architect A.R. Denison — a scion of this area’s founding family — only 12 survive. Two that didn’t — numbers 125 and 149 — are included in this publication (see pages 6 & 7.) The eight houses north of Hepburne were influenced by their proximity to Bloor Street. None has been demolished, although many have been enlarged or extensively rebuilt. Note that 30 houses were demolished in 1965 to make way for the apartment blocks at 323 and 347 Rusholme Rd. The absence of any photographs of Number 98, and Number 204 that of Caroline Denison Kirkpatrick, is keenly felt. Long-time residents described them as massive and detailed — quintessentially Victorian.

[Footnote #1: Plan 405 was surveyed on April 03, 1883, and registered on April 24, Rusholme Rd. south of College St. is in Plan 313, surveyed on Nov. 27, 1879 and registered on Nov. 29. Had we included 313 in this study we could not have published it in 1991. This decision was not intended to suggest that the buildings in 313 are in any way inferior.]
The original number 125, the Clarence Denison House, built in 1884 and designed by A.R. Denison, was demolished in 1937. It was replaced by Number 125. The Women’s College Street Hospital relocated here in 1915, and stayed at this location until their current Grenville St. address was constructed in 1936.

The original number 149, the Herbert Langois house built in 1894, designed by Gordon & Helliwell, was demolished in 1935. It was replaced by Numbers 139 through 147. Many years prior to the relocation of Women’s College Hospital to the downtown core, this was a nurse’s residence.
You can’t relate the history of lot development on Rusholme Road without acknowledging the role of the Denison family. As Rosedale was to the Jarvises, the Grange area to the Boultons and the Annex to the Baldwins, so was Rusholme to the Denisons. They were the principal landowners in the area bounded by Ossington, Bloor, Queen and Dufferin.

In 1837 Richard Lippincott Denison married Susan Hepbourne, hence Hepbourne Street. The next year his younger brother, George Taylor Denison II, married Mary Ann Dewson (Dewson Street’s namesake) and immediately began building his own homestead at the northwest corner of Dundas Street and the lot-line he named Rusholme Road for “Rush Holme,” his wife’s uncle’s residence in Manchester, England.²

[Footnote #2: This and other background notes about Toronto’s “squirearchy” can be found in the published works of Lucy Booth Martyn.]
Rusholme Road between College and Bloor streets is Edwardian in its genesis and architectural styling. Over half its surviving structures were built between 1901 and 1910; only 10 survive from the preceding Victorian period.

Many of Rusholme Road's Edwardian homes fall into one of two architectural categories: centre-hall floorplan or cottage. In reverting to the centre-hall plan of the early Victorians, Edwardian families were seeking more formal, compartmentalized living spaces than those they had known in the previously typical High Victorian home. Cottage-plan houses, on the other hand, were more relaxed. Rooms flowed into each other, and the best way from front parlour to kitchen, for instance, was probably through the dining room, where papa could be found reading his newspaper at the dining room table — unless the table was already set for dinner.

The cottage style evokes a cozy, informal ambience from a distant past, resuscitating techniques and materials from the medieval village house — the gambrel roof and board-and-stucco construction, for example. When you called upon a home designed to a centre-hall plan home, however, the threshold offered few glimpses of the family activities within. Instead, you possibly might see only the front parlour to your left and the study or dining room to your right. Each room had an exclusive function — separate and decidedly "specialized."
Rusholme also had Edwardian homes that were cottage/centre-hall hybrids. To add to the confusion, some cottages are as large as or larger than the centre-hall homes. Nevertheless, after examining Rusholme Road you're still likely to conclude that its Edwardians were dynamic individualists who were striving to produce a society and built-form that could accommodate all their myriad tastes, interests and aspirations.

The Data
Building Permit Data and Maps

This section presents the maps and building-permit information that relate to the construction of the 141 addresses on Rusholme Road between Bloor and College streets. It includes, whenever possible, information about accessory buildings such as stables, coach houses and garages, but not about alterations nor about houses since demolished. Information about a building is only mentioned once when the building was erected as part of a group of structures authorized by a single permit. An "R" has been added to permits that refer to outbuildings: stables, coachhouses, garages, etc. A bracket "(" at the beginning of a line indicates that the permit was for more than one address. A complementary bracket appears at the end of the group.

The following is a guide (using a real example) to reading a building's data line.

street Address: 254 Rusholme

Lot Number: 254

Year built: 05 (05=1905, 89=1889)

Permit Number: #1731; 05

Person the Permit was issued to: E.G. Wilson; J. Hunt

Trustee: STANFORD

Dollar Value of permit: $4,000

It was sometimes necessary to attribute a permit to a particular building even when no proof of such a permit existed. The need for these educated guesses occurred only rarely. Every care was taken to ensure that all attributions will withstand future scrutiny.
Rusholme Road
West Side between Hepburne and Bloor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>388; 55; # 42167</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>E. W. Corby</td>
<td>J. Hunt STANFORD; $9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386; 56; # 42167</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384; 56; # 348</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>J. Peacock</td>
<td>1; $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382; 56; # 348</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380; 56+57; # 348</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378; 57; # 348</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376; 57; [N/A]; 84</td>
<td>C. Schmidt</td>
<td>1; [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354; 58; # 7592</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>W. A. Cesar</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352; 58; # 7592</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350; 59; # 307</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>D. McCurdy</td>
<td>1; $1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348; 59; # 51827; 21</td>
<td>C. Webster</td>
<td>1; $4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346; 60; # 139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>R. Milligan</td>
<td>F. SAUNDERS; $7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344; 60; # 139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342; 60; # 139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338; 61; # 9830</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>D. McCurdy</td>
<td>J. Hunt STANFORD; $2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336; 61; # 7616</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Wm. Saunders</td>
<td>1; $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334; 62; [N/A]; 86</td>
<td>Ed. Broome</td>
<td>1; [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332; 62; [N/A]; 98</td>
<td>N. M. Otiphant</td>
<td>1; [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328; 63; # 61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>P.H. Sohman</td>
<td>G.F. PRICE; $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328; 63; # 27958; 11</td>
<td>D. McKinney</td>
<td>P.H. FINNEY; $3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326; 64; # 1187</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>R.H. Smith</td>
<td>1; $1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324; 64; # 193</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>H. Baker</td>
<td>E. TULLOCH; $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320; 65; # 7300; 107</td>
<td>A. Wright</td>
<td>J. Hunt STANFORD; $4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318; 65; # 697; 105</td>
<td>R.H. Smith</td>
<td>1; $3,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316; 66; # 687</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314; 66; # 6116; 96</td>
<td>R.H. Smith</td>
<td>1; $2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[3 Footnote: Although its address 1027 Bloor St. W. St. Anthony's Church disqualifies it from inclusion we feel it is only fair to provide you with permit information –
1027; 52+53+54; # 52135; St. Anthony's RC Church (J.M. Cowan); $102,000]
Rusholme Road
East Side between Hepbourne and Bloor

381: 14; # 17177; "28; United Construction Co.; H.C. ROBERTS; $75,000

323: 14; # 88191 + 88192; "65; Belmont Const.; G.A. JAROSZ; $3,600,000

305: 36 + 37; # 695; "05; Messrs. White + Co.; 14; $8,000

Portion of Property Data Map
Entrance, 323 Rusholme Rd.

274 and 276 Rusholme Rd.

244 Rusholme Rd.
Rusholme Road
West Side between Dewson and Hepbourne

[276: 67; # 1463; '05: T. Sprule; W. CONNERY; $11,600
274; 67; # 1463;
272; 68; # 1463;
270; 68+69; # 1463; ]

[268; 69; # 1405; '05: A. Walker + J. Kemp; J. A. HARVEY; $6,000
266; 69+70; # 1405; ]

[264; 70; # 1781; '05: D. Campbell; R. S. HAMBLETON; $5,000
262; 71; # 28; '04: W. K. Cook; J. A. HARVEY; $5,000
260; 71; # 28; ]

[258; 72; # 8891; '07: Bierse Bros.; Jas. THOMPSON; $6,000
256; 72; # 8891; ]

[254; 73; # 1731; '05: E. G. Wilson; J. Hunt; STANFORD; $4,000
250; 74+73; # (N/A); '87: G. Ridout; (158)
246; 75; # 20622; '20: E. E. McCall; R. S. Hamberton; $3,000
244; 75+75; # 922; '04: W. J. Kirby; J. A. HARVEY; $5,000
242; 76; # 468; '02: R. F. Rowland; R. FORTUNE; $2,800
240; 77; # (N/A); (179)
236; 78; # 842; '03: R. W. Tite; (183)
236R; 78; # 14643; '09: M. J. Milburn; SIMPSON & YOUNG; $2,000
232; 79; # 42830; '21: W. F. McCutcheon; $11,000
230; 79; # 42830; ]

[228; 80; # 1173; '05: R. Wan; S. B. COON; $5,500
222; 81; # 26263; '17: Wm. Vokes; W. CONNERY; $6,000
220R; 83+82; # 20174; '16: G. Sworn; (187)
220B; 83+82; # 1822; '05: R. Wan; Wm. G. HUNT; $4,000
218; 82; # 1822; ]

[216; 83; # 583; '05: H. M. Flock; J. W. SIDDALL; $3,200
214; 84+83; # 127; '01: G. G. Miles; Wm. H. MALLERY; $3,200
210; 84; # 69; '01: T. Vallentine; J. A. HARVEY; $3,500
208; 85; # 78345; '02: J. Diamond; E. L. RICHMOND; $18,000
206; 85+86; # 78345;
204; 86; # 78345;
202A; 86; # 78345; ]
Rusholme Road
East Side between Dewson and Hepbourne

229 Rusholme Rd.

231 Rusholme Rd.

Portion of Property Data Map
Rusholme Road
West Side between College and Dewson

202; 87; # 966; '04J. Davis; S.M. DAvis; $2,500
198; 88; # 6885; '07 W.G. Childsem; , ; $4,000
194; 89; # 2532; '05 F.B. Ward; , ; $3,500
190; 90; # 3819; '06 A.C. Hutson; J. Hunt STANFORD; $5,800
186; 91; # 16053; '09 R. Burkett; , ; $4,000
184; 92; # 7603; '07 R.H. McKercher; , ; $4,000
182R; 93; # 35188; '12 J.H. Stowe; J. Hunt STANFORD; $1,000
182; 93; # 19559; '10 Geo. Henry; GEO. HENRY; $5,000
180; 94; # 67630; '23 Wm. C. McBrien; Wm. G. HUNT; $7,500
170R; 95; # 30726; '11 J. Williams; Wm. G. HUNT; $500
170; 95; # 15252; '09 J. Williams; Wm. G. HUNT; $5,400
164; 96; # 70384; '23 J.D. Young; J. D. Young; $12,000
162; 96; # 75973; '42 S. Blackstein; J. SUGARMAN; $6,800
160; 97; # 29957; '11 J.D. Young; J. D. Young; $5,000
154; 98; # 7802; '07 J.A. Harvey; J.A. HARVEY; $5,000
152; 98+9; # 8456; '07 J.A. Harvey; J.A. HARVEY; $4,500
150; 99; # 151301; '09 D.E. Smith; D.E. SMITH; $4,100
148; 100; # 24362; '10 J.A. Hambleton; D.E. SMITH; $3,500
146; 100; 1; # 30158; '11 J.A. Hambleton; R.S. HAMBLETON; $3,900
144; 101; 0; # 30160; '11 J.A. Hambleton; R.S. HAMBLETON; $4,000
142; 101+3; # 30159; '11 J.A. Hambleton; R.S. HAMBLETON; $4,000
140; 101+3; # 30151; '11 J.A. Hambleton; R.S. HAMBLETON; $3,800
Rusholme Road

East Side between College and Dewson

167-14+15; # 9878; '08; H. Hutson; J. Hunt STANFORD; $4,000
163; 14; # 8554; '07; R. W. Campbell; R. J. EDWARDS; $5,000
159; 13; # 6469; '07; R. B. Hayhoe; Geo. HENRY; $5,500
159R; 13; # 4439; '13; R. B. Hayhoe; Geo. HENRY; $500
157; 12; # 7776; '07; W. Heintzman; H. G. PAULL; $4,000
( 155A; 11; # 60914; '36; Davis + Freeman; E. L. RICHMOND; $9,400
155; 11; # 60914;
153; 10; # 19559; '10; G. Henry; Geo. HENRY; $5,000
151; 9; # 6561; '07; G. Henry; Geo. HENRY; $5,000
( 147; 8+9; # 51198; '36; Davis + Freeman; E. L. RICHMOND; $33,000
145; 8; # 51198;
143; 8; # 51198;
141; 7; # 51198;
139; 7; # 51198;
( 137; 6+7; # 25499; Davis + Freeman; '31; E. L. RICHMOND; $21,000
135; 6; # 25499;
133; 5+6; # 25499;
131; 5; # 25499;
129; 4+5; # 25499;
127; 4; # 1983; '05; Edm. Hardy; H. G. PAULL; $3,000
125; 2+3; # 69136; '38; I. Freeman; E. L. RICHMOND; $33,000

119; 1; # 6896; '07; S. Jardine; S. Hamilton TOWNSEND; $6,000
117; 1; # 6510; '07; A. Harvey; J. A. HARVEY; $6,000
115; 1; # 6224; '07; A. Harvey; J. A. HARVEY; $4,000
113; 1; # 7472; '07; A. Harvey; J. A. HARVEY; $4,000
111; 1; # 5819; '06; J. A. Harvey; J. A. HARVEY; $4,000

Portion of Property Data Map
Four Buildings Considered

303 + 305
267
250
245

Although each structure on Rusholme Road deserves an architectural description, such a laudable aim is beyond the scope of this publication. Instead, we have focused on one or two building types that exist in close proximity to each other. This will offer you some handy reference points from which to view the entire street and identify buildings designed according to centre-hall or cottage-style floor plans. We have also included brief description of four noteworthy buildings.

303 and 305 Rusholme Road

J. Hunt Stanford at his best? Corner lots challenge the ablest designer. Here, the question is how do you build an attached pair of large homes that do not dominate the street nor flaunt their togetherness. There are at least three answers.

First: Use a sound roof structure, but give it a fairly steep "rake" to keep the observer's eye busy.

Second: Place one entrance on the flanking side street in a matter-of-fact fashion. Its mate on the Rusholme front, however, masquerades beneath an infinitely more elegant porch. Who's to know that this isn't really a single home?

Finally: Break up the north and west elevations with irregularly placed facade designs, each serving to keep the eye in motion. Although the building seems quiet in its general design, the individual components of style entertain.
267 Rusholme Road

Given the High Victorian’s near obsession with intricate surface designs, this home is startling in its simplicity and directness. Not one element of the facade is superfluous; nothing here is a mere add-on. This is an exemplar of the Queen Anne style that has more in common with Queen Anne houses of the American northeast coast than with those found in Toronto. The architect of Number 267 (still unknown, but possibly A.R. Denison, Ely Gordon, Herbert Hancock or S. Hamilton Townsend) proved extremely selective when borrowing from illustrations of the history of British architecture.

The boxiness and overall smoothness of the building’s front are refreshing. Although the southerly third is deliberately intended to be seen as a projecting element that breaks up the mass of the whole, it results instead in an understated byplay, leading one to assume that the designer was trying to prevent the whole “cube” from boring the viewer’s eye. The principal and secondary gables are covered by one of the best ever local displays of terra cotta tiles.

The Flemings, who owned this home from 1891, were important contributors to the natural sciences in Toronto. James Fleming Sr. was the city’s first and most prominent seedsman and florist. He likely selected many of the plants and trees that still grace its generous grounds. James Jr. was a self-styled naturalist and the first Canadian to attach an identification band to a bird — a red robin (caught on Sept. 24, 1905 in the yard at 267).

250 Rusholme Road

The dense shrubbery around number 250 shrouds one of the more complicated architectural stylings on the street.

In its major elements, number 250 is number 267’s twin, though built a year earlier. Number 267 is an architectural essay on clay products; bricks and tiles were direct and honest. Unlike Number 267’s gables, though, which were clad in terra cotta tile, number 250’s received a more typical choice: an Elizabethan-style board-and-stucco. It’s not clear whether the cladding was altered shortly after the building’s construction, or much later. But the end result is a surface design that is perfectly compatible with the building’s main framework. Number 250’s board-and-stucco successfully breaks up the front elevation. The surface design for Number 267 also succeeds, albeit with an opposite purpose: the terra cotta tiles stitch together the centripetal elements of the facade. The two design choices underline the significance of properly selecting surface finishes.
245 Rusholme Road

Conflicting architectural intentions and domestic desires, unless absolutely incompatible, can sometimes result in superior designs that are both visually stimulating and functionally satisfying. Take Number 245. Although a rational, centre-hall house, it — and many of its Edwardian contemporaries — retained many of the structural elements and visible design facets of the previous generation’s Queen Anne-style buildings.

After all, who could fail to appreciate the light that flooded into front parlours through polygonal windows. There were other pragmatic design carryovers. For example, the complex roofscape of the houses built in the 1880s and 90s were not merely picturesque; they also functioned as shields against the elements, ably withstanding wind, rain and snow. The form remained subservient to the function.

These and other practical design elements were welcomed by the Edwardians.

Architect James Walker’s design for Number 245, of necessity conservative, nevertheless displays such a clever collation of borrowings that it is easy to overlook the ultimate impact of the building’s general appearance: brown bricks; elegant roof-lines that curve subtly down to their soffits; and especially that porch — so strong and sober. Without intruding onto the property, note the attractive tile floor of the porch — a magnificent synthesis of design and inherited function.
275, 277, and 279 Rusholme Road

The Holby clan — father J.C. and sons J.D. and William — were instrumental in the erection of hundreds of commercial and industrial buildings through their construction company. They worked alongside many notable Toronto architects, including Hy Simpson, who designed Number 277R Rusholme. Built by J.C. Holby in 1905, it also served as his firm’s office.

Six years later J.C. Holby built Number 277 using plans drawn up by F.H. Herbert, architect. Herbert’s building designs are often so showy they’re almost self-conscious. Nevertheless, those that survive are a joy to behold — ever exuberant! Number 277, with its eclectic front porch sporting elements of an Italian loggia, is quintessential Herbert. Even modern metal siding over its soffits and eaves can’t disguise the theatricality of his creation.

Numbers 275 and 279 were also built in 1911 by Holby’s, albeit by J.D. and William. For both these houses the “boys” and architect Hy Simpson orchestrated such a graceful reworking of the Elizabethan town-manor-style house — that they obscured the centre-hall plan. No such deliberate artistic confusion reigned at Herbert’s 277 Rusholme. It is direct, even authoritarian — no doubt in keeping with its resident’s dominant position in the family firm.

The Cottage

Number 127 show architect H.G. Paull’s version of cottage architecture, although the ground-floor front facade has likely been reworked. On these houses the roof attracts our attention first: gambrels are in friendly competition with gables. Also consider Number 219.
Numbers 142 through 146 are variations on the same theme. All sport identical silhouettes, although minor variations give each a sense of here is individuality. Architect R.S. Hambleton.

And then there’s 119 Rusholme (also on the east side), with architect S. Hamilton Townsend’s equally interesting version of the cottage. On the surface Number 119 looks like an unassuming gambrel-roofed cottage. A quick peek at its south facade, however, reveals that this is not a small house. The gambrel roof engages in most of this “creative deception.” Notice how it dissolves into the sky, becoming almost invisible. The masonry wall that breaks through the second floor roofline at the northwest aspect is Townsend winking at you, letting you know that not everything is as it seems. Townsend could have resorted to functional dormer windows — as did most of his contemporaries — thereby letting light into the upper floors. Their absence shows the hand of a clever architect with a different design intention.4

[4 Footnote: Those interested in the career of Townsend should see P. McHugh’s, Toronto Architecture: A City Guide, Revised Edition.]

Biographies

We conclude our survey of Rusholme Road with biographies of four people who determined the street’s evolution: the Flemings at 267 Rusholme, builder J.A. Hambleton, architect/developer J.A. Harvey and architect/designer J. Hunt Stanford. By focusing on these key players, we hope to show how and why Rusholme’s different building designs developed.

James Fleming (Sr.)
James Fleming (deceased) may be mentioned among the well-known and highly-esteemed business men of Toronto of the past generation. He was born in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1812, and in his native land learned the seed business. In 1834 he came to Montreal, whence he made his way to Toronto two years later, beginning seed growing on three acres of land on Yonge, south of College. Mr. Fleming built a seed store and greenhouses for the sale of plants and seeds. He was the pioneer seed grower of the County of York, and made a decided success in his line, accumulating a handsome competency. His original place, established in 1837, is still in the possession of the family.

Mr. Fleming was not only well known as a successful seedsman, but as a leader in public affairs. In 1864 he was commissioned a justice of the peace in Toronto, and in 1888 was tendered the same position for the County of York. In 1877 he was elected an alderman for St. John’s Ward, and was re-elected for three consecutive elections. He was a director of the Horticultural Society and of the Industrial Exhibition Association. In political sentiment he was a Reformer, in religion a member of the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Fleming was twice married, his first wife bearing the maiden name of Margaret Geddes. She is now deceased, as are the children of that marriage. Mr. Fleming was united in marriage to Miss Mary E. Wade, daughter of the late John Wade, who was born in England in 1803.... Mrs. Fleming survives her husband and resides at No. 267 Rusholme Road.

To James and Mary E. Wade Fleming came one son, James H., a naturalist of the city of Toronto, born in that city in 1872, who was educated at Upper Canada College, completing the course in 1889. He further pursued his studies in Europe, and since returning has been engaged in his profession, that of naturalist, in the city of Toronto. He married Miss Christine Mackay Keefer, now deceased....

John Albert Hambleton

For a number of years active in the construction work of the city, and now prominent as an estate and business broker, John A. Hambleton is identified with the physical progress and growth of Toronto. He is a son of John Hambleton, a resident of Norfolk county, Ontario, who was born in the State of Pennsylvania in 1850, and came to Ontario with his family in 1854.

John Albert Hambleton was born in Norfolk county, Ontario, March 20, 1883, and received a thoroughly practical education in the public schools of that section, after which he spent several years with his father on the farm. In the year 1906 Mr. Hambleton came to Toronto, and opened offices in the Cosgrave building, on Yonge Street. For ten years he was very active in the building world, specializing in the erection of homes. A great number of pleasant and comfortable dwellings owe their existence to his energy and far-sighted faith in the prosperity of the city. With the necessary restrictions in building during the World War, Mr. Hambleton laid aside his interests in this field entirely, then, in 1919, entered his present business, which comprises brokerage in both real estate and business properties. He is meeting with gratifying success, and largely confines his operations to the sale of residential properties, including apartments.

Mr. Hambleton married, in 1910, Alice Ford, of Barrie, Ontario, and they have one child, Emerson Stacey. The family reside on Albany Avenue.

[Source: Middleton's Toronto, Volume III (1923); pp.223-224.]
Noted Architect Called by Death

J.A. Harvey Made Many Improvements

James A. Harvey of "Harcroft," 15 Olympus Avenue, well-known architect, and the first Reeve of the Village of Swansea at the time of its incorporation in 1926, died in the Private Patients' Pavilion, Toronto General Hospital yesterday. Many of the local improvements and developments of Swansea were the result of Mr. Harvey's foresight. He had the distinction of founding one of the first wild flower and bird sanctuaries in Canada, known as "Harcroft," which is recognized as one of the beauty spots of Toronto.

Born in Whitby in 1870, he received his education in Whitby schools, and graduated from the University of Toronto School of Science. Several subdivisions were developed by Mr. Harvey, who had the honor of naming a number of Toronto's streets.

He was a member of the Alpha Lodge, A.F. & A.M.; the Parkdale Canoe Club; and a charter member of the Briars Golf Club, Jackson's Point. He was interested in boating and yachting.

Surviving are his widow and three daughters, Mrs. H.H. Chapman of Bombay, India, Mrs. L.A. Macklin of Stafford, and Mrs. H.B. Bell of Toronto. Two sisters, Miss Esther Harvey of Whithby and Mrs. H.H. Hayes of New York, and two brothers, Frank Harvey of Toronto and Walter Harvey of Vancouver, also survive.
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Frequent items on gardening and horticulture by James Fleming in Canadian Agriculturist.

1861 Item in Canadian Agriculturist: Announcement by James Fleming and George W. Buckland, dated Toronto, Jan. 1, 1861, of their "partnership as seedsmen and dealers in all kinds of agricultural and horticultural implements", under the name of "James Fleming & Co." (NB: for more on Buckland, see the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. XI, pp. 32-33).


1868 James Fleming's greenhouses, etc.; Four original prints of photographs by Octavius Thompson, 1868.

City of Toronto Archives, The Fleming Collection; SC 534-3, 4, 5, 6.

1868 James Fleming, Seedman, Florist, 368 Yonge Street at Elm Street. Photograph of building and sign by Octavius Thompson, 1868.

City of Toronto Archives, The Fleming Collection; SC 534-1.2

1871 "Mr Fleming's Nursery" The Ontario Farmer 3 May 1871: 147-48: An extensive description of a visit to Fleming's Yonge Street establishment, with lots in greenhouses.

1872 Advertisement for "James Fleming & Co., SEED MERCHANTS, FLORISTS, AND DEALERS IN ALL KINDS OF GARDEN, FIELD AND FLOWER SEEDS, &c. AGRICULTURAL HALL, CORNER OF YONGE & QUEEN STS., TORONTO."

1874 Wholesale Price List of Seeds. OFFERED BY GEORGE W. BUCKLAND & CO., (Late JAMES FLEMING & CO.) Established 1856. SEED GROWERS AND IMPORTERS. 180 Yonge Street, and 4 Queen Street, Toronto. Royal Botanical Gardens Library, Centre for Canadian Historical Agricultural Studies.

1879-81 James Fleming represented St. John's Ward, City of Toronto, as an alderman.

1880s Photograph of James Fleming, c. 1880s, by Elderbridge Studios. City of Toronto Archives, The Fleming Collection; SC 534-8

Why Have We Prepared this Study?

The primary reason for undertaking this booklet is to begin evaluating our existing urban builtform and resources. Studies such as this one represent the first phase in what can eventually lead to residents taking the responsibility for managing change on their street. Of course, that’s possible only where neighbours can get to know one another and earn one another’s trust such that change and renewal can proceed in a congenial manner.

The first step in any evaluation is to discover what you possess: not simply in terms of the structure’s age, dimension, and other statistics, but how it relates to other buildings.

Changes will occur – they always do. But there are ways to ensure that when they happen in your part of town they happen fairly and equitably. You and your neighbours could well take the steps needed to manage change. Most neighbourhoods – including yours – have the players and the talent to start to produce a study, similar to this one for example.

For subsequent studies (Phase Two and Three) you’ll probably need logistical and financial support from at least one level of government. And why seek to control and manage these inevitable changes? If we care about our cities, our neighbourhoods, and our buildings, then we have no other choice – for our architectural resources are finite, imperilled, and crucial to our social well-being.

At present the only real help available with Phase two or Phase three of neighbourhood preservation lies with the current Heritage Act.

Ontario Heritage Act
Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1980 (Chapter 337)
September 1986

Part V
Heritage Conservation Districts

40. – (1) The council of a municipality may by by-law define the municipality or one or more areas thereof as an area to be examined for future designation as a heritage conservation district and the council may, after such examination is completed, prepare official plan provisions with respect to such designation.

ACO is currently working with the Advisory Committee of Honourable Karen Haslam, Minister of Culture and Communication, toward developing a New Heritage Act. We have every right in the future to expect more substantial assistance toward efforts at neighbourhood stabilization.

... We’ll keep you posted.
254 and 256 Rusholme Road circa 1908-09
[Photo: J. R. Biette, Courtesy of Mr. & Mrs. W. L. Sloan]
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