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Abstract

What role does place differentiation play in contemporary urban redevelopment processes, and how is it constructed, practiced, and governed? Under heightened forms of interurban competition fueled by processes of globalization, there is a desire by place-makers to construct and market a unique sense of place. While there is consensus that place promotion plays a role in reconstructing landscapes, how place differentiation operates – and can be operationalized – in processes of urban redevelopment is under-theorized in the literature. In this thesis, I produce a typology of four strategies of differentiation – negation, coherence, residue, multiplicity – which reside within capital transformations and which require activation by a set of social actors.

I situate these ideas via an examination of the redevelopment of the Gooderham and Worts distillery, renamed the Distillery District, which opened to the public in 2003. Under the direction of the private sector, the site was transformed from a space of alcohol production to a space of cultural consumption. The developers used a two pronged approach for the site’s redevelopment: historic preservation and arts-led regeneration. Using a mixed method approach including textual analysis, in-depth interviews, visual analysis, and site observation, I examine the strategies used to market the Distillery as a distinct place, and the effects of this marketing strategy on the valuation of art, history, and space.
Two central arguments direct the thesis: first, in an attempt to construct place differentiation, what emerges is a sense of sameness which limits the potential of the district and produces a disconnect between the space and its users; second, it is only by understanding how differentiation operates in discourse and practice that alternative formations of place-making can emerge and socio-spatial disconnectedness can be rethought.
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Chapter 1:
Differentiation and Sameness: Contemporary Urban Festivity at the Distillery District

The machine rotates on the same spot. While determining consumption it excludes the untried as a risk (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2001: 134).

A Time & Space for Festivity

In the last couple of decades, a festive urbanity has entered into the North American city through the redevelopment of de-industrialized spaces as arts, culture, and / or entertainment districts. Shared amongst these spaces alongside their unequivocally celebratory tone is a desire for differentiation in order to respond to the rapidly growing global market of tourist dollars, the search for the new middle class market, and the need for a stable economic base. In an era of fast policy transfers, where products, systems, and ideas can travel across borders more quickly than ever under processes of globalization, it becomes difficult for festival marketplaces, cultural districts, and themed environments to differentiate themselves. But the difficulties associated with place differentiation do not lessen or preclude the score of attempts to construct variation. How is place differentiation constructed, practiced, and governed in the contemporary period? What do these constructions enable and disable on the basis of this ordering and identification?

In order to situate these ideas, in this thesis I examine the redevelopment of the Gooderham and Worts distillery, renamed the Distillery District which officially opened to the public in May 2003. The property, spanning five hectares, is located within the City of Toronto just east of the downtown corridor bounded by Mill Street to the north, the Gardiner Expressway to the south, Parliament Street to the west, and Cherry Street to
the east (Figure 1.1).\textsuperscript{1} While the property operated as an industrial plant between 1832 and 1990, it was transformed in the early 2000s under the direction of the private sector as an ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ district. Housed on site are a collection of over forty Victorian and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century industrial buildings dating from between 1859 and 1927 which underwent a process of adaptive reuse to make them more amenable to new functions. The developers, whom I will introduce in the coming pages, drew upon a two prong strategy for redevelopment: historic preservation and arts-led regeneration. Old machinery is placed (or retained) as heritage wares without description or animation throughout the district; buildings that once served particular industrial functions are now utilized for their industrial chic as a backdrop to artistic production and consumption (restaurants, retail, galleries); and aspects that were incomplete have been made coherent (cobblestones from other sites undergoing demolition were transported to the district, and modern clocks and lights that are made to appear ‘historic’ are woven into the fabric of the space). The current iteration of the district, following redevelopment, resonates with festival marketplaces, cultural districts, and themed environments in North America and Europe. While these linkages exist, there is an active attempt to construct place differentiation (promoted by the developers, on-site tenants, the media, and the city). The attempt to construct differentiation is not unique to the site in question. Rather, the imperative to construct difference is fundamental to capitalism to ensure self-replication. Applied to urban redevelopment processes, the familiar cycle of investment / disinvestment / reinvestment – a concomitant process of creative destruction and the creation of new needs and desires – works to actively reshape the built environment to

\textsuperscript{1} There are exceptions to this boundary including several structures housed directly north of Mill Street and east of Trinity Street (Rack House D and two apartment buildings constructed in the late 1990s).
Figure 1.1: Map showing location of the Distillery District in Toronto. Map produced by Matt Talsma, Cultural Economy Lab, University of Toronto.
maximize profit (Harvey, 1989: 105-7). Applied to the tourism industry, a similar process of differentiation emerges to produce new sets of engagements (whether real or fabricated) to motivate visitors:

Modern tourism is...an inherently expansive economy, constantly appropriating and constructing new experiences and places. Yet such activity bears with it the ironic seeds of its own destruction...Faced with these challenges, workers in the travel business have attempted to reinscribe difference in places. In a global market, where tourists have a wide choice of similar destinations, it has become vital to make a distinctive patch (Coleman and Crang, 2002: 2-3).

While acknowledging the imperative for flows and movements that produce the new or novel, in this thesis I turn to how difference is produced / consumed via an analysis of the strategies and tactics underlying the attempts to construct variation. I do this by tracing the trajectory of the Distillery – a space of industrial reuse – from its historical beginnings to its contemporary refashonings. The argument that I present in this thesis is twofold. First, I argue that in their attempt to generate a distinct place identity at the Distillery District place-makers have created a sense of sameness which fractures the (social, economic, cultural, political) potential of the space and produces a disconnect between the space and its users. Second, I argue that it is only by developing an understanding of how place differentiation operates (and can potentially operate) in discourse and practice in the construction of place identity that these fractures can be sutured and the cause of socio-spatial disconnectedness be re-thought.

The redevelopment of the Distillery emerges within a particular geographic and historic context. Following the decline of the Fordist regime, sites of consumer culture shifted away from the standardized shopping mall to new spatial patterns of consumption that emphasize aesthetics through local preservation and architectural achievement
The developers of the Distillery draw on and build from previous models (and modes) of commercial culture (including festival marketplaces, arts-led regeneration, and cultural precincts) and reject other forms of commercial culture (including chain stores and theme parks) to construct a ‘distinct’ place identity. While at the outset the attempt to individuate the Distillery through a rejection of the global brand appears amenable to long term urban development, I argue that the more up-scale approach of commercial culture procures a similar set of effects, including the sanitization of histories, the exclusion of certain segments of the population, the retrenchment of the public sector, and uneven development. The redevelopment process ensures that one of North America’s most remarkable collections of Victorian industrial architecture was rescued from potential ruin, and a number of artists, craftspeople, arts organizations, small to medium theatre companies, and small galleries at risk of expulsion from the inner city (due to the rising costs of real estate, gentrification, and the appropriation of arts districts), were offered space. As a concession to the developers for heritage preservation (and to ensure economic viability), three condominium towers ranging from 32 to 40 storeys (Pure Spirit, Clear Spirit, and the Gooderham condominiums) were approved by the city for the district, scheduled to be completed by 2012. One of the condominiums (Pure Spirit, 32 storeys) is now complete and stands at the north-west quadrant of the district. The two remaining condominiums at 35 (Clear Spirit) and 40 (Gooderham) storeys will be located in a more central position in the south-east quadrant in close proximity to the heritage focal point of the district (Trinity Street). The degree to which the modernist structures will affect the heritage resources
will become clearer once construction of all three condominiums is completed (in terms of sight lines, shadows, and visual capacity).

Given the rise of planned cultural districts such as the Distillery since the 1970s and 1980s in North American and European cities, it is necessary to develop an understanding of their social, economic, political, and cultural effects. This thesis contributes to the body of literature on urban redevelopment in three ways. First, I offer a Canadian case study of a planned cultural district that has not been interrogated in academic writing\(^2\) (see as an exception Caulfield, 2005). In particular, the orientation of the site as a planned private redevelopment departs from the typical tenure of waterfront redevelopments and festival marketplaces as public or public-private endeavors. The retrenchment of the public sector in the redevelopment process shapes the level of public engagement and consultation in the process, and presents an alternative set of goals underlying capital transformation geared towards profit making (away from social welfare). Even though the Distillery had always been a privately owned property, following the closure of the industrial operations in 1990 consideration for public sector involvement was proposed. Given these considerations, the ownership model is significant. Second, while place-making has emerged as an important element within processes of urban redevelopment, theorizations on how places are differentiated remains under-developed in the literature. Specifically, the multifarious dimensions of place differentiation in processes of urban redevelopment have not been explored in great detail.

Where place differentiation is cited, it is typically conceptualized as part of a broader

---

\(^2\) Two master’s theses also focus on particular elements of the narrative of Gooderham and Worts. Fisher’s (1995) research on the early redevelopment process for the district focuses on heritage planning and adaptive reuse in the 1990s, and MacKinnon’s (2000) work on the Ontario distilling industry from 1850 to 1930 presents some important reflections on the emergence of five big industrial distilling enterprises (including Gooderham and Worts) and the subsequent demise of small scale operations.
process of image transference characterizing the present climate of urban redevelopment (see Harvey, 1989). In this thesis, I produce a typology of four strategies of place differentiation which operate – or can be operationalized – in discourse and practice in relation to urban redevelopment, and which collect (and cut across) theoretical currents. The typology presents an opportunity to extend discussions of how place differentiation emerges as a strategy for place promotion, and to examine alternative orders of place making (that are more politically engaged). Third, I contribute to discussions of diversity and creativity in urban spaces by departing from dominant understandings and claims about space through the incorporation of contested discourses and marginalized voices, narratives, practices, and meanings. The main research questions which guide this project are as follows:

1. How are notions of place differentiation incorporated into the Distillery District? How are the demarcations of place celebrated, commodified, resisted, regulated? How is the district articulated in relation to other places, spaces, and times? How is the site articulated as an autonomous space?

2. How have shifting ideas (in policy, politics, and everyday life) surrounding history, art, and space contributed to the current form and function of the Distillery District?

3. How is history incorporated / included in the contemporary redevelopment of the Distillery District? What types of relations, networks, and identities are excluded / silenced on the basis of this ordering?

4. How is art incorporated / included in the contemporary redevelopment of the Distillery District? What attracts artists, collectives, and galleries to the district?

In this introductory chapter, I lay out the groundwork from which this project emerges, and the necessary tools through which to traverse the chapters that follow.
**Historicizing Urban Festivity: The Emergence of Cities as ‘Places to Play’**

The desire for place differentiation is not new or unique in the history of local and global relations. The introduction of World’s Fairs in the late 19th century represented a planned order of festivity under the relations of a global sensibility of production and consumption. As de Cauter (1993: 14) notes, World’s Fairs tended towards an ideal representation of society, conceived of as exhibitions of science and industry, but they “became the laboratories of exoticism, tourism and consumerism.” These laboratories of exhibition heralded consumption as a form of distraction from the ills of modernity; they were representations of cultural and social relations that responded to, and demonstrated, a capitalist version of utopia. The emphasis on an aesthetics of utopia shifted towards an aesthetics of illusion in the twentieth century ushering in an immediacy of experience (entertainment / shock) which transformed the site of exhibition (de Cauter, 1993: 20).

There is some agreement that these early evocations of festivity form the ancestry of the present arrangements of culture as spectacle (Benjamin, 1935: 7; Sorkin, 1992: 209).

Concomitant with the shift in the nature of exhibition spaces, was a shift in the nature and organization of culture and entertainment in urban spaces. As Hannigan (1998: 14) notes, by the end of the nineteenth century “city life was transformed [in North America] by the emergence of a new infrastructure of commercialized leisure: amusement parks, theatres, night-clubs and cabarets, baseball stadiums, ballrooms, burlesque houses, storefront nickelodeons and grand movie palaces.” The emergence of the city as a ‘place to play’ was supported by the growth in leisure time, increases in disposable income, technological advancements in travel and electricity, and the emergence of advertisements and billboards (Hannigan, 1998: 14). The meaning and
nature of urban space was transformed through the commercialization of the experience of culture and entertainment. The rise of new forms of consumption witnessed in mass markets, fashion, and advertising (consumer culture) were made possible by shifts in production and distribution (advancements in machinery, rising urbanization, and expanding trade routes).

The rise of consumer culture received considerable attention in the 20th century in the literature emerging from members of the Frankfurt School who, through careful critique, marked out the terms of debate for the culture industry. In this work, the culture industry was seen to dominate all aspects of material and mental culture. The works of Benjamin (1935), Horkheimer and Adorno (2001) and Adorno (1991) exposed what they saw as the impossibility of escape from an order that organizes and controls culture (and entertainment) as commodity. Mass deception – through the blurred distinction of the general and the particular – removed the ability to differentiate variation. As Horkheimer and Adorno (2001: 124) suggest, where sameness runs rampant, consumers are made to see choice even when it is not there.

In the same way, place differentiation operates via an emphasis on surface variation. In order to harness capital investment, as Harvey (1996: 298) suggests, placemaking is dependent upon image construction and advertising. While members of the Frankfurt School are criticized for their emphasis on abstract concepts, their deployment of a totalizing critique, and the categorization of consumers as passive subjects, they provide an important and instructive starting point for thinking through the strategies and

---

3 The label Frankfurt School is a more informal title. The school – the Institute for Social Research – was founded in Germany in the 1920s and is strongly associated with modern critical theory. Many of the thinkers who are associated with the school wrote during exile to the United States making the title Frankfurt School somewhat misleading.
tactics of place differentiation and the arrangement of cities under the power of the image.\textsuperscript{4}

In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, the heightened commercialization of culture and entertainment in North America and Europe was realized in the creation of themed landscapes (festival marketplaces, shopping malls, flagship destinations, and theme/amusement parks). Waterfront properties and derelict warehouse lands offered space for heightened consumption practices in the form of festive markets; shopping malls captured how the experience of consumption is larger than the space between a set of walls (see Crawford, 1992); starchitect designed museums and galleries such as the Tate and Guggenheim ushered in repetitive forms of architectural achievement; and Disney Land (alongside amusement parks more generally) accelerated the capacity of global capital to shape urban aesthetics, entertainment, and the experience of public space. While contemporary forms of festivity work to democratize culture (by rejecting the notion of a universal transcendent conception of aesthetics), they continue to blur the distinction between the particular and the general as raised above.

This blurring is captured nicely in research on contemporary urban form and urban experience. In the introductory chapter to \textit{Variations on a Theme Park}, Sorkin (1992: xi) remarks that “recent years have seen the emergence of a wholly new kind of city, a city without a place attached to it.” The placeless character of the “new kind of city” is directed to the “clumps of skyscrapers…huge shopping malls, anchored by their

\textsuperscript{4} Consumers were placed in a position of passivity in the works associated with members of the Frankfurt School. For example, as Ross (1989: 52) notes, they were conceptualized as “a populace of dopes, dupes, and robots mechanically delivered into passivity and conformity by the monolithic channels of the mass media and the culture industry.” Furthermore, popular culture was seen as subordinate, a point which has led to critiques which explore the ways in which popular culture itself “creates political and social identities, by rearticulating desires that have a deep resonance in people’s daily lives” (Ross, 1989: 52).
national-chain department stores...hermetically sealed atrium hotels cloned from coast to coast...uniform ‘historic’ gentrifications and festive markets” (Sorkin, 1992: xi). In themed landscapes, wholeness is simulated through the collapse of boundaries between elements. Writing about the West Edmonton Mall, a space which is said to encapsulate the world within its walls, Crawford (1992: 4) writes:

\[
\text{past and future collapse meaninglessly into the present; barriers between real and fake, near and far, dissolve as history, nature, technology, are indifferently processed by the...fantasy machine.}
\]

In relation to the project at hand, urban festivity is increasingly used within redevelopment processes to construct place variation and attract consumers. The use of festivity as a catalyst for redevelopment emphasizes the use of images and symbols to sell products and experiences (Goss, 1996; Gottdiener, 2001; Gotham, 2002). This emphasis fashions space as a container for cultural dominants, and works to disguise exclusivity and displace policy initiatives and interventions from the amelioration of inequality (Philo and Kearns, 1993; Eisenger, 2000). Eisenger (2000: 331) calls the process of the growing polarization within the contemporary city where resources are directed to the visitor class in the form of large scale infrastructure and entertainment investments rather than to local residents, the politics of “bread and circuses.” Indeed, neoliberal planning policies emphasizing entrepreneurialism and competition have led to the “growing aestheticization of urban space” (Kipfer and Keil, 2002: 243). Consumption dominates and place making is shaped by a world in which an insatiable demand prefigures supply (Harvey, 1990; Jameson, 1991; Zukin, 1995).

I engage with the relationship between consumption and urban redevelopment in this project on two levels: 1) urban policy and programming, and 2) social identities.
First, I position contemporary manifestations of consumption as part of a broader process of re-imaging the post-industrial city to harness competitive advantage to attract tourists, businesses, and consumers. As Jayne (2006: 185) suggests, city authorities increasingly turn towards consumption activities (where places compete on the basis of their consumptive offerings) to offset disinvestment in the manufacturing sector. Second, I address how consumption is tied to the performance of social identities (social prestige and status). Specifically, I examine how social positions of taste (Bourdieu, 1984) are produced, performed, and enacted in processes of urban redevelopment. I draw on de Certeau’s (1984) practices of consumption in order to complicate Bourdieu’s structured relations that determine fields of production and consumption. As de Certeau (1984: xii-xiii) suggests, the “making” or “using” of the products consumed responds to the realm of production:

To a rationalized, expansionist and at the same time centralized, clamorous, and spectacular production corresponds another production, called ‘consumption.’ The latter is devious, it is dispersed, but it insinuates itself everywhere, silently and almost invisibly, because it does not manifest itself through its own products, but rather through its ways of using the products imposed by a dominant economic order.

De Certeau’s view of consumption grants agency to the consumer, acknowledging their ability to appropriate and interpret / reinterpret the products imposed upon them. Through their “signifying practices” consumers create “‘indirect’ or ‘errant’ trajectories obeying their own logic” (de Certeau, 1984: xviii). These understandings of the relationship between consumption and urban redevelopment – from the incorporation of consumption into place promotion, to its relationship in the performance of social identities and the practice of everyday life – form an approach to consumption that is flexible across structures and agents.
Whiskey and Windmills / Art Galleries and Condominiums

In 1990, the Gooderham and Worts distillery, established in 1832, closed its doors as an operating industrial complex for alcohol production. The closure, spurred by global competition and financial constraints by way of necessary equipment upgrades, raised questions concerning how the property could be adapted in order to celebrate its historical importance while also ensuring its long-term economic viability. Two years prior to the closure, Gooderham and Worts was designated as a National Heritage Site by Parks Canada’s Commercial Heritage Property Incentive Fund, a recognition of its landmark status as well as its contributions to Toronto’s distilling industry (Parks Canada, 2007). Prior to this, in 1967, the Toronto Historical Board designated the complex as an historic site under the City of Toronto Act (by-law 100-74) and in 1976, it was designated for protection under the Ontario Heritage Act. In the context of these protective designations, the redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts, a collection of over forty Victorian and early 20th century industrial buildings, was set to proceed with caution to ensure respectful adaptation of the property for alternative uses.

Alongside these protective designations, a number of proposals and reports issued in the 1990s offered detailed inventories of the built form and the potential future uses of the district. These texts emerged from the public and private sectors and worked to guide future directions for the site. In 1994, Toronto City Council passed a planning framework for the property approving a mixed use redevelopment scheme that ensured the preservation and adaptive reuse of the buildings. The first permanent tenants on site

---

5 The designation was administered by Parks Canada through its Commercial Heritage Property Incentive Fund. Financial assistance in the form of $1,000,000 was granted by the Government of Canada to aid in the project costs associated with the redevelopment (http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/plp-hpp/itm1-/plp-hpp2h_e.asp).
after the closure of the complex came in the form of three apartment buildings constructed between 1997 and 2000 by the non-profit organization, Options for Homes, which satisfied the provision for affordable housing. After the industrial operations ceased in 1990, revenues were collected by the site owner, Allied Domecq, throughout the decade from the film industry, which temporarily rented and refashioned the district for use in over 800 films and television series, and countless music videos. Each of these moments conditioned and fuelled the redevelopment process of the Gooderham and Worts distillery.

Cityscape Holdings, a private real estate development company comprised of four principles (John Berman, lawyer; Jamie Goad, architect; David Jackson, planner; and Matthew Rosenblatt, real estate broker), acquired the site in 2001 for $10.75 million dollars. Founded in 1997, Cityscape had earned a reputation for its specialization in the conversion and restoration of historic properties in Toronto. Developer Bill Wiener and his wife Lillyann Goldstein financially backed the initiative until 2004 when financial concerns over renovations and ensuing heated disputes in the courts forced them to sell their interest back to Cityscape. The fall out amongst the partners produced a great deal of publicity and stalled capital improvements to the site which negatively affected the

---

6 In 1986 Hiram Walker-Gooderham and Worts Limited sold the property to Allied Lyons, an internationally recognized wine and spirits company based out of the U.K. Allied Domecq was formed in 1994 following a merger between Allied Lyons and Pedro Domecq.

7 Cityscape’s portfolio includes the conversion and restoration of The Movie House, 200 Clinton, The Stewart Building, and the Wellington Worx Building, and new build projects including Massey Estates, Portland Park Village, and Cityscape Terrace.

8 There was a previous working relationship between Wiener/Goldstein and Cityscape, which led to a verbal agreement over ownership rights. As Waldie (2004) suggests: “The relationship between all sides was so tight that no one bothered with written ownership agreements. It was simply understood that Cityscape would manage the site, in return for a $200,000 annual fee, and Mr. Wiener would provide financing, in return for a 53-per-cent ownership stake.” This arrangement would become a difficult point when the two sides ended up in court.
early tenants. Dundee Real Estate came on board in 2005, purchasing a 50% interest in the district. The new company was well-known among Toronto financial circles, and offered a great deal of financial stability to Cityscape’s vision for the district.

Opened to the public in 2003, Gooderham and Worts, renamed the Distillery District, was fashioned into a precinct of artisans and craftspeople, creative retailers and services, and educational and performance based institutions. Packaged as a site of consumption, the Distillery offers retail (and cultural) goods and services for sale and history and artistic production for consumption. In other words, the experience of culture and heritage are commodified, pre-packaged and pre-meditated (Evans, 2003). I take up Massumi’s (1992: 200) definition of the commodity as “a form of capital with its own motor of exchange (fashion, style, ‘self-improvement’) and cycle of realization…Its value is now defined more by the desire that it arouses than by the amount of labor that goes into producing it.” In other words, capital circulates according to the trading of images rather than to material production. In order for capitalism to self-replicate it is always seeking out new and novel commodity forms. The commodification of art / culture, heritage, and place identity responds to their imageability (commodity-images to borrow Massumi’s term) and not to any form of production / labour. I argue that the commodification of these aspects serves a particular end goal of place differentiation / distinction. This end goal is achieved via the production of signs and symbols (images) to direct meaning and value. This idea is directly linked to Benjamin (1968), Berger (1977) and Burger’s (1984) work on the use of caption and signature to manipulate value in objects and experiences by distorting and directing ways of seeing. The rise of images (signification more generally) to direct value in everything from objects to experiences
(through aspects such as mass advertising) has transformed the nature of consumption and its pervasiveness to enter into almost all aspects of everyday life. The packaging of consumption (as a form of place promotion) at the Distillery through art and heritage directs the (aesthetic) value of experience.

The Distillery drew on a two prong strategy for the redevelopment of the site: the inclusion of cultural agents and historic preservation through adaptive reuse. In the next section, I draw on these two components of redevelopment in greater depth through their respective literatures and connect them with the proceeding discussion on urban festivity.

The Inclusion of Art and Culture to Catalyze Change

[I]f cities have been essential to artists, artists have been essential to cities (Solnit, 2000: 19).

At the Distillery, a major component of the cultural strategy was the inclusion of creative agents (artists, craftspeople, designers, performance companies, and galleries) brought on at the beginning stages of the project. Artscape, a non-profit organization with a mandate of developing downtown live / work spaces for artists, is housed in two buildings within the district. Artscape is an arm’s length organization of the City of Toronto which grew out of the Toronto Arts Council in 1986. It was believed that in order to achieve its mandate the non-profit enterprise would need to act autonomously. The organization entered into a twenty-year below market lease with Cityscape in 2002 and offers studio and office space for approximately 60 individual artists, non-profit cultural organizations, and performance groups (Artscape, 2006). The lease is intended to encourage “long-term” residency, and to protect the arts community from eventual displacement as a result of upgrading. The lease with a public sector organization which
was well established in the city lent legitimacy to a private sector redevelopment. Several anchor galleries were also brought on in the formative months of the project (early 2002) which attracted a range of arts-focused tenants.

The catalytic value of the arts in economic development strategies across North America is well established (Kong, 2000; Bain, 2003; Ley, 2003; Leslie and Rantisi, 2006). Attracted to “improvisational spaces” in the city – unordered spaces that are open to multiple usage and which retain a diversity of forms and functions (Bain, 2003: 303) – the arts work to tame space and fulfill a longing for counter-culture practices for middle class interests (Ley, 1996: 191). In other words, the strategy to incorporate the arts in the redevelopment of the Distillery for their catalytic potential is rooted in decades of urban change in North America and Europe. For example, when artists took up residence in the declining industrial district of SoHo, New York in the 1960s they popularized the aesthetic of industrial chic. The mass market popularity of an industrial aesthetic allowed a transference of the image value from industrial spaces to contemporary apartments and condominiums which advertise ‘loft living’ for middle class tastes (Zukin, 1982). The trajectory of New York neighbourhoods, in particular the Lower East Side, Tribeca, and SoHo, that emerged as popular art districts and were subsequently refashioned as high-end residential and commercial landscapes (Zukin, 1982; Deutsche and Ryan, 1984; Cole, 1987) provided evidence that art plays a role in revalorizing space. Within Toronto, similar processes of arts-led gentrification were underway in neighbourhoods such as Yorkville in the 1960s and King Street West in the 1980s (Ley, 1996; Bain, 2006; 9

---

9 Consequently, the mass market appeal of ‘loft living’ is rarely affordable or popular amongst artists from whom this aesthetic was originally derived (Ley, 2003). While loft living is divorced from the practitioners who fashioned it, it remains tied to the commodification of their identity.
Mathews, 2008). Encompassing a range of built environments from Victorian row houses to derelict industrial buildings, the ability for the arts to change the symbolic meaning and material form of urban space was clearly demarcated through these cases. The use of art as a strategy for urban revalorization in the contemporary period finds its roots within these historic contexts.

Not only were cultural agents themselves valued by institutional (city officials, policy makers) and individual actors (developers, property owners, businesses) for their ability to revalorize real estate through their material presence, their productions were also praised for their catalytic potential. As Hall and Robertson (2001) note, policies drafted in the U.K. by the end of the 1980s were incorporating public art into urban regeneration schemes. Public art, similar to the arts more broadly (cultural producers, arts organizations, galleries), is recognized on the basis of its ability to contribute to community building, education, a sense of place, civic identity, social inclusion and social change (Hall and Robertson, 2001). Armed with a list of these potential contributions, the arts (from cultural agents to art objects) constitute a major component in a multifaceted strategy to alleviate declining population rates, high unemployment, derelict and underused lands and buildings, and a waning sense of place. These perceived contributions and experiences of arts-led regeneration inspired institutional and

---

10 Cameron and Coaffee (2005: 46) situate the incorporation and development of the arts as a strategy for urban change between 1960 and the late 1980s as a shift from “the creation by artists of a milieu for the production of art” to “the commodification and private consumption of this artistic milieu” (emphasis original). In the first stage artists take up residence in declining or underused lands in the city and trigger a shift in atmosphere. The second stage marks the consumption of the aesthetic sensibility of artists and their productions by higher income groups and land uses, spurring property values to rise. As property values rise, artists are typically driven out in what is now a familiar cycle of displacement. While the shift from production to consumption is certainly visible, capital and culture are mutually constitutive parts in the cycle. Zukin’s (1982: 176-90) notion of an “artistic mode of production” represented an early attempt to correlate capital and culture by linking the real estate industry to the culture industry. The “artistic mode of production” represents the use of culture by investors to attract capital in the built environment.
individual actors around the world to turn to this sector as a strategy for local urban economic development.

More recently, the incorporation of art into economic development strategies has shifted towards public consumption (Cameron and Coaffee, 2005: 46). As evidence of this shift, flagship architecture, cultural quarters, festivals, and public art displays are increasingly used in policy and planning to promote a ‘livable’ and ‘beautified’ urban core, aspects that are highly valued in attracting the middle to upper class. Artists are increasingly invited into particular urban areas (such as the Distillery) to fuel the process of revalorization. Ultimately, the shift from the production of art to the public consumption of art has promoted a more visible (yet proscribed) presence of the arts in the urban fabric, where they are valued for their ability to “smooth the flow of capital” (Hackworth and Smith, 2001). In relation to their ability to smooth capital flows and frame space, the arts are used to differentiate space (to construct a place identity of distinction). The Distillery District is a prime example of the public consumption of art. It possesses flagship architecture, promotes festivals and events, displays public art, and operates as a cultural quarter.

*Historicizing Space: Heritage and Urban Redevelopment*

The second prong of the redevelopment strategy was to telescope narratives, images, and objects from the past into the present constitution of the district. The heritage value of the property largely defined the parameters of the redevelopment process via an emphasis on adaptive reuse. *Heritage* is a socially constructed category...

---

11 Alongside this shift is a preference for terms such as ‘renaissance,’ ‘regeneration,’ and ‘revitalization’ as opposed to urban renewal and gentrification in order to direct attention away from the contested nature of urban change (Wyly and Hammel, 2008).
that works to protect and preserve a particular cultural or physical entity under the force of law. It is contingent upon a system of governance which constructs and reinforces its value according to a ‘public.’ At the site, couched within the interests of building historical social memory and the pursuit of education, narratives of the past are drained of contestation and struggle. While narratives of the histories of Gooderham and Worts are largely absent within the district beyond heritage plaques (and online through the Distillery District Heritage Website), machines and general use objects (a safe, barrels, a millstone) are placed throughout the interior and exterior spaces. The material objects for the most part contain no description of their prior use or function, confronting consumers of the space either with an inflection of history as exchange value and / or with objects devoid of value. Historical experience and imagery are drawn into sites of urban redevelopment as consumptive strategies (Goss, 1999). By tracing the incorporation of history into these spatial reconstructions it is important to examine what is included and excluded in the representation of these sites.

In his discussion on the adaptation of Ottawa’s Byward market into a festival marketplace, Tunbridge (2001: 359) distinguishes between two forms of heritage expression: public heritage expressions that draw on more local histories, and private heritage expressions that produce a more dissonant story. In the former, public heritage expressions are made up of multiple messages and in the latter, heritage expressions are streamlined for commercial intent. Taking up the latter, as Tunbridge (2001: 359) suggests,

festival marketplaces are particularly manipulative heritage commodifiers, selectively capitalizing on whatever heritage spin has most appeal to their
clientele, fundamentally in the values of a market and reclaimed urbanity but also in their buildings where possible, and in ornamentation, association and environs.

At the Distillery heritage is utilized and constructed for commercial intent. Heritage commodification is a core feature in the recipe of cultural precincts and festival marketplaces. The commodification of heritage in sites of festivity finds resonance with the circulation of the past within the tourism industry more broadly. According to Coleman and Crang (2002: 3), “[t]he commodification of the past almost provides a unity in diversity, or similarity at a higher level by making all these sites equivalent as potential places to visit.” In other words, there is a unity in diversity which is present in these articulations of the past.

As Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990: 25) note, the valuation of heritage is directed by a particular market for an intended inheritor. Similarly, the heritage industry is constructed as an economic enterprise which manufactures and exploits nostalgia (Hewison, 1987). This leads Hewison to pose the question “what kind of past have we chosen to preserve?” (48). Barthel (1989) adds to this consideration by asking, what are the motivations behind preservation efforts? While the motivations behind these efforts are difficult to assess, an examination of particular representations of heritage can work to map the associated effects. In this way, it is necessary to shift from articulations of the meaning of heritage to articulations of what heritage “does” (Rose, 2002). Heritage is neither pre-given nor natural, rather it is multiply articulated by different sets of social actors who draw on history in an “attempt to represent the already present landscape differently” (Rose, 2002: 465). The work of Crang (1994: 341) is particularly useful in addressing the multiple dimensions of historical experience. Rather than defining history
as a single object, Crang emphasises the dialogue between heritage discourses and the way that they are appropriated. Time does not exist in an a priori form; actors with varying degrees of power contain and purify history for economic, social, cultural, and/or political ends.

Since its inception, the Distillery has been a venue for a range of activities, acting as a grain mill, spirits and industrial alcohol distillery, national factory during WWI for acetone production, film location, and currently as an ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ destination. The many functions of the site cannot be separated from the relations, systems, institutions, and discourses that led to these changes and made each transition possible. For example, historically the Distillery’s local and non-local linkages enabled the physical expansion and development of the property; the technological advancements in production processes (distillation, milling, and malting) led to the development of built form on the property to house equipment, provide storage, and carry out particular functions; the context of WWI combined with the onset of prohibition led to the use of the property for war efforts. In the contemporary period, the demand for industrial landscapes in film and television coupled with the closure of the industrial operations in 1990 provided an appropriate context for film production; the rise of creative city planning and the privatization of public resources (including heritage), combined with changing representations of art, history, and industry fueled the current context of redevelopment.

I focus on one site of redevelopment – the Distillery District – to allow critical scrutiny of the layers of representation that condition its present constitution. The rise of redevelopment projects that position culture and heritage at the forefront of place
promotion ignites a system of sameness. As Philo and Kearns (1993: 20) suggest, “the idea is not so much that [places] be genuinely different from one another but that they harness their surface differences” in order to appear more natural and less deliberate.

Framing place via capital transformation for economic ends is not limited to the redevelopment of the Distillery. Many locations have turned towards place marketing as a competitive strategy to attract residents and businesses. Given that the redevelopment was directed by private actors (market oriented), it reflects one type of shift in the contemporary character and governance of inner city spaces.

Within the Canadian context of planned cultural districts and / or festival marketplaces (Granville Island, Vancouver; Byward Market, Ottawa; The Forks, Winnipeg; Privateer’s Wharf, Halifax), Gooderham and Worts is unique in that it is owned and operated by the private sector. While the encroachment of the private sector in Ottawa’s Byward Market is rising (see Tunbridge, 2001), each of these spaces have retained public sector involvement (either as a public sector or public-private sector led initiatives). Public sector involvement in these spaces ensures public participation in the planning process (through feedback loops). These spaces are comparable to the Distillery District in their heritage designations (cultural and / or physical), emphasis on festivity, and historic relations to waterways. In private sector redevelopments such as the Distillery, the role of the state is limited to that of facilitator: instituting heritage designations, guiding the planning process, and providing grants and awards. While there are obligations to the state to ensure respective reuse of the buildings through compliance with buildings codes, heritage easements, and permits, the site is under single ownership. The result in the case of the Distillery is the transference of a potential public good to
private control and reduced public consultation and engagement in the planning process. In addition to the transference, the animation of history is also strained. For example, while the developers are legally obligated to offer an interpretive program that animates the heritage value of the property at the Distillery (in accordance with the planning framework), this mandate was slowed to allow time for the site to develop. With one market condominium now completed and two more in the wings (following the restoration and leasing of the majority of spaces), it is unclear when and how this orientation will take place under the stewardship of the private sector.

**Contextualizing Urban Redevelopment: Shifting Policy Regimes**

The current demand for place differentiation is rooted within a series of changes that took effect over the past several decades. In this section I briefly sketch out how changes in urban policy beginning in the late 1970s and 1980s led to substantive shifts in the organization and transformation of urban space. I narrate these shifts by examining how entrepreneurial, neoliberal, and culture / creativity policies have shaped urban redevelopment outcomes in North America and Europe. These shifts help to contextualize the redevelopment of the Distillery District.

The entrepreneurial style of governance adopted in cities in North America and Europe beginning in the 1970s, was a response to deindustrialization, rising unemployment, financial pressure resulting in increased privatization and market rationality, and the declining role of the nation state (Harvey, 1989: 5). In order to reorient the market, urban governments took on a more entrepreneurial role, shifting the function of the state from welfare provision to economic development (see Hall and
Entrepreneurialism can be summated through the following characteristics: public sector risk, public-private partnerships (where the public often shoulders much of the cost to allow the private sector to benefit), and an emphasis on innovation, promotion, and profit (Harvey, 1989).

There are substantive issues surrounding these arrangements. For example, in his research on the redevelopment of East Manchester, Ward (2003: 120) outlines the effects of this form of governance on the local populace. Over several decades, while a considerable portion of the city benefited from grants, particular areas such as East Manchester were left wanting. When East Manchester’s time for redevelopment came, it was joined by a civilizing campaign, “illustrat[ing] how there are clear links between the pursuit of a particular model of economic redevelopment and the regulation of individuals and communities whose activities pose a potential threat to its realization” (Ward, 2003: 125). The focus on outward promotion precludes the potential for local (inward focused) improvements. Paddison (1993) examines urban entrepreneurialism through a case study of Glasgow. Drawing on the “Glasgow’s Miles Better” campaign in the 1980s, which attempted to attract inward investment through image reconstruction, and Glasgow’s European Cultural Capital hallmark event in 1990, Paddison (1993) argues that the emphasis on economics in these campaigns and events overlooked the social implications. The effect of these outward oriented policies on a local populace leads to processes of uneven development, marginalization, and potential displacement.

Practices of urban change under entrepreneurial governance are increasingly neoliberalized. As Weber (2002: 185) argues, “[o]bsolescence has become a neoliberal alibi for creative destruction, and therefore an important component in contemporary
processes of spatialized capital accumulation.” This process of devalorization /
revalorization is what invariably shifts capital to particular areas of the city while
ignoring others (creating a process of uneven development), in the pursuit of reclamation.
Through the introduction of policies such as tax increment financing (TIF’s) and business
improvement districts (BID’s) under neoliberal policies, the state shoulders some of the
costs of devalorization in order to spur revalorization by the private sector (Weber, 2002).

Shifts in global capitalism in the 1970s and 1980s placed cities in a precarious
position. On the one hand, there was a need to reinvigorate local economies to attract
investment and job opportunities. This took the form of fast paced interurban
competition, place reimagining, and regulatory undercutting (Leitner and Sheppard, 1998).
Concomitant with these shifts, “the retrenchment of national welfare state regimes and
national intergovernmental systems has likewise imposed powerful new fiscal constraints
on cities, leading to major budgetary cuts during a period in which local social problems
and conflicts have intensified in conjunction with rapid economic restructuring” (Brenner
and Theodore, 2002: 367). The result is a full array of experiments in neoliberal policy
from the local tax abatements noted above to the creation of urban development
corporations (such as London’s Docklands) to spur growth and development. These
neoliberal experiments have led to the increased privatization of the built environment
and urban form, and a focus on upper class consumption (Brenner and Theodore, 2002).

The emphasis on the local combined with the rising demand for interurban
competition fueled the most recent shift in urban policies towards creativity and culture.
Building on the foundations of the entrepreneurial city, urban creativity policies further
propel the pursuit for competitive advantage through an emphasis on consumption, place-
marketing and cultural attractions / settings (Catungal et al, 2009: 1101). Drawing on Florida’s (2002) most seminal text on the subject of creativity, Peck (2005: 767) outlines the prevailing speed of transference within the newest avenue for urban competition:

_The Rise of the Creative Class_, as a knowingly constructed ‘mutable mobile,’ entered this hypertrophied sphere of circulation at a velocity that revealed less about its intrinsic qualities than it said about, firstly, the profound policy vacuum that characterized the neoliberalized urban realm, and secondly, the now-extensive circuitry of the fast-policy regime that has been constructed around cities. Whatever else it may be, Florida’s creative-city thesis is perfectly framed for this competitive landscape, across which it has traveled at alarming speed.

Interurban competition is secured through the aestheticization of space which attracts creative workers and middle class mobiles. In the case of the (now) iconic sculpture _Angel of the North_ by Anthony Gormley located near Gateshead, England, the piece was meant to mark a shift in the image of the region from a post-industrial to a cultural landscape. But as Sharp et al (2005: 1014) note, “In claiming to be a signifier for the city as a whole, of course, it hides the inclusions and exclusions inherent in any singular vision for a community.” The incorporation of cultural policies often includes investment in cultural flagships – museums, galleries, precincts – in order to harness public consumption. There is an expansive base of research which attempts to work through the nature of these large scale investments, their ability to re-image place, and their effects on existing residents. Investments into arts infrastructure can be unstable. As Evans (2003: 433) explains,

City location alone is not sufficient to generate interest – symbolic association is needed to overcome the arbitrariness of the new and novel architecture, as well as inherited cultural facilities. Where memory or the sense of a place is effectively absent, and where a place is to be created, so to speak, from scratch, massive capital investment and revenue is likely to be required and success still cannot be guaranteed.
Similarly, drawing on the cultural quarter of Hoxton, London, Pratt (2009: 1057) illustrates how re-imaging place through marketing is not a long term practice, “especially when that development is rooted in consumption.” When culture and creativity are incorporated into urban policies, they are generally oriented towards interurban competition (starchitect architecture, hallmark festivals, international artists, cultural districts). Urban redevelopment strategies which pivot around art and culture are increasingly popular in the urban policy toolkit, and the inner city is emerging as a “unique zone of experimentation” for new economy clusters (Hutton, 2009: 987).

The ease by which policies glide across borders is reflected in the incorporation of particular arrangements (and regimes) of space in cities seeking solutions to urban economic development. In the context of these shifts in governance, processes of urban redevelopment have emerged as prime expressions of interurban competitive advantage. In the case of the Distillery District, the private ownership model is concomitant with entrepreneurial and neoliberal city policies. While the rise of public private partnerships and / or heavy subsidization in the form of tax abatements (such as in Atlantic Station, Atlanta) are common features in large scale redevelopment projects, the Distillery is rare in its private sector orientation. The city’s involvement in the project is in the order of facilitator (policy and planning, grants and awards, heritage designation). The focus on high-end consumption at the site is consistent with the strategies for interurban competition arising since the 1970s, and its emphasis on culture and creativity mirrors the current climate of urban policy in the city of Toronto. While the city has minimal involvement with the site, they are involved in a number of projects and planning exercises taking place in and around the Distillery.
Neighbouring Lands: Contextualizing the Distillery

The Distillery is surrounded by a number of (ongoing) planning exercises and redevelopment projects including the King-Parliament area, West Don Lands, St. Lawrence neighbourhood, and the East Bayfront. It is useful to provide a brief synopsis of these areas in order to set up the spatial context for the redevelopment of the Distillery. The Distillery is located within the boundaries of the King-Parliament area, but it operates as a special identity area within Part II of the Official Plan. In 1996, ‘The Kings’ (King-Parliament and King-Spadina) underwent a series of changes in zoning regulations in an attempt to reinvigorate two declining traditional manufacturing areas in the city (TUDS, 2002a). A more flexible planning policy was put into place to stimulate employment activity, create mixed land uses, and preserve heritage resources. The following major elements guided the revitalization efforts: flexible zoning (as-of-right development); removal of density numbers and a new focus on height limit regulations, massing, and light (built form standards); and transfer from single use industrial to commercial, light industrial, and residential land use (TUDS, 2002b: 2-3). The flexible planning framework reinvigorated the local economy and recognized the Distillery District as an area of site plan control.

Housed within the King-Parliament area is the Corktown neighbourhood, located at the northern boundary of the Distillery, and the West Don Lands regeneration area at the east and north-east boundary. Corktown is known for its 19th century industrial architecture, curved laneways, and worker’s cottages. New investment in the neighbourhood is achieved through “gradual change, primarily through infill redevelopment which maintains the existing character of the area” (TUDS, 2002a). This
is a stable neighbourhood in comparison to some of the other adjacent areas which are undergoing mass transformation. The West Don Lands Reinvestment Area, a 30 hectare brownfield site, is located east and north-east of the district (and is designated as a regeneration area in the King-Parliament Plan Policy). For decades, the area was used for industrial, residential, and commercial purposes. In 2005, the West Don Lands Precinct Plan was completed under the direction of Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (now Waterfront Toronto) which set out an ambitious mixed-use precinct involving all three levels of government. The main pillars of the plan include the following key elements: the construction of 6000 residential units, 1200 of which were earmarked for affordable rental housing; 25% of the area designated for parks and public spaces; and the creation of new transit lines to ensure that all residents would be within a five-minute walking distance to public transit (TWRC, 2005). Recently, Toronto won its bid for the 2015 Pan American Games, which will significantly alter the redevelopment already underway. The Pan Am athletes village (training facilities, lodging, and dining halls) will be located in the West Don Lands, and the site will be transformed back into a mixed-use waterfront neighbourhood following the sporting event (Paperny, 2009). While the original proposal was to unfold over the period of a decade or more, the timing of the games means completing the project in half the proposed time. Planning initiatives for the West Don Lands aim to match the aesthetics and form of the Distillery where possible to create continuous sight lines.

West of the Distillery is the St. Lawrence neighbourhood, a mixed use redevelopment dating back to the 1970s. Under the direction of Mayor David Crombie and Toronto’s reform council, St. Lawrence was transformed from an industrial district in
decline into a mixed use neighbourhood combining commercial and residential land uses. Significant to the social mix, 55% of the residential units were “socially assisted, comprising non-profit corporations and cooperatives” (Ley, 1996: 252). Klemek (2009) describes the shift in urban politics in the neighbourhood as a sea change within municipal politics which attempted to engage in a more ‘humane’ form of urban renewal through grassroots planning, a form of urbanism that was orchestrated in response to the devastating actions of renewal from the 1940s-1960s.\(^\text{12}\) Significant to the redevelopment of the area, “a primary objective became preservation of the character of Toronto’s ‘core area’ against threats from both destructive public policies, as well as private market forces” (Klemek, 2009: 81).\(^\text{13}\)

Lastly, south of the Distillery, are two industrial areas – East Bayfront and the Port Lands – which are currently undergoing redevelopment under the direction of Waterfront Toronto. Planning initiatives for the East Bayfront area focus on fostering a strong relationship to the waterfront through a mixed-use precinct of park spaces, urban boulevards, and public promenades (TWRC, 2005). Historically, the Distillery fostered a strong relationship to the waters edge; the transformation of the East Bayfront area holds potential to reinstate this relationship. The Port Lands area is “a vast peninsula of old industrial land” which is slated to be transformed into a “series of new lakefront urban communities that will connect to waterfront parks, beaches, trails and various amenities”

\(^\text{12}\) See Berman (1982: 287-348) for an example of the shift in urban politics between the 1960s and 1970s through the case of New York. Berman draws out the devastating effects of expressway planning under Robert Moses and the response to this mode of bulldozing through Jane Jacobs’ “a shout in the street.” This provides a useful example of how the ideas of advocacy planning (grassroots planning / humane renewal / New Left urbanism), attributed to Paul Davidoff, were enacted in the 1970s in North American and European cities.

\(^\text{13}\) The preservation efforts of the 1970s, and the re-valuation of historic properties as worthy of retention, helped to fuel processes of gentrification.
Pinewood Toronto Studios, a public-private development was recently constructed within the Port Lands and stands as Canada’s largest film centre offering a comprehensive production facility for creative and knowledge-based industries. King-Parliament encourages commercial concentration of film use (TFTO, 2008) and the Distillery continues to be listed as a film location. In other words, this area of Toronto is becoming known for its concentration of filming (from on location shooting, to post-production facilities).

Clearly, there is great deal of planning activity in the lands neighbouring the Distillery. Many of these projects will continue into the next decade and beyond, and will have long term impacts on the site at hand as residential, commercial, and light industrial land uses expand. Currently, this area of Toronto more broadly (east and south east of the downtown corridor) is underdeveloped with a supply of former industrial lands which await development or redevelopment. In the context of this planning activity, the redevelopment of the Distillery is precedent setting in several ways. First, the adaptive reuse of the historic buildings shows a commitment to heritage planning and reinforces the importance of preservation efforts in the east end of the city (and their economic potential). Second and connected to the first point, the height of the condominiums which are completed or under construction at the site (32 to 40 storeys) is precedent setting for other developers and stakeholders wishing to rearrange density allowances or surpass height limits on the basis of economic viability. All of the planning exercises have retained some degree of public sector involvement so it will be interesting to see how economic viability through density enters into the rearrangements of space. The overall relationship between the Distillery and its neighbouring lands at present is
minimal. While the developers participate in neighbouring planning initiatives (such as the West Don Lands) as stakeholders, there is little effort beyond these activities to foster connections with adjacent districts (such as public meetings, shared events). These planning directives will engineer a substantive amount of social and economic upgrading in Toronto’s east end which will complement the high-end consumption which presently characterizes the Distillery. In other words, the redevelopment of the Distillery forms part of a broader process to remake the image of the east end through a process of revalorization.

**Differentiation & Distinction**

Since the 1980s, there has been a growing interest in the concept of *difference* in geography. The emergence and incorporation of post-structural social theory that challenges singular understandings of people and places (in Marxist analyses), provided a basis for rethinking notions of inequality, identity, and power. Accordingly, difference was reconceptualized as a social (cultural, political) construction which produces material and discursive effects. The production (and reproduction) of difference is based on access to power, which I define as the ability to articulate and classify social difference, the ability to direct resources and to produce space, and the construction of differences / relations between places.

14 For example, the mapping techniques associated with the Chicago School constructed difference through a simplification of identity (a myopic view). Groups were identified by one attribute and were charted spatially on this basis, and places were represented through a simplification of their form / function based on surface appearances (see Fincher and Jacobs, 1998: 4-7). It is generally accepted today in literature on difference in geography that individuals and groups occupy multiple subject positions, and that subject positions (such as race, gender, class, sexuality) are socially constructed. Similarly, places carry multiple and contested meanings across space and time.
In this research, I do not focus on *difference* per say but rather on the strategies of place differentiation which I will introduce shortly. The purpose of collecting these strategies is to better understand the construction and enactment of place differentiation in urban redevelopment as practiced by place-makers, and to engage with alternative systems of classification. This focus on differentiation finds resonance with what is termed the ‘geography of difference’, wherein the relationship between place and identity is deemed to be fluid and flexible. Harvey’s (1990: 171) work on space-time compression emphasizes the changing conditions of accumulation since the 1970s wherein “the more flexible motion of capital emphasizes the new, the fleeting, the ephemeral, the fugitive, and the contingent.” Taking up the position of place within space-time compression, Massey (1994) illustrates how the local and the global are always interlinked through what she terms “a global sense of place.” By ascribing several characteristics to place (as process, as relational, as multiple, as a site of conflict), she highlights the possibility of retaining a sense of geographical difference which doesn’t deny the linkages that a place shares with other places. Emerging out of this area of research is an understanding of place as porous, and identity as socially constructed though networks of power.

Also pertinent to my understanding and use of place differentiation is the distinction made between the ‘play’ and the ‘politics’ of difference. Fincher and Jacobs (1998: 2) argue that a “*play*” of difference (where difference is encouraged and displayed on the surface) is more pervasive in the contemporary period of policy and politics than what they describe as a “*politics*” of difference (where difference is framed in deep
rooted struggles over “identity, resources, citizenry, and space”). This distinction (surface versus depth) is particularly useful for thinking through the attempts to construct variation in urban redevelopment projects. Specifically, the distinction provides an entry point into theorizations of place differentiation in relation to economic restructuring and social polarization. Understanding how place differentiation is constructed offers a reflexive space for thinking through the possibilities to insert or extend a politics of difference into place-making. I weave these two elements (the play and politics of difference) throughout the thesis to examine how difference is framed in relation to the Distillery (across multiple strategies), and to highlight the political implications of this framing. For example, when history is manufactured at the site as a singularized entity to differentiate place (a play of difference that focuses on aesthetic preservation), a whole order of moments, events, and processes are excluded from these narratives (fracturing place memory). This framing works to eradicate critical knowledge transfers in relation to the histories constituting the site (such as industrial production processes and labour) in order to prop up an easily digestible consumptive fare of the past. Understanding the political implications of particular strategies of place-making provides an opening into alternative strategies of difference that are more inclusive. Fincher and Jacobs (1998) argue that geographical constructs must be complicated to allow for a multiplicity of spaces and identities to overlap and intersect. Fraser (1997:90) describes these openings as mobile “networks of multiple intersecting differences.” Borrowing from the idea of multiple axes (and intersections) of difference, I theorize place as a set of multiple and overlapping identities that fluctuate across space and time (a multiple axes of place difference).

15 See Deutsche (1996) for her discussion on the play of difference in postmodern theory.
In this project I generate four strategies of differentiation in order to engage with the production of space across different lines of thought (and along different axes): negation, coherence, residue, and multiplicity. These are offered in short form in Box 1. I have placed within brackets some of the thinkers that inform each strategy. While thinkers are collected within particular strategies for the purpose of showing my trajectory of thought, this designation is by no means static. Given the importance of images in the production of space, it is necessary to unpack *how* place-making grants authority to particular arrangements, and to examine alternative processes of place-making. The conceptualization of these four strategies emerged in relation to the site at hand in an attempt to better understand the differentiation of place (as a marketing strategy, as practiced by a set of actors, as a (re)construction of time and space, and as a fiction). While the typology can be moved to additional sites of consumer culture, it should always remain responsive to the particularities of place. In analyzing the differentiation of the Distillery, the typology collects and responds to the different forms of place-making at play while providing alternative conceptualizations that run counter to the dominant claims. Once these positions are outlined, they can be used by various actors to recover different notions of place.

While I deal with each strategy individually in the pages that follow for the purpose of clarity, there are four common principles that connect the strategies. First, each strategy is embedded within a set of power relations that produce discursive and material effects. In this sense, the four strategies can be conceptualized as four techniques of power, utilized by place-makers to project differentiation. Second, while the strategies are constructed as singular arrangements, at times they form overlapping
relations (in other words the presence of one strategy, does not negate the presence of another). Third, while some of the strategies may (at times) appear at rest, they can be activated at any moment (they are always present even when they purport absence).

Box 1: Four Strategies of Differentiation

1. *Differentiation as negation.* In this strategy, subjects, objects, processes, events, systems – both individual and collective – are identified based on a system of negation. Something *is* based on what it is not. Identification is based on association with a general concept. (Ferdinand de Saussure)

2. *Differentiation as coherence.* In this strategy, a “unity” is created through an articulation of similarity between elements. The unity appears stable and natural, even though some elements collected under this order are forced into a system of similarity. The whole does not bear relation to the elements which it collects. (Jacques Derrida, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer)

3. *Differentiation as residue.* In this strategy, residual conditions are brought into visibility to establish an alternative arrangement (vision, order, effect) that disrupts conditions of domination. The alternative arrangements are not conditioned through negation. (Homi Bhabha, Walter Benjamin)

4. *Differentiation as multiplicity.* In this strategy, there is never unity, only an articulation of a system of relations which are connected yet individual. It does not correspond to a plane of reference. (Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari)

Each strategy in this sense is *made* active by social actors. Fourth, each strategy is open to processes of (re)appropriation, cooptation, resistance, and subversion (there is no hierarchy amongst the strategies). Furthermore, each strategy holds the potential to be mobilized as a critique to insert or extend a politics of place difference, or to be mobilized as a form of place-making in accordance with varying goals (whether geared towards profit or social welfare). In accordance with these principles, I shift from what the strategy *is* to what the strategy *does* (or can do) once it is made active. The purpose of
the typology is to examine how place differentiation is constructed (and enacted) in particular sites of urban redevelopment, to engage with the political implications that arise through these constructions, and to explore potential alternatives.

I arrived at the four strategies of place differentiation according to several movements. Based on early analyses of newspaper reports and policy documents on the Distillery, I identified the production of place difference as a relation to other sites / sights within and outside of the city. In other words, an identity of place difference was constructed according to a negative system of relations (the site is x because it is not y) which led me to formulate the strategy of negation. Through a system of relations, the value and order of place was produced through a series of hierarchical chains. Alongside the construction of place difference via negation, the developers worked to project unity by advocating inclusion and access to the site which led me to devise the strategy of coherence. For example, the vision behind the redevelopment was presented to the media as a space in which the whole city could participate. When I began to work through the implications of these two strategies of place differentiation, I arrived at two additional strategies which offered potential early on as interpretive critiques: residue and multiplicity. While at the outset these two strategies were useful in opening up ideas about how place-making could operate differently to produce an alternative set of processes, it became clear as the research unfolded that the developers were engaging with these strategies as place-making devices (albeit in altered form). For example, while constructing place differentiation in accordance with the strategy of residue can work as a mode of critique to make visible unrepresented pasts, it also operates at the site through the collection of “historic” objects and streamlined narratives of history to make visible a
dominant (and superficial) experience of the past. In regards to multiplicity, while there is a great deal of potential to rethink notions of place and identity through the representation of the site in filmic space, place-makers draw on the repetition of the site in film to produce distinction (thereby singularizing the multiple). In this sense, it matters how the strategies are made active, by whom, and for what purpose. Once the four strategies were devised, I began to work through how they were being operationalized (and by whom), what work they were doing, and where their potential lay.

1. Differentiation as Negation

The notion of difference as negation is tied to Saussure’s (1959: 964) work on semiotics (marking out the relation between the sign, signified, and signifier). This work provides a basis for understanding how the value of one sign is determined by its relationship to other signs within a system. As he suggests, “I propose to retain the word sign [signe] to designate the whole and to replace concept and sound-image respectively by signified [signifié] and signifier [signifiant]; the last two terms have the advantage of indicating the opposition that separates them from each other and from the whole of which they are parts.” In the application of semiotics, the signifier (a product of cultural manifestations) and the signified (the underlying concept) combine to form a sign that operates within a system of signs that are spatially and temporally fashioned. Producing differentiation through negation is arguably the most recognizable strategy of identification. The nature of identification works through a process of association / dissociation with ideal models. This form of accounting, however basic, dictates value. I examine how this strategy is employed by the developers (and other place-makers) to
construct a place identity for the distillery which is based on its relation to other urban spaces. This is evident for example in articulations by the developers that the district is *not a themed space*, and the district is *not an historical recreation*. This strategy is particularly pertinent to chapters 3 and 4 where I draw out the ways in which place identity is produced at the Distillery through selective classifications by the developers, the media, and the city. In response to this valuation, I draw on this strategy as a form of critique to highlight how negation – while operating to singularize meaning – produces dialogue. By locating contradictions that are produced within these classifications, I work to recondition the relation being cast by examining the potential that is simultaneously produced (as a mode of resistance or tactic of subversion). The strategy of differentiation as negation as it is currently employed at the Distillery by place-makers produces surface variation (a play of difference). By highlighting the contradictions which emerge within this set of classifications, a number of questions can be asked: What is enabled on the basis of this ordering? What is the potential for dialogue? What is the response to this strategy of differentiation by the tenancy? What are the political implications of this system of identification?

2. *Differentiation as Coherence*

Often times, differentiation as negation is joined by another strategy: that of coherence. It is useful to begin with an image provided by Horkheimer and Adorno (2001: 126) which responds to this category: “The whole inevitably bears no relation to the details – just like the career of a successful man [sic] into which everything is made to fit as an illustration or a proof, whereas it is nothing more than the sum of all those idiotic
In other words, resemblance is constructed and defended where and when this union is not conceded. Furthermore, as Derrida (1978: 279) notes “coherence in contradiction expresses the force of a desire.” In other words, coherence is propped up via contradictory and/or nostalgic desire to produce a centre (as illusion). In relation to the Distillery, despite the contradictions present at the district, the space is rendered coherent for the purpose of distinguishing place. At times, it is difficult to recognize this strategy as it operates under the praxis of naturalizing the relationship between the general and the particular, but it is a common form of place marketing. Value under this strategy is conditioned through an ability to retain a sense of coherence either in a mode of absolute sameness or as an articulation of differentiation. I examine how this strategy is used by the developers (and other place makers) to engage with the articulation of place identity through a mode of resemblance (illustrated through claims such as this is urban farming, and this is a site the whole city can share in). This strategy is particularly pertinent to chapters 3 and 4 where I engage with how coherence obscures geographies of exclusion and ushers in a rhetoric of place. In an attempt to construct a unique sense of place, contradictions are rendered coherent, a practice which culminates in (the byproducts of) purification and exclusion. The production of a coherent whole for the purpose of positive place-making can, as Sibley (1995: 72-89) suggests, obscure the negative outcomes of exclusivity and homogenization. This obscurity may not be intentional. As Duncan and Duncan (2001: 390) found in their research on Bedford, New York – a predominantly white upper class suburb – exclusion emerged as a byproduct of preservation: “social exclusion in itself is often not the goal; preserving the ‘look of the landscape’ is the primary intention.” The emphasis at the Distillery on producing a
landscape of aesthetic pleasure (to be apprehended visually) obscures the level of spatial exclusion that is present in this transformation of space. By critically engaging with the strategy of differentiation as coherence, I argue that there are other (more open and inclusive) formulations of “unity” in place-making that incorporate contradiction and tension. Specifically, while the developers work to market the site as a coherent whole (despite the contradictions at play), the tenancy unravel this unity through their multimodal ways of seeing and engaging with the site (which in turn produces a new centre, a unity in disunity).

3. *Differentiation as Residue*

Differentiation as residue refers to the act of bringing to light alternatives, either in action or in thought, that rub against the dominant modes of knowledge, process, or practice. As Bhabha (1994: 18) aptly notes, “the critic must attempt to fully realize, and take responsibility for the unspoken, unrepresented pasts that haunt the historical present.” This strategy is connected to the two others in the representation of unity and the conditioning of identification. Where history is constructed in the image of the dominant, there exists a set of marginalized aspects that are contained within these nodes of visibility. Benjamin (1968) is particularly useful in this regard for his critique of history as a linear narrative that is set against empty, homogenous time.  

As he suggests, “A historical materialist approaches a historical subject only where he encounters it as a

---

16 Benjamin unmasked the veil of progress and exposed its illusory form. For him, the narrative of history is the narrative of inescapable piles of debris. Progress is the storm that carries the angel (seen through the example of Paul Klee’s Angelus Novus) into the future, above the debris that grows skyward (Buck-Morss, 1995: 95). In other words, progress instills an unfolding of time that is counter to the erratic exploitative nature of history as it actually unfolds.
He takes cognizance of it in order to blast a specific era out of the homogenous course of history – blasting a specific work out of the lifework” (263). Residual aspects can be actualized at any moment to disrupt the unity of narrative and reposit the order. Rather than working to blast these moments, in this thesis I work to highlight their position as a method through which to confront the lack of present engagement with the past. This strategy is particularly pertinent to chapter 2 where I explore two forms of differentiation as residue: one that is presently employed by the developers which sets linear narratives of the past and objects to construct an (aesthetic and consumptive) experience of history, and one that I employ to engage with unrepresented pasts to highlight overlapping and contested histories. In other words, residue is conceptualized as both a physical remainder (formulated through the visual apprehension of buildings, objects, and significations), and as a set of moments, ideas, images, ways of seeing which remain in place but lie outside of the present framing of the past as articulated by the developers. I focus my critical strategy on the histories of built form (the context in which new buildings were constructed, the functions that they served, and their meanings over time). These narratives are then telescoped into the present constitution of space to illustrate how histories are manufactured into ‘heritage’ for commercial intent. I weave together an alternative trajectory for the histories of the Distillery in order to direct attention to the importance of collective (contradictory and overlapping) place memory in urban space.
4. Differentiation as Multiplicity

Finally, differentiation as multiplicity responds to pluralism. Differentiation as multiplicity is affirmative and positive. Differentiation in this state does not correspond to a model, but operates outside of the plane of reference. Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 3) define the nature of multiplicity as “neither object nor subject; it is made of variously formed matters, and very different dates and speeds.” As a result, value does not correspond to this strategy as value is constructed as a relation of negation (through a mode of hierarchicalization). This strategy is particularly pertinent to chapter 5 where I draw on multiplicity in relation to the use of the district in filmic space. Place-makers draw upon the multiplicity of place in film as a tool through which to project universal value (through celebrity appeal and commodity fetishism) to construct distinction. As a mode of critique, I emphasize how the visualization of the district in filmic space (as montage) highlights the functional and aesthetic possibilities inherent in the form and function of urban space. In other words, whereas place-makers draw on the pluralism of the site in filmic space to produce a coherent place identity (singularizing meaning), I draw on the strategy of multiplicity to outline how place identity is not tied to absolute location (rather, place identity is constructed through an assemblage of meanings, ideas, understandings that circulate in real and reel space).

Approach to Differentiation

The central problem that this research seeks to uncover is: what is the role of place differentiation in the current climate of urban redevelopment, and what are its (social, cultural, political, and economic) effects? This line of questioning is important
on several levels. First, there is continued interest by policy makers and developers to individuate space for the purpose of interurban competition within urban politics. Second, place differentiation is typically oriented outward (for growth and development) at the cost of local social provision and local development needs (producing uneven development). Third, place-making operates as a powerful tactic through which to smooth the unevenness of capital flows (power of the image) and is deeply intertwined with the production of differentiation. Fourth, despite the desire to produce generative difference, strategies which aim to individuate place often result in the production of sameness. Local ‘differentiation’ is most readily produced through the import of policies and programs from other contexts, raising questions concerning long term sustainability and overall costs (beyond economics). In consideration of these contexts, the multiple ways in which place differentiation operates (in discourse and practice) demands greater scrutiny. The typology emerges from, and is directed towards, a particular context of contemporary urban redevelopment. I am referring here to the continued retrenchment of the public sector in the redevelopment process since the 1970s, the recognition of art and heritage as economic catalysts (with subsequent reframing of policy and programming), the availability of industrial lands following the decline of manufacturing employment, and the continued extension of the “class remake of the central urban landscape” (Smith, 1996: 39; 2006) where heightened levels of place promotion are deployed to compete for mobile capital. Throughout the thesis, I examine the multifarious ways that differentiation is expressed (governed, practiced, constructed); the effects of these expressions (what is enabled and disabled on the basis of this ordering); and whose interests these expressions serve.
While the four strategies of differentiation as they are laid out in bare form above are diverse in their theoretical underpinnings, they provide a general basis from which to derive distinct patterns of knowledge production (through negation, coherence, residue, and multiplicity). I approach the relationship between knowledge and reality through the consideration that human understanding conditions perceptions of the world. As discourses and representations play a significant part in my project it is important to acknowledge that ideas can have material effects in the construction and perception of space, and conversely, that practices condition ideas.

Markings of differentiation as I have indicated are not pre-determined, rather, the value and meaning of the Distillery is crafted in order to direct ways of seeing. Bourdieu (1984: 479) describes how classification is based on access to power, wherein

What is at stake in the struggles about the social world is power over the classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of the representations of the groups and therefore of their mobilization and demobilization: the evocative power of an utterance which puts things in a different light...or which modifies the schemes of perception, shows something else, other properties, previously unnoticed or relegated to the background...; a separate power, a distinction...drawing discrete units out of indivisible continuity, difference out of the undifferentiated.

Under the regulation of space at the Distillery, strategies of differentiation are used to manufacture distinction. The emphasis on consumer aesthetics and taste is directed for purchase (monetary and / or experiential) towards the middle to upper classes.

Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of ‘distinction’ links aesthetic disposition to social class milieus. While I draw on the concept of distinction (as taste) in relation to the cultural elite in the thesis, this does not preclude the operation of distinction in other social class groupings. Bourdieu (1984: 41) writes that “...[i]t must never be forgotten that the working-class ‘aesthetic’ is a dominated ‘aesthetic’ which is constantly obliged to define itself in terms
of the dominant aesthetics.” The class hierarchy, while present, is unintentional: if exclusion takes place, it is a product of disinterest as opposed to intentionality. Tastes are cultivated through social class milieus (are acquired through, and have purchase in, a particular social habitus). In this sense, the working class may be disinterested in the Distillery as this form of taste aesthetic has no purchase in that social class milieu, but their avoidance and / or disdain may in effect socially reproduce the dominant aesthetic.

The developers work alongside various parties (such as the media, the tenancy, and the city) as agents of taste, creating an awareness of the exchange value of heritage, culture, and industry (manufacturing distinction for high-end consumption).

Despite attempts to construct a coherent place identity at the Distillery, a reserve of alternative meanings, relations, and moments unravels the unity. The district witnesses a constant dance between classification and declassification, differentiation and sameness. The dance between these poles is significant in that it represents the flexibility that is always already present. This illustrates how unity is a classification that is policed and protected, unnatural yet naturalized for the retention of power and profit.

**Methodology**

The typology of differentiation operates as a vehicle through which to assess the political implications of particular forms of place-making, while offering alternative modes of classification. The typology should never be assigned as a blanket onto space; rather the constitution of space must be examined first to determine how place, difference, and identity are being constructed. Following this appraisal, the typology can be operationalized as a way to further understand the present evocation of meaning, and to
offer alternative formations of place difference that are motivated along diverse lines (political, social, cultural, economic).

The identification of the Distillery is an assemblage of fragmented parts that are drawn together as unity for specific interests. Foucault (1982: 12) would describe these assemblages as “ready-made syntheses” that are normalized and routinized. As he suggests, it is important to recognize that these expressions are a “population of dispersed events.” What this means is directing attention to the power relations that impose a system of unity onto urban space. I draw on a mixed-method approach in this project (textual analysis, interviews, observation, and representation) in order to respond to these constellations with flexibility and to scrutinize different narrative structures. In using this approach I do not strive for an objective truth, rather I explore multiple discourses and spatial constructions which have circulated, are in circulation, about the Distillery.

Textual Analysis

My central methodological approach consists of textual analysis of contemporary and historic materials pertaining to the Distillery. Four types of texts were analyzed during the research stage of the project: newspaper and magazine articles from 1985 to 2008; planning reports and assessments issued by the three levels of government and private consultants; contemporary advertisements in magazines, city brochures, and material distributed by the site owner; and visual images including historic maps and photographs. The objective of this method was to gain understanding of how discourses on art, history, and urban redevelopment have developed and shifted since the inception of the site. If the site is sold as a unique space, how is the space constituted?
Furthermore, how did it come to be what it is at present (what is the geographical and historical context)? As Aitken and Craine (2005: 248) suggest, textual analyses that reject essentialist claims about the world “question not only what is known, but also how it comes to be known.” In working through the four strategies of place differentiation, ways of imaging / presenting the site in textual materials formed the basis for uncovering the production of difference in place-making. My analysis of cultural texts is informed by Doel’s (2003: 512) checklist of different modes of reading: by whom, for whom, how, and why was the text produced?; what form does the text take, what is the content, what assumptions are present (just as important what is absent)?; in what context did the text emerge?; what “work” does the text do?; how are power relations enacted and resisted within and outside of the text?

I focus on two major newspapers – the *Toronto Star* and the *Globe and Mail* – to analyze the discourses surrounding the closure of the site, the subsequent planning framework, and the redevelopment process under Cityscape and their financial partners. While for the most part these searches focused on the period between 1985 to 2008, more focused searches were used to locate historical newspaper articles (1850-1930) which documented the status of the Gooderham and Worts families; modifications to the physical structure of the site or new construction; employment records; and key transfers in tenure or in function. I supplement this material with contemporary magazine articles (*Toronto Life*, *Report on Business Magazine*, and *Strategy*) to draw out the conceptualization of the past and the future directions of the site. These texts are used to contextualize the construction of history at the site today and to examine what is included / excluded on the basis of this ordering.
The planning reports and assessments detail how discussions proceeded amongst the owners, planners, architects, organizations, societies, and the state, regarding the site’s conversion. Through an examination of these documents, I explore how the meaning of the site is constructed by the various actors; what elements are deemed to be important to retain in the redevelopment; and what issues have arisen. Analysis of these documents animates the policies that guided the conversion of the site and the trajectory of ideas surrounding the value of art and history in urban change.

Advertising and promotional materials produced since the site’s conversion in 2003 (including seasonal brochures on offer at the visitor’s center at the Distillery, City of Toronto tourist brochures, and magazine advertisements) were analyzed to decipher how the site is marketed through an application of words and images (who and / or what is included in the images, what is absent, what captions are used to direct meaning, what assumptions and / or values are present). I use this source to examine the following aspects: how the site is represented in advertisements; what aspects are highlighted; how the representations of the site change according to the author of its production (developers, city tourism, popular magazines); and what discourses are evoked. Advertisements are significations of meaning used to sell an experience, product, or (ideal) subject. In analyzing this material, I examine the representation of (and relationship between) art / history / industry, the expression of place differentiation, and the discourses used to sell the space. I place this material in the context of its production (urban redevelopment) and its intention (to produce and sell a particular place identity), and question what work the advertisements and promotional material do (what are the effects, what discourses are promoted?).
Photographs provide visual descriptions of the site throughout its inception and are utilized to document shifts in ways of visioning the site. Historical photographs and insurance maps are used to document the physical layout of the site, and the practices taking place, where available. The use of historical images / objects at the site and on the website provide an opportunity to evaluate which aspects of history are drawn upon to market the space, and what images are deemed to be historically significant through their preservation. Contemporary photographs are collected from the Distillery website, and are supplemented with my own personal photographs taken during participant observation. In taking my own photographs, I acknowledge that this is a subjective reading of space, where the very act of framing a shot implies a decision to include and exclude particular elements, thereby creating meaning in certain forms and functions. These images do not present an objective truth about the site; rather, they provide an authored snapshot of the spatial and temporal aspects of place (Sturken and Cartwright, 2001). I incorporate a selection of these photographs throughout the thesis to document moments of transformation or evidence of material objects and practices.

Each source within the textual analysis constructs identities and understandings of the district (signifying practices) across a range of spaces and times. Engaging with the production (and operation) of these discourses is critical to the project of mapping different ways of seeing space (and different formations of power).

*Interviews*

Interviews are an important component to understanding the effects of place-making. Forty in-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with on site tenants (art
gallery owners, retail owners, artists, craftspeople, performance spaces, and organizations), developers, and key stakeholders between February 2007 and September 2007. Following the official opening of the site in 2003, there were great levels of fluctuation in consumer base as the developers struggled to attract their target market. This was a product of the sudden accessibility of a site that was previously hidden from public view, and a festival and event season which pulled in all manifestations of urban festivity (from jazz festivals to ribs festivals). I was interested in interviewing the tenants and the developers of the Distillery given their role in the strategic framing of space. The inclusion of key stakeholders involved in urban programming at the neighbourhood level, and in the arts, heritage, and housing sectors provided an opportunity to engage with policy and planning shifts in the city of Toronto.

By incorporating interviews as a method, I do not claim authority in particular subjects, situations, or in my own positionality. Drawing on what Crang (2002: 650-2) describes as a plurality of dialogues, assumptions, and subject positions, I contend that access to, and the construction of, knowledge, is neither equal nor possible. An open-ended interview technique was utilized to allow participants to draw on their own interpretations, experiences, and discourses of the site. As Valentine (2005) notes, this technique allows interviewees to raise issues or themes that are not anticipated by the interviewer, and it allows the interviewer to repeat questions in various forms in order to reach greater understanding. This method of conversational style interviewing was particularly important given the differential participation of the interviewees, and differential discourses surrounding the role of the Distillery in the arts and culture, economy, and tourism sectors.
Potential interviewees were contacted by letter-mail for the first phase of recruitment, and I followed up with a phone call 1-2 weeks after the mailout. The interviews ranged in length from 45 minutes to 3 hours and were primarily conducted at the participants’ place of work, or at a nearby coffee shop in order to ensure a convenient and comfortable setting (what Longhurst (2003: 125) describes as a “neutral setting”). The interviews were recorded with the participant’s consent and confidentiality was offered to each participant. In some cases, participants refused the use of a voice recorder, and I modified my interviewing technique by taking detailed notes of the conversation. Those participants that chose to remain anonymous are represented by a letter and number combination in this work (e.g. A1, R2). Each interview was coded using descriptive themes. As an example, the codes used for interviews with the tenants included site selection, economic performance, place identity and atmosphere, role of art, heritage / industry at the site, and everyday experiences. Once these descriptive codes were established, I went back through each interview to map the language used to address particular themes, to look for possible overlap between and within tenant types, and to look for sub-themes (for example site selection was broken into sub-categories including other spaces considered, reasons for the move, and attraction to the site). The breakdown of interviewees by categories can be found in Appendix A. The interviews provide a detailed examination of the discourses in operation at the site in the context of everyday life. These conversations work to highlight how differentiation is produced (enacted, governed) and consumed (practiced, resisted) across a range of social actors.

17 There are five classifications for anonymous interviewees. The first letter in the coding system represents the classification of the interviewee (“A” represents Artscape tenants, “G” represents galleries, “R” represents retail, “T” represents theatre, “O” represents organizations, and “S” represents stakeholders).
**Participant Observation**

Given that a large portion of the interviews were conducted at the Distillery, I spent a significant amount of time at the site before, after and outside of these meetings detailing the physical characteristics of the built form, the people present, and the consistency and variation of practices and patterns. As Herbert (2000: 551) notes, ethnography, through interaction and time spent with social groups, provides a rich opportunity to examine everyday activities and practices, “the processes and meanings which undergrid social action.” I participated in walking tours and a Segway tour, attended festivals and events, and became one of many avid amateur photographers at the site. I visited the condo sales centre and sat in the model suites for the proposed condominiums, ate at the restaurants, went to gallery openings and theatre productions, and became a card carrying regular in Balzac’s Café. The awkward stranger in the background of wedding parties and photo shoots, and the consumer of temporary stalls of corporate wares and informational packages, I consumed the site by immersing myself in its rhythms. These observations and experiences – documented through a set of field notes, photographs and voice recordings – work to inform my understanding of the animation of the district. I have provided two examples of field notes in the form of ‘reflections’ to document my own practice of, and ways of seeing, space (Appendix B). In addition, personal photographs are woven into the chapters to document space and to illustrate evidence of spatial transformation.
Representations

Animations of space are not limited to that which is practiced and observed in everyday life: film creates an alternative space that emerges as an important element in the redevelopment of the Distillery.\(^{18}\) Visual culture continues to gain currency within the discipline of geography based on a recognition of its dominance within contemporary society; as Rose (2001: 1) suggests “knowledge as well as many forms of entertainment are visually constructed...what we see is as important, if not more important, than what we hear or read.”

The official website for the Distillery lists many of the films, television shows, and music videos shot at the site over the past 15 years, under a section titled “Hollywood North” (Distillery District, 2006). Using this as a starting point, I draw on a set of feature films shot on location to engage with the representation of place in film. The decision to focus on feature films responds to the value placed on this type of production by the developers, the tenants, and the media. The films selected represent the exterior spaces of the site in a visible and prominent way in the medium. During the analysis of the films, I examine the image of the site in the film, the setting of the film spatially and temporally, and the meanings which the site is used to convey and / or support. As Bartram (2003: 152) suggests, “Visual imagery *always* produces cultural meaning....We can understand this relationship in terms of ‘sign’ and ‘signification’ – the visual form that has been ‘encoded’ with meaning, and its ‘decoding’, or interpretation” (emphasis original). I draw on these visual clues to explore the broader relationship between film and the district, alternative formations of place differentiation (in particular multiplicity), and the

---

\(^{18}\) See Shiel and Fitzmaurice (2003) and Clarke (1997) for detailed discussions on the interplay between city space and the cinema.
expression of built form and place in filmic space. The malleability of the site in filmic space to express a range of spaces, places, and times highlights alternative formations of place identity that are not tied to an actual location (deriving meaning through virtual expression alongside everyday lived space).

Outline

In working through this material, each chapter examines different ways of seeing (space) through dominant and marginal perspectives. In chapter 2, I examine the physical expansion of the property through built form, from the first structure built by the company in 1832 to the final stage of development prior to the closure of the industrial operations in 1990. I incorporate cartographic representations and archival sources to map the physical expansion of the plant and the underlying conditions for its development. The narrative of history offered at the site in the contemporary period is limited to visual clues and heritage plaques (a play of difference as residue). In this chapter, I complexify the histories of the site using the strategy of residue as critique in order to re-orient the contemporary expression of space and time. This produces an alternative set of entry points into the collective memory of the site (a more political expression that seeks to position the site as a contested space).

While chapter 2 focuses on the physical expansion of the site through built form and the firm’s local and global linkages, in chapter 3, I orient ways of seeing the district along the parameters of urban planning. Plans were put forward by the city and the

---

19 Two structures (Rack House M and the Case Goods Warehouse) were added to the site in 1927 which were present at the time of sale of the property to Cityscape in 2001. Structures that were added to the site following 1927 were dismantled prior to the sale of the property and as such are not part of the redevelopment plans.
current owners to redevelop the industrial complex as early as 1990. In 1994, the City and major stakeholders realized that a lack of public sector funding meant that they would need to devise an approach for the property that opened up height and density allowances to foster “development for profit,” while at the same time preserving a nationally designated heritage district. Given that the complex was vacant throughout the greater part of the 1990s except for use by the film industry, the redevelopment of the district in the early 2000’s led to a spatial remapping of this area in the city. While considerations of historic preservation and accessibility were elements that formed part of the mandate, the redevelopment proceeded as a top-down approach by the private sector. The redevelopment strategy was readjusted in 2003 to incorporate art, culture, entertainment, and history as catalysts for economic growth. I demonstrate the commodification of art and heritage as two modes of theming space (cast through the strategies of negation and coherence by place-makers as a play of difference) and the relationship between the site and the festival marketplace model.

In chapter 4, I extend the discussion on the strategies of negation and coherence by critically engaging with how these forms of place-making (a play of difference directed by a top-down mode of governance) are performed / resisted in the everyday by a set of social actors, and the potential dialogue that is created via their limitations. I explore how tenants at the site respond to the singular vision of space constructed by the private sector with a focus on individual and collective understandings of what it means to be part of the district through discussions and debates over representation, governance, and the valuation of art, heritage, culture, entertainment, and labour. Specifically, I examine how flexibility in meaning and practice is produced in response to the discursive
web of naming space in the contemporary reordering of the site by focusing on the individuality of the tenancy as a counter to global banality, cultural commonality and aberration, and the containment of heritage via the construction of condominiums. This flexibility is productive in shaping and unraveling the fixed identity of the site and its boundaries, both imagined and material.

In chapter 5, I provide an alternative narrative for the period between 1988 to the present through the film industry which rented out space on site pre-redevelopment. I privilege the visual as a marker of the possibilities that exist between built form and space through the medium of film. The entry of the film industry onto the district in the 1990s altered the meaning and practice of built form and function. The presence of the film industry operated as a place holder for post-industrial redevelopment, and highlighted the potential for place reinvention. I examine the ways in which the use of place in film creates moments or happenings exterior to their everyday functions and visual form, and the ways in which the film set shapes the physical and cultural renderings of the site. The Distillery as film set represents a consistent reconstitution of the meaning of place, space, and time undetermined by specific or closed relations. The developers draw on the use of the site by the film industry and the multiplicity that it produces as a universal marker of value (a play of multiplicity to produce distinction). I counter this singularization via an inflection of multiplicity as critique, demonstrating how the pervasiveness for the site to be re-imaged in filmic space is an expression of how place identity is not tied to absolute location but rather is a product of overlapping and contested ideas, values, and meanings drawn from the symbolic and the material.
In the conclusion, I examine broader considerations for planned cultural districts in theory and practice. Specifically I turn from what is being said – how meaning is assigned, what it is assigning – to what these constitutions enable, in order to create possibilities for assemblages of a different order. I engage with the multiple meanings of the site by engaging with the multiple spaces of the site – the site as a set of multiply constitutive (and contested) spaces.
Chapter 2:
Looming over Progress: Historical Impressions of Gooderham and Worts

The histories of Gooderham and Worts are constructed as safe, distant, and conflict free. In this chapter, I produce a more contested historical narrative for the site by critically deploying the strategy of differentiation as residue. I take as my starting point a photographic series of the distillery pre-redevelopment which captures the set of Victorian industrial buildings during their period of abandonment. I aim to fill this series with the histories that led to their formation and retention. I map the histories of Gooderham and Worts through a series of insurance plans, and weave together a chronology of industrial development through the expansion of built form in four phases between 1832 and 1927. Differentiation as residue is currently utilized by the developers as an aesthetic backdrop to consumption (a play of difference). There are political implications to this form of place-making including the eradication of critical knowledge transfers in the histories of industrial production processes and labour practices. I argue that a critical engagement with the strategy of residue produces an alternative entryway into the site which is open to interpretation, contestation, and the idea of place as process.

Introduction

Oddly, considering the location’s evident origins, everything seems as pristine and ahistorical as the condo towers that encircle the Victorian gates (Vaughan, 2004).

Following the redevelopment of the Distillery District, the litters of consumer culture have replaced the refuse of the antiquated manufacture of alcohol; these two moments – industrial production and cultural consumption – toggle together as layers of place. While the adaptive reuse of the buildings at the Distillery has reinvigorated the property, the interpretation / orientation of the buildings is incomplete on the ground. As Toronto author, playwright, and filmmaker R.M Vaughan (2004) suggests in the opening quote, the past is restricted to a set of tracings wherein the buildings remain anonymous in terms of their historical function and serve as an aesthetic backdrop to commercial development. The developers incorporate the residue of history in order to construct a distinct place identity, a practice which limits engagement with the past to a set of
physical remains. For example, a sign from the management warns patrons to exercise caution in the historic district, a message which directs value (this is an historic district) and experience (urban exploration) without orientation (Figure 2.1). The singularization of history at the site raises a number of questions: Whose past is being preserved? What narratives are being exaggerated? What and who is being marginalized? How are these narratives prepared, and for what ends? In response to this play of history, in this chapter I engage with the strategy of residue as an interpretive critique to articulate alternative formations of place history that are complex and uneven. In particular, I am responding to the ways in which residue is mobilized by the developers as a surface aesthetic at the expense of more contested and plural engagements with the past.

I take as my focus the buildings themselves, in order to engage with the material dimensions of place. If Benjamin (1968) critiques linear history by blasting apart monads as sites of political potential, in this chapter I work to highlight potential moments that can be further activated. While the developers focus on the residue of industry as a form of aestheticization, there is little contextualization on the ground in terms of what filled the series of buildings, when they were produced, and who utilized them over time for what purposes. Edensor (2005a) highlights different ways of engaging with industrial spaces that have been abandoned and / or are underutilized following deindustrialization. Included on this list is their role as places of play, practice, and playground, as home, as sites of rummaging within the informal economy, as art spaces, and places of memory. Industrial ruins are, as Edensor (2005b: 325) suggests, unsmooth spaces that “offer opportunities to engage with the material world in a more playful, sensual fashion.” At the site, engagements with industrial forms are singularized. The naturalization of both
property and redevelopment emphasizes ‘highest and best use’ for the land at the expense of other (less economically viable) forms of engagement. Where these other practices exist(ed), they are displaced from dominant discourses. There are many different ways of telling the histories of Gooderham and Worts. I have chosen to focus here on built form as a way to collect narratives of the social actors, forms of commodity production, and shifting ways of seeing the site over time.

I want to start by introducing a set of visual representations of the site pre-redevelopment that open up a space for the critical reinterpretation of the past. In 2002, Robert Bourdeau, a photographer known for his representations of industrial and transitory spaces, photographed the buildings at the Gooderham and Worts distillery pre-renovation, a project which culminated in a series titled, *The Distillery District*. The images record the inactivity of the district’s built form and function with poetic undertones, where the industrial beams and the still machinery cast shadows on the rough walls and floors. The exterior shots set abandoned buildings, the windows of which are dark, avoiding refraction, amidst a golden pink hue. Each photo displays a perspective: a ceiling that refuses the comfort of a full stance, the mechanics of a machine that rests, supports that prop up a structure (Figures 2.2 & 2.3). While time is fluid in the images, without human movement or activity to act as a disruption or to set time as period, it is distant. The series was exhibited at the Corkin Gallery, an early tenant of the Distillery, in the summer of 2005. The photographs raise a number of questions: Why is the district silent in the images? What is to be made of the unfinished floors and the messages of light? Where are the people, the activity (industrial or otherwise), the rhythms of space?
What voice do the photos speak? These impressions of space, images that record a moment between industry and culture, a moment where the engines were at rest and before the cultural sirens had begun, are collected here under the operation of history.

Figure 2.1: A sign posted at the site by “The Management” draws attention to the historic value of the distillery and the excavation process associated with urban exploration.
Figure 2.2: Robert Boudreau (2002) *The Distillery District.*

Figure 2.3: Robert Boudreau (2002) *The Distillery District.*
Operating on history does not imply “fixing” its contours or smoothing out its contradictions. Rather, I penetrate into, and break past, the assumptions of history in order to create movement. When I draw on the term *history* it should always be read as something fluid and contested, temporarily staged long enough to be narrativized before retreating to an entangled and mutating collection of qualities and expressions. In doing this, I am not trying to set time as distant nor as something that can ever be fully reconstituted. Where space and time are fluid in the photographs, in the pages that follow I aim to temporarily stage complex moments of production and consumption as alternative passageways into the histories of the site.

In order to do this, I collect representations of industrial development at the Gooderham and Worts distillery, with the aim of cataloguing the construction of the district (materially and discursively) through time and across space (Figure 2.4). This focus supports my interest in processes of urban redevelopment, and responds to the tendency for these processes to privilege built form for its aesthetic value. As Benjamin (1935: 1016) argues “[i]n collecting, the important thing is that the object is taken out of all the original functions of its use.” Taking the object, process, system, subject out of its context works to create an alternative passage.\(^1\) This process of collection and transference for Benjamin, ushered in a critical moment of reflection that was politically motivated (as opposed to the playful rendition of time practiced at the Distillery).

In collecting alternative moments of residue – remainders of built form as well as their context and representations over time – I complicate the present orientation or

\(^1\) Nineteenth-century industrial culture represented to Benjamin (1935) a playground for bourgeois capitalism, wrapped in the discursive sheath of progress as ritual, the city as a set of mirrors, reflections that morphed the crowd into spectacle, and turned everything inward. Telescoping these representations out of their context works to reorder their meaning in ‘the present.’
Figure 2.4: Site Plan with Building Names and Numbers (Distillery District, 2009).
interpretation of history on the ground. The only mode of orientation or interpretation that currently exists is through visual clues (the apparent age of buildings, cobblestones, old signage), heritage plaques, and short chronologies in Distilled, the Distillery District Guide. These visual clues are cleansed of the markers of ruination that one might expect in a district of this age. For example, fresh coats of paint on the woodwork and piping, new windows, and restorative brickwork have covered most signs of decay. I take up Benjamin’s (1977: 226) view of origin as having “nothing to do with beginnings,” rather it is a term which “does not mean the process of becoming of that which has emerged, but much more, that which emerges out of the process of becoming and disappearing.” Even within the arrangement of buildings and narratives which are visible at the district today, there is an entire order of relations, moments, and memories that await their re-emergence.

I engage with four phases in the development of the site from 1832 to 1927. This frame marks the construction of the first structure on the site (a wooden windmill in 1832) and the last permanent buildings to be constructed (the Case Goods Warehouse and Rack House M in 1927) up until the closure of the plant in 1990. In between are two phases which draw their narratives around the physical development of the district including: a) the construction of a steam mill and distillery and the addition of malting operations in the late 1850s and 1860s, and the expansion of the site territorially in the 1870s to the eastern side of Trinity Street; and b) the addition of numerous tank and rack houses in the 1880s and 1890s in response to changing consumptive patterns. In order to ensure legibility, where possible, narratives are offered in a chronological order. I focus on those buildings that remain today and incorporate ghostly buildings (those structures
that were demolished and / or built over) when appropriate to the narrative of expansion and / or the present intonation of space.

I draw on several cartographic representations to illustrate the spatiality of the district across the many stages of its development. These mappings also chart the time period for structures added to the district and their relationship with the existing built form. Added to these representations are a range of sources that stretch across time from localized perspectives to more general accounts of labour and industrial growth in the city of Toronto. The more contemporary photographic series that I describe above, offers a lens through which to begin the process of narrativization: the images cut through the relationship between sign and referent. I aim here to temporarily fill the images as a series.

“The Distillery 1832”: Windmill and Whiskey Production

The year 1832 marks the inception of Gooderham and Worts within the present discursive construction of the district. This year is used within corporate marketing for the Distillery (on logos, in brochures, in advertisements) as well as for the purpose of heritage designations (Figure 2.5). While the Gooderham and Worts distillery is memorialized today as the oldest surviving complex of its kind in Canada, in its early

---

2 Beginning in the late 1980s, after the designation of Gooderham and Worts as a heritage district, twelve heritage assessments of the site were commissioned ranging from detailed inventories of available archival sources, to reports on the significance of the historical buildings. Many of these publications are accessible via the Distillery District Heritage Website (http://www.distilleryheritage.com) under ‘Reports’, and prove an important base for those interested in the history, architecture and industrial and cultural archeology of a Toronto industrial site. In particular, Otto’s (1988) report on the history of the distillery lays out the major phases of construction for the buildings that remain on site today.
Figure 2.5: Plaque designating the heritage value of the site, marking the years 1832 and 1837 as the inception of the site (Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, 1988).
days of operation, it was one of many distilleries in the province of Ontario.³ The labeling of 1832 is presented without complexity at the district where it stands as a marker to promote historical value.

The crossing of two English immigrants, George Gooderham and James Worts, at different times, over the Atlantic Ocean is fossilized in writing as the historical beginnings of the Gooderham and Worts distillery. The imagery associated with Toronto’s expanding hinterland is a legend of entrepreneurialism, marked by wealth production and nation building. The Gooderham and Worts families formed part of an elite circle of individuals who arrived in Toronto early and prospered through their business acumen and capitalist visions.⁴ One of these newcomers was James Worts who crossed the Atlantic Ocean and arrived in Toronto three years before its incorporation. A miller by training from Suffolk, England, Worts immediately set to work surveying the waterfront for a site on which to erect a flour mill. The mythology of the pioneer forging through the wild for matters of enterprise is clearly alive in historical portrayals of this instance of prospecting:

³ As Shuttleworth (1924: 62) notes, since the “earliest settlement of the country” [sic], manufacturing alcohol was an agreeable way to dispose of excess grain. Grain at this time was not exportable, but alcohol was “considered by almost everyone as an absolute necessity of life.” This level of consumption was in part due to the perceived medicinal qualities of liquor to curtail diseases such as cholera. It is of relevance to note that in 1834, the city housed 78 taverns (one tavern for about every 120 residents) (Kealey, 1984: 49) owing to the popularity of the commodity of alcohol. Both the consumption of alcohol as well as its effects on behavior were naturalized (see Pearson, 1914: 233-239). This naturalization of consumption alongside the ease of production to dispose of grain led to important shifts in the historical geography of the province. In her work on the distilling industry within Ontario between 1850 and 1900, MacKinnon (2000) emphasizes the shift from small scale production to industrial enterprises. This shift is clearly depicted through the decline of distilleries between 1851 and 1871, from 150 to 19 respectively, and the rise of what she terms the “Big Five” which included Gooderham and Worts (MacKinnon, 2000: 1-4).

⁴ The myth of “progress” was tightly bound to the myth of the “pioneer” in the early stages of the city’s development. In 1831, the town of York housed a population of close to 4,000, a small commercial sector, manufacturers of some essential goods and services, and most importantly, financial and transportation interests. What little industry there was centered on local artisans and “newcomers” who brought capital and vision to Toronto (Firth, 1966: xxxii).
We have been told by Mr. James Beaty [a shoemaker and capitalist] that when out duck shooting, now nearly forty years since, he was surprised by falling in with Mr. Worts senior rambling apparently without purpose in the bush at the mouth of the Little Don – all the surrounding locality was then in a state of nature and frequented only by the sportsman or trapper. On entering into conversation with Mr. Worts, Mr. Beaty found that he was there prospecting for an object; that, in fact, some-where near the spot where they were standing, he thought of putting up a windmill! The project at the time seemed sufficiently Quixotic (Scadding, 1966: 143).

The incident is recounted here as it provides a fitting description of the imagery associated with industrial expansion. The moment itself, an everyday exchange, collects significance through the realization of the power of the enterprise. Demarcated as a swamp in early surveys of the waterfront, the site selected by Worts benefited, in an industrial sense, from its proximity to wind and water. The associated imagery is pregnant with tales of the receding forests and wildlife under the power of the pioneer.

Construction of a windmill began with great speed with a team of twelve men in 1831 (Shuttleworth, 1924: 22) and by October of 1832, the first run of flour production was underway.\(^5\) Designated to be of Dutch fashion, the windmill, a cylindrical red brick structure, tapering upwards six stories high with large vales powered by a revolving fan, was the first of its kind in the town of York (Shuttleworth, 1924: 35). Steam began to triumph the fickle temperament of wind and the mill was adjusted accordingly in 1833 to include a steam engine as a supplemental source of power for just such errant occasions.\(^6\) While the windmill functioned for a limited time before its vanes were swept away and its roof was removed in a storm, it reached iconic landmark status. As Shuttleworth

\(^5\) The lapse in time between the completion of the mill foundation and the first run of flour is explained by missing parts. The machinery for the project, as well as the sails, were in transit (Shuttleworth, 1924).

\(^6\) See Gad and Gad (2004) for their discussion on how smoke produced by the steam engine in the city of Toronto became an iconic symbol of industrialization and a useful measure today for understanding industrial history and changing technologies.
reveals, it became a prominent marker for navigation along the waterfront, as “the starting point of all Harbour surveys.” Impressive in form and material, the windmill was included in early artworks of the harbour. In 1832, the windmill is pictured in a painting projecting the expansive view of the waterfront looking west (Figure 2.6). The scale and visibility of the windmill is articulated clearly in this image through its relation to other structures.

Figure 2.6: A painting dating back to 1832 illustrates the scale of the windmill along the harbour. W. Armstrong is the favoured choice as photographer (1832). Source: The Distillery District Heritage Website.

In 1832, Worts was joined by his business partner and brother-in-law, William Gooderham, who crossed the Atlantic with a party of over fifty relatives (Scadding, 1966: 143, see also Otto, 1988: 2). The reunion set at play the visions of utopia imagined through the venture: Worts contributed the technical experience and Gooderham the capital. The entrepreneurial spirit of the firm presented itself early through the

---

Days after the arrival, an account was opened with the Bank of Upper Canada and a deposit of £1823 was made in the firm’s name (Shuttleworth, 1924: 33). Though most of the deposit was earmarked for the expenses associated with the construction of the windmill, the amount signified the growing economic landscape of the town representing one of the largest deposits attained up to that point.
diversification of its production from flour to whiskey in 1837. After spending a number of years “accept[ing] grain in payment from the farmers for grinding their flour, instead of money” the firm was left with an oversupply of grain (West, 1967: 128; see also Armstrong, 1983: 73). While some of this supply was used as feed\(^8\), offal, consisting of waste and sweepings not appropriate for this purpose, contained a starch that could be converted into alcohol. This practice was common amongst millers of the day wherein a loss was turned into a profit due to the demand for spirits. By the time the property was converted into a distillery in 1837, Gooderham was alone in the venture.\(^9\) Although little is known about the construction of the distillery, it is said to have been styled as a “frame structure, to the south and west of the tower of the Windmill” (Shuttleworth, 1924: 65).

The residue of the early flour trade became the dominant output of the firm, and experimentation began to realize a product (whiskey) that would satisfy its customer.

The outline of the windmill is demarcated at the district today with a red brick arc on the cobblestones, following the ‘discovery’ of its foundation in 2003 during excavation work to lay new sewer infrastructure (Gibson, 2007b). While the outline is present, there is no signage to commemorate the corner of Buildings 31 and 33 (the Cooperage buildings) as the site of the original windmill, or to indicate that the historic

---

\(^8\) Early on in the enterprise, the firm housed a piggery on site and cows for milk for the families. In 1843 this enterprise was expanded to include a dairy with 22 cows (Shuttleworth, 1924: 106-7). The dairy and the cows were sold to Archibald Cameron, dairymen, in 1844, who paid interest for the continued housing of the animals and equipment on the property (Shuttleworth, 1924: 117).

\(^9\) Worts committed suicide in 1834 following the death of his wife during childbirth. Gooderham remained as sole proprietor, until 1845 when Worts’s eldest son, James Gooderham Worts entered into partnership of the company (Firth, 1966: 81). After the suicide, Gooderham changed the name of the firm from Worts and Gooderham to William Gooderham, Company (Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 1966: 358-60). The addition of James Gooderham Worts as a full partner remedied, in name, the relationship between the two families and the site.
foundations lie below.\textsuperscript{10} Moreover, for the average walker, the shift in coloration and arrangement in brickwork on the ground is a passing detail.\textsuperscript{11} The near invisibility of this narrative is juxtaposed against the last lines of Gibson’s (2007b: 2) discussion of the arc on the Distillery District Heritage Website: “When you stand on that arc, you can almost hear the creaking of the windmill sails, the grinding of the millstones, and the shouts of labourers going about their work.” The suggested ‘discovery’ of the foundation is perplexing given that the site of the original windmill is clearly demarcated in a proposal produced by Hiram Walker (1991) as a possible scheme for the revitalization of the property. As stated in the proposal, “Traces of now lost features can also be revived. The most important of these are the original shoreline and the windmill….The windmill foundation plan might be revived as a paving pattern in its original location between the Stone Distillery and Hiram Walker offices [The Cooperage]” (Hiram Walker, 1991: 61).\textsuperscript{12} The year 1832 is visible within contemporary renderings of the district to draw attention to the historic nature of the property where it forms part of the present valuation of the experience of space. However, the year is presented without complexity or interpretation on the ground.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{10} An archeological assessment of the windmill foundation followed the discovery of the remains. This document titled “Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of the Gooderham & Worts Windmill Foundation Gooderham & Worts Heritage Precinct Toronto, Ontario” was prepared by Archeological Services Inc. (2003) for E.R.A Architect Inc. (the heritage architect for a number of tenant spaces and the Architect-in-Record for the overall project since 1996).

\textsuperscript{11} The tours on offer at the site (The Distillery Walking Tour and the Segway Distillery Tour) do make reference to the location of the windmill, but there is a price tag for these historic interpretations ($19 dollars for the walking tour, or $69 for a 1 hour Segway tour).

\textsuperscript{12} The placement of the original windmill is also indicated in several of the heritage reports produced in conjunction with the planning process in 1994.

\textsuperscript{13} I am making the distinction here between on-site / on the ground interpretation and website interpretation. There is an extensive amount of historic interpretation of the site offered on the Distillery District Heritage Website, produced by in house historian, Sally Gibson. The meaning of ‘site interpretation’ in relation to
Constructing the 1860s and 1870s: Milling, Distilling, Malting

Over several decades, a set of Victorian industrial buildings were added to the property, and the Gooderham and Worts distillery rose to prominence as a great contributor to Toronto’s manufacturing base. The 1858 Boulton Plan of Toronto provides a useful record of the extent of the development witnessed in the 1860s and 1870s (Figure 2.7). One of the key igniters for this expansion was the addition of a new steam mill and distillery (1859-60) which increased production capacity. This was followed in the next decade by the construction of a number of storage spaces that expanded the plant onto the east side of Trinity Street (Otto, 1988: 8). Railroad expansion in Toronto around this time presented new trade routes and opened new markets, deepening the linkages the firm had with its supply and demand chains. These factors fuelled the general prosperity of the owners and the city. Over the next decade, the company would rise to become the city’s and Canada’s leading tax payer (Otto, 1988).

A new steam mill and distillery, towering five storeys high in Kingston limestone and completed in 1860, increased production capacity at the plant. With the ability to turn out 1500 bushels of grain a day, production reached a capacity of 7,500 gallons of whiskey a day (Otto, 1988: 4; Shuttleworth, 1924). The expansion was overseen by George Gooderham, William Gooderham’s third son, who was groomed into the family empire at an early age and who took on the risk associated with the venture. Personal financing for the distillery allowed construction to continue unabated even though

---

14 This amounts to a production capacity of two and a half million gallons of whiskey per annum. The Dictionary of Canadian Biography (Vol. XI, 1966: 359) places the production capacity of over two million gallons per annum later on in the years 1874 / 75. This most likely relates to potential capacity versus actual production which may have come later.
Figure 2.7: Produced in 1858, the Boulton’s Plan of Toronto illustrates the early stages of development at the site. Along the harbour, the introduction of the rails was proximally located at the southern limits of the site. The plan also illustrates the extent of the cattle barns on site east of Trinity Street until the 1860s. Source: The Distillery District Heritage Website. (www.distilleryheritage.com)
Canada was eighteen months into a recession which began in 1857 (Otto, 1988: 4). Four schooners were dedicated to carrying shipments of limestone from Kingston to the site, and a minimum of four to five hundred hands were reported to assist in the construction, ranging from general labourers to mechanics (Globe, 1859: 2). The windmill was demolished around the time of the new mill’s construction and the landmark status given to the old windmill was bestowed upon the new stone structure. The desire by the firm for the continued status of the site in the imagination of the citizenry may have been amongst the reasons for using expensive Kingston limestone (Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986).

The firm sought the expertise of David Roberts Sr., architect and engineer, to plan the addition. His proposal set out plans for a structure 300 feet in length, 80 feet in width with a maximum height of five storeys. The modernized distillery, a technological marvel amazed visitors: “in scarcely any other establishment in Canada there is so much accomplished without the aid of manual labour. From the time the corn is received at the door until it is ‘racked’ or drawn off in barrels, as whiskey or spirits, it is not handled by human hands” (Shuttleworth, 1924: 121).

Alongside the construction of the steam mill and distillery were a series of buildings also planned under the expertise of David Roberts Sr. in 1859-1860 to assist in the process. Two red brick boiler houses were constructed abutting the stone mill

---

15 The windmill was demolished in either 1856 or 1863. While one account positions the removal of the structure in 1856 to make room for the new construction (Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986: 88), others place the demolition in 1863 drawing on an illustration prepared by architect David Roberts Sr. in the same year which details the incorporation of the windmill into the blueprints (Otto, 1988: 19-23).

16 Machinery and equipment appropriate to the needs of the plant were also planned and designed by Roberts, and included a 100 horsepower land engine, the largest of its kind in the province (Shuttleworth, 1924: 122).
(Building No. 2 & 4) to power the milling operations and produce hot water. Also part of the series were two limestone structures standing at one and a half storeys used to ferment the mash (No. 6) and a storage building (incorporating scale tanks, yeast tubs, and fermenting tanks) (No. 7). The scale and technological achievements of the new additions propelled the firm into a space of social and economic privilege, where the families’ ability to translate profit into new investment opportunities gave them access to some of the city’s more exclusive circles. The growth in production earned the company the title of the largest distillery of its type in the British Empire. On February 12, 1866, the Globe newspaper reported the employment for Gooderham and Worts at 160 men (cited in Masters, 1947: 61). The additions also pointed to a shift from a local manufacturing scene to larger scale relations, the latter of which were aided by the expansion of land and water trade routes.

The proximity of the rails to the distillery operations proved vital for matters of trade; the new distillery building incorporated an elevator for moving grains from the rail cars to storage areas (Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986: 88). According to the Globe (1859),

17 Building No. 4 also included a mashing function (and slop / yeast drying) on the second floor.

18 Improvements to the production capacity at the site through the diversification of its output were also aided through the introduction of new prospects for investment. The Gooderham and Worts distillery, as well as its partners, backed the foundation of the Bank of Toronto. Upon its inception in 1856, “JG Worts [acted] as a major shareholder, and from 1862, William Gooderham [was] one of three successive presidents drawn from his family” (Careless, 1984: 81). The family was also involved in Manufacturers Life, an insurance company, and supported education through donations to the University of Toronto.

19 The first rail line in 1853 (the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway, later renamed the Northern Railway), presented an opportunity to expand trade from more locally oriented markets to a wider compartment of consumers. Traffic moved from Toronto to Bradford until 1855, after which the rails reached Collingwood, with subsequent extensions to Orillia, Gravenhurst, and Penetanguishene (Glazebrook, 1971: 104). Access to the American market was realized in 1855 through the extension of the Great Western Railway to Toronto, and a year later the inception of the Grand Trunk Railway linked Toronto to Montreal. As Fisher (1995: 29) suggests, while the railways spurred the economic reach of the firm, they also marginalized the area surrounding Gooderham and Worts by converting workers housing into railyards.
the productivity of the operations would rise exponentially, with the inclusion of millstones capable of producing 150 barrels of flour daily, besides which the operatives in the distillery will be enabled to mash in the same time 1,500 bushels of grain. Elevators will be used for hoisting grain into the building from the railway wagons, which can be run close up to the front.

But it wasn’t merely the presence of the rails that impressed upon the site the possibility for growth; the firm itself (and the partners) harnessed immediate ties to many of the lines as shareholders, directors, and president. In addition to the rails, a company wharf and grain elevator was added in the 1850s to move shipments of grain needed for distilling operations from ships which greatly expanded trade potential through water routes (Figure 2.8).

Following the construction of the steam mill and distillery was another period of expansion south of Mill Street and west of Trinity Street from 1863-1864. This set of new structures provided a western border for Trinity Street (No. 27, 28 and 31-36) and responded to the growing output of the firm. David Roberts Sr. worked with Gundry and Langley architects on the majority of these new additions with the exception of the Malt House and Kiln Buildings (No. 35 & 36) for which he is listed as sole architect. This expansion is best classified through two groupings: the Rectifying buildings (No. 27, 28, 31-34) and the Malting operations (No. 35 & 36). The Rectifying buildings, now labeled as ‘The Cooperage’ by Cityscape, were constructed to increase the capacity for whiskey

---

The Gooderham and Worts firm had ties to several railways. They were important shareholders in the Toronto and Nipissing Railway, and from its incorporation in 1868 to 1882, held important posts. William Gooderham Sr. was provisional director upon its incorporation in 1868, James Gooderham Worts was director between 1870-1872, and William Gooderham Jr. was president and managing director between 1873-1882. The Toronto terminal of the line was located near the distillery indicative of the family control of the railway. The firm was also an important shareholder in the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, and James Gooderham Worts was director of the Ontario, Simcoe, and Huron Railway between 1856-1858. This information is based on the biographies of the three men outlined in Volume XI of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography (358-61; 937-8).
purification and the production of barrel casks on the site. Alongside the increased demand for purifying and storing whiskey, was a requirement to expand the malting operations (the conversion of grain into a fermentable liquid). These operations were realized through the construction of a Malt House (No. 35) and Kiln Building (No. 36) which allowed the company to increase capacity in the conversion of malt from barley.

Gibson’s (2008a: 2) explanation of the process describes the relationship between the two buildings:

The barley arrived at Gooderham & Worts via ship or railway, was carted over to the Malt House, hauled up to the attic granary for storage, using a winch and the wooden hoist beam still visible in the gable of the four-storey dormer…As needed, the barley grain was fed through chutes to the
low-ceilinged malt floors below. Here it was spread out, watered, raked, and turned over until it sprouted to just the right size. This ‘green malt’ was then transferred to the adjacent Kiln Building. There, two furnaces in the basement heated the sprouted barley in the kilns above until it was dried and converted into malt. The malt was then hauled back to the Stone Distillery where it was put to work creating fermentable sugary liquid.

A photograph by Bourdeau (2002) illustrates the low ceilings of the malting floors used for sprouting barley (Figure 2.9). The new malting operations were a source of great pride for Gooderham and Worts, evidenced by the incorporation of “maltsters” on the company’s letterhead from the 1860s alongside “millers” and “distillers” (Gibson, 2008a: 2). In 1863 the Globe reported on the expansion of the firm into cooperage and malting operations: “This firm are about [to erect] another mass of buildings in connection with

![Figure 2.9: Photo by Boudreau (2002) in the series The Distillery District illustrating the interior of the Malt House, specifically a sprouting floor.](image-url)
and adjacent to their extensive mills and distillery. The new block will cover an area of over 15,000 square feet.” The physical expansion, technological advancements and diversification of output were clearly an expression of the expanding linkages of the firm.

The two structures, which form the malting operations, provide a strong focal point for the northern entrance to the property at the corner of Trinity and Mill Streets. The Malt House in particular collects intrigue in the contemporary period owing to its five parallel underground barrel vaults, each stretching 100 feet in length. Differing viewpoints over why the vaults were included in the basement of the Malt House and what purpose they served has produced a number of urban legends ranging from their use during prohibition to secretly transfer alcohol to the U.S. through Al Capone, and their ghostly activity. Recently, a set of drawings for the building were unearthed which record the fire proof characteristic of the vaults. The probability that they were used for the storage of flammable and / or valuable material (such as whiskey) is high given this finding (Gibson, 2008b). In 2008, the vaults, nicknamed the “catacombs,” were opened for public viewing during the annual Toronto Doors Open event where they continue to mystify.

---

21 Originally, the Kiln House and Malting House were of equal height at three and a half storeys. Sometime between 1877 and 1884, the roof of the Kiln House was extended by one storey (Otto, 1988: Appendix A: 15).

22 The plans in question date from the 1860s. On the drawings for the Malt House there is a description stating that the vaults are “fire proof.” The plans are currently housed at the City of Toronto Archives, Box 399876-1. They can also be found in Gibson (2008b).

23 Toronto was the first city in North America to launch the Doors Open event, a European experiment in building public knowledge and access to cultural and physical heritage (www.toronto.ca/doorsopen/history.htm). In the year 2000, Toronto Culture, City of Toronto, presented the first annual Doors Open event. For a weekend each year, numerous buildings (significant for their built form, heritage, and / or design), are opened for public viewing.
The Fire of 1869: Vulnerability and Rebuilding

While the beginning of the 1860s witnessed the confidence of the firm, the end of the decade exposed its vulnerability. A benzine cask on the lower level of the steam mill and distillery exploded on the night of October 26, 1869, setting the series of buildings aflame. The stone walls of the distillery and steam mill (three and a half inches thick) proved their tenacity, while the blaze pursued the flammable wood floors and climbed up the elevator shafts, completely destroying the interior. A documentary art piece depicts the extent of the fire (Figure 2.10), the flames rising from the structure and spilling out of the windows, a cinema of light for the crowd of workers and onlookers below. Firemen arrived quickly and diligently worked for hours to save as much of the property as possible by limiting the reach of the flames. Large quantities of wood and alcohol were stored in other buildings on the premises, and as Robertson (1904: 642-644) suggests, the
wind allowed the fire to flirt with other structures, causing the firemen and those witnessing the flames to shift in accordance to its temperament. Robertson illustrates the fear instilled in the event, where substantive explosions and heat transference loomed heavily, and the beauty that must have also appeared as rafters were shot into the air to be swallowed by the lake. There was no insurance on the building at the time of the fire which makes it even more remarkable that the structure was rebuilt by 1870 under the direction of David Roberts Jr., the son of the former architect and engineer employed by the firm. Its outward appearance remained unchanged and much of the original machinery and equipment was salvageable, blanketed by the supply of grain falling through the upper floors which smoldered for hours. The quick rebuilding was also testament to the success achieved by the firm in the 1860s through trade and technology.

Following the reconstruction, the decade of the 1870s saw the following additions to the site: the Pure Spirits Buildings (No. 53-57, 61 & 62), a tank house (No. 63) storage areas (No. 57, 58 & 59), a maintenance shop (No. 8), and cart and stables buildings (No. 51 & 52). This period marked the expansion of the operations east of Trinity Street and south of Mill Street. Of the new additions, it is perhaps the Pure Spirits Building grouping (in particular No. 53-56), so named for the storage of explosive alcohols and built with this purpose in mind, that garners the most attention in print. While the architect is unknown the buildings, standing at three to four storeys in height, are an

---

24 Cattle sheds were originally located east of Trinity and south of Mill Streets prior to this construction and can be seen in the Boulton (1858) plan of the city of Toronto (Figure 2.6). These took the form of four rectangular buildings, each housing about one hundred cattle at a time. The cattle were farmed and marketed at a rate of nearly 1,000 a year and the milk was sold to the city. The enterprise was carried out by William Lumbers who contracted the “wash” from the distillation process and in return was able to stay on site (Shuttleworth, 1924: 125). The new cattle sheds were built on the east side of the Don River after 1864, designed by David Roberts Sr. (Otto, 1988: 6-7).
impressive representation of Victorian industrial architecture.\textsuperscript{25} The expanse of glass windows that occupy much of the façade of the main structures were designed to collect as much natural light as possible, eliminating the need for oil lamps. They were also purposefully constructed to direct potential explosions outward eliminating the spread of fires to nearby buildings. A wrought iron balcony dividing the height of the structures lends a more delicate detail to their reflective exterior. The tank houses, most of which were constructed as one storey red brick structures, flaunt remarkable cohesion to previous construction. The uniformity of the complex, and its investment in architecture represented confidence and stability following a period of vulnerability. This outward expression was consistent with the ideals of the city to project an image of progress. Following the fire of 1869, new buildings were designed and constructed to direct, withstand, and eliminate potential future conflagrations.

Timperlake (1877: 271-2) provides a telling narrative of the firm’s ability to reach beyond the boundary of its property through its production capacity in the 1870s:

\begin{quote}
This distillery is the largest in the world, exceeding in capacity any of the mammoth establishments in the United States or Great Britain, the production being over two million gallons of spirits annually...The annual consumption of cereals is about 500,000 bushels of Indian corn, 100,000 bushels of rye, 51,000 bushels of barley, 25,000 bushels of oats, and ten tons of hops. It is computed that this firm consumes the fruits of the labour of upwards of 81,000 acres of arable land, and over 8,000 tons of coal is annually imported….One hundred men are employed in the distillery, but this number represents only a small portion of the men employed by the working of the firm.
\end{quote}

The other workers employed by the firm that Timperlake (1877) is referring to include those involved in the carrying process, the removal of the finished product, and those

\textsuperscript{25} Dendy and Kilbourn (1986: 88) suggest that David Robert Jr. may be responsible for the construction, while others (see for example Otto, 1988) note the inconsistency between this and other buildings on the site.
dependent on the refuse of the plant to feed their cattle. Alongside these direct occasions of employment, the firm’s connections to the railways, their ownership of the Bank of Toronto, and their large payments to the city for taxation is also raised by Timperlake as an example of capital / labour relations.

The Precession of Two Generations: Looking North and East 1880s-1890s

Following the death of William Gooderham and James G. Worts in 1881 and 1882 respectively, George Gooderham inherited the firm.\(^{26}\) The *Globe* (1881), reporting on the services of the funeral for William Gooderham, draws attention to the influential position of Gooderham and the respect conferred upon his contributions to city life in general and the distilling industry in particular. Representatives from all sectors of the business community, The York Pioneers,\(^{27}\) and employees from the firm of Gooderham and Worts attended the service. It is noted that some of the latter came from across the country (in areas where the firm had offices and warehouses) to pay their respects. Crowds lined the streets of the procession from Gooderham’s home to the burial site, making the funeral “one of the largest ever seen in Toronto.”\(^{28}\)

Following the death of the partners, and nearing the end of the late Victorian period in Toronto, Gooderham and Worts underwent its final major stage of construction

---

\(^{26}\) George Gooderham became a partner of the firm in 1856.

\(^{27}\) The York Pioneers, a society formed in 1869, worked to preserve the history of pioneer settlement in the town of York. Gooderham was amongst the early members of the society (http://www.yorkpioneers.org/history.html).

\(^{28}\) When Worts died within a year, a similar presentation was offered (*Globe*, 1882: 6), pointing to his accomplished services in various civic institutions and the general history and progress of the city. Similar to Gooderham, the relationship between his capital mobility and those that laboured in his name was naturalized in the newsprint: “His employees were highly attached to him and always found him a kind master.”
Much of this expansion was catalyzed by changing consumptive patterns, wherein fears over the harmful oils contained in straight whiskey prompted a shift towards redistilled spirits (Otto, 1988). Nine tank (No. 47-50, 64-65) and rack houses (No. 42-44) were constructed on the site between 1884 and 1895 to aid in the prolonged storage of whiskey to rid its character of fusel oil. These were mostly comprised of single storey buildings with the exception of Rack House D (No. 42), a six

29 After this stage of construction, two buildings were added to the site in 1927 (No. 74, the Case Warehouse, and No. 75, Rack House M) (Otto, 1988). I exclude here the onsite constructions in the late 1990s and early 2000s, as well as reconstructions and modifications to existing structures.
storey brick structure housing a six level timber rack frame, and were predominantly attributed to architect David Roberts Jr. (Figures 2.12 & 2.13). The tank and rack houses filled out the eastern portion of the property (specifically the corner of Mill and Cherry Streets). Also added during this period were the Pump House (No. 60), Boiler House (No. 46), storage and shipping building (No. 62a), glycol and molasses tank (No. 9), barrel wash house (No. 25), carpentry and machine shop (No. 45) and a new elevator on the wharf.  

Most of the construction radiated around the older buildings, and blended in

Figure 2.12: Rack House D (No. 42) is one of the larger buildings on site which may explain why it was constructed north of Mill Street and east of Trinity Street so as to not detract from the coherence of the site (personal photo).

---

30 These structures are mostly attributed to David Roberts Jr. with the exception of the glycol molasses tank (No. 9) which remains unattributed.
Figure 2.13: Interior image of Rack House D (No. 42). Designed by David Roberts Jr. the building houses a wooden timber frame for alcohol storage that was recently opened to the public during Toronto’s Doors Open event in 2008 (personal photo).

form with the earlier structures (red brick buildings with limestone foundations). The additions are depicted in the 1880 and 1890 additions of Goad’s Atlas (Figures 2.14 & 2.15).

Alongside the physical expansion of the site was the expansion of the brand globally. The firm garnered a world-wide reputation, achieving reputable endorsements in the World Exhibition circuit. In 1878 and 1885 at the World Exhibitions of Paris and Antwerp respectively, Gooderham and Worts whiskies received gold medal honour, “the grounds for the highest distinction being its purity and its excellence” (Toronto
Illustrated, 1893: 88). World’s Fairs, as showcases of the progress of the colonies, presented to consumers a catalogue of preferences. The Gooderham and Worts brand radiated from the confines of the city to the global marketplace; through a process of product differentiation, the liquors produced by the firm projected an image of status and a palette of refinement. Beyond the consumption changes and taste refinements, this period also marked an unparalleled expansion of the city itself in terms of area and population. This expansion presented issues surrounding the compatibility of land uses as a result of overcrowding, and increased social divisions.

31 Spanning a mere 6,771 acres in 1834, by 1896, the city had almost doubled to 11,924 acres as a result of the annexation of areas including Yorkville, the Annex and Parkdale (see Clark, 1898 and Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986). Industrialization in the city “feature[d] both the economic gains of wealth-producing factories and the social problems of massing, crowding numbers” (Careless, 1984: 109). The concentration of factory workers continued to increase in the subsequent decades. Between 1871 and 1891 the workforce engaged in manufacturing enterprises grew from 9,400 to 26,242 respectively31 (Careless, 1984: 109). The new found wealth of those engaged in the operations of these enterprises led to a number of multiplier effects in the spaces of the city, but also led to social division and powerful hierarchies. One of the catalysts for the divisions was capital itself, as Barth (1980: 20) notes, “the direct links between money and status heightened the incentive to gain and demonstrate wealth and power,” a discursive construction that does not always fashion itself through collective desire.
Figure 2.14: The Goad’s Fire Insurance Plan for the City of Toronto in 1880 (plate 11) illustrates the first major wave of construction at Gooderham and Worts beginning in 1859. Note the extent and scale of the new distillery east of Trinity Street and north of the Esplanade East. Much of the construction following this structure was owing to the new capacity afforded by changing production techniques. Source: The Distillery District Heritage Website (www.distilleryheritage.com).
Figure 2.15: The Goad’s Atlas for the city of Toronto, 1890: plate 29. Note the construction of several new buildings, south of Mill and east and west of Trinity Streets. These buildings, mostly tank and rack houses, responded to the changing needs for redistillation to clear the spirits of harmful oils. Source: *The Distillery District Heritage Website* (www.distilleryheritage.com)
Outward Expression: The Gaze of Labour

When I stand at Front and Wellington Streets today and look up at the Flatiron building, an image occupies my thought, directs my attention. Its placement on the street – dividing the intersecting traffic in a triangular shaping – speaks to the building’s historical prominence in this area of the city. Before the building was commissioned by George Gooderham in 1891, the site, housing a commercial building, was referred to as “Coffin Block” because of its particular shape (Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986: 133). It faces eastward, a point that seems unimportant today without an understanding of the city’s development, or the view that the facing enabled over a hundred years ago. It is not the copper detailing turned green with rust on its roof that engages me, nor its Victorian architectural design. It is the window on the top floor that directs my gaze. The view afforded by the semi-circle tower at the eastern plane of the building was unique, a vantage that “few other Toronto businessmen could match (it included the Bank of Toronto, the St. Lawrence Market, the distillery at the end of the harbour and the railways along the waterfront)” (Dendy and Kilbourn, 1986: 133). In the nineteenth century, the geography of the city was drawn in accordance with a conception of the harbour as the centre of activity (economic, social, political, and cultural). Over the course of several decades, the harbour line moved from the site of the Stone Distillery building 500 meters south, a result of various stages of infill including the company wharf. In 1912, infill was used to create Ashbridges Bay, a human engineered shoreline, divorcing the relationship shared between this industrial site and the water.

32 Left with overseeing the future of the site, George Gooderham, set to extend the visibility of the wealth attained by the firm into the physical texture of the city through great architectural achievements. This included the construction of the Flatiron Building (also known as the Gooderham Building) located at Front and Wellington Streets, and the construction of a new residence at St. George and Bloor Streets (known today as the York Club).
The Gooderham building today no longer claims the sky as its vantage; its five levels drowned in the endless parade of scrapers and columns. But Gooderham sat for years from this vantage, watching the production of spirits at the Gooderham and Worts distillery. Watching the production is dictum for watching the exhaust of progress that would spill out of the site and into the skyline. When the airs were free, so too were the workers, and legend has it that Gooderham would respond with speed to reach the site and spark the wheels of capitalism once more.33 A panopticon of progress, removed from the sight of those who worked within the confines of the distillery bounds, the production of labour measured at a distance via its refuse. Enamored by the empire he resided over on the Toronto harbour, this gaze is cast into the memory of place. Foucault (1977: 205) defines the gaze of the panoptic schema as “a type of location of bodies in space, of distribution of individuals in relation to one another, of hierarchical organization, of disposition of centers and channels of power, of definition of the instruments and modes of intervention of power.” In other words, the relationship fostered between the vantage claimed by Gooderham’s office and the position of the distillery in the distance can be read through a hierarchy of power. The vantage from the Gooderham building provided a tactic through which to monitor labour through output (in this case the exhaust of the steam engines).

Besides the long range vantage from Gooderham’s office, the presence of monitoring took place in more proximal means. The estates of both William Gooderham and James Gooderham Worts (built in the 1850s and 1840s respectively) were located on

33 The vantage offered by the top floor of the Flat Iron building has become an urban legend where it is recited in tours of the city and on blog sites. Whether the actions are factual is secondary. The narrative engages with the historical relations between capital and labour and offers a reflection on the development of the downtown skyline.
the property until the end of the nineteenth century at which point they were replaced by tank and rack houses (Figure 2.16).\footnote{The two estates were leveled in the late 1880s and early 1890s respectively (Otto, 1988: 10).} A photograph of Gooderham’s estate, located west

Figure 2.16: Goad’s Atlas, City of Toronto, 1910 (Vol.1, plate 29). In this plan, the General Distilling Company buildings are pictured west of Trinity and south of Mill Streets (on the site of Gooderham’s estate which was demolished in the mid 1880s). Also evident in the plan is the construction of the rack and tank houses east of Trinity and north of Mill Streets that took place in the late 1890s. Source: The Distillery District Heritage Website (www.distilleryheritage.com).
of Trinity and south of Mill Street, illustrates the dual function of the property as a commercial enterprise and a family home complete with a garden (Figure 2.17). The site of the Goederham estate currently houses the Pure Spirit Condominium completed in 2008. The Worts estate was located north of Mill Street and east of Trinity, and faced

![Figure 2.17: William Goederham’s estate was located west of Trinity and south of Mill Street until the mid 1880s. Following the death of William Goederham, the estate was demolished and in its place two rack houses were constructed (Gibson, 29 Apr., 2007).](image)

south towards the plant (Figures 2.18 & 2.19). In its place Rack House D was constructed. Whereas commercial and residential areas were tangled in the early half of the 19th century, the boundaries of these functions grew more divisive by the end of the century.³⁵ Land values in the city were rising and the possibilities for trade, historically

³⁵ It is this division that Dendy and Kilbourn (1986) reference to explain the reason why, in 1889, Goederham commissioned David Roberts Jr. to build him a home in the “fashionable” Annex area. The estate, located at the corner of Bloor and St. George Streets, stands today as a testament to the architectural detail and display of prosperity witnessed at the century’s close. As Lemon (1984: 329) notes, “In the 1880s homogenous upper- and upper-middle-class neighbourhoods started to appear in Toronto” in areas including the Annex, Rosedale and Yorkville (see also Goheen, 1970). The construction of the rails along the waterfront and the perpetual expansion of industry led to noise and air pollution, and a shift in aesthetics. Goheen (1970: 90) describes this process of residential and commercial reorientation as “the death of the waterfront as an amenity.” Spatial division according to class and function was also indicative of a process of ‘othering’ at play which activated a series of measures to control the arrangements of the city.
offered through a position of centrality, were dissipating in accordance with (technological) advancements, urbanization, and changing land values. The process of decentralization began in the second half of the nineteenth century when industry began to relocate to the edges, and outlying “suburban” areas were annexed to the city (see Lewis, 2000).

Beyond the presence of monitoring alluded to above, early industrial working conditions were fraught with safety issues and unethical labour practices. The federal government commissioned a study on the conditions of factories and mills in 1882, and their findings were troubling. While the spaces of industry remained nameless in their report, as Glazebrook (1971: 143-4) notes, the findings can be generalized. Conditions of child labour, long hours, work accidents, lack of training, and poor ventilation and emergency exits were among the infractions. Arthur (1986: 161) writing on the newly rebuilt distillery following the fire remarks,
we might criticize the smallness of windows and the consequent lighting conditions for workmen within, but, looking at it just as a building (as, of course, no critic would dream of considering it), the masonry is impressive, the gable well proportioned, and the strong bands tying the window sills give the building an almost Florentine look.

Looking at these structures as simply buildings and not as houses of labour, and / or as statements of industrial progress, status, and functionality, produces a disjuncture. At the site, the presence of alcohol (in production processes and in storage) contributed to close inspection and monitoring of the workers. In the accounts held by Gooderham and Worts, there was occasion to measure the conditions of wage labour through the consumption of alcohol. In one entry, Shuttleworth (1924: 24) notes the “troubles incident to builders,” where the degrees of intoxication of a workman were measured according to their degree of productivity: “Thus the man might be ‘partly drunk,’ ‘drunk half a day,’ ‘sleepy drunk,’ ‘dead drunk,’ or ‘drunk as David’s sow’.” The list here is also produced as a census, a daily consumptive affair penalized through wages.

While the workers were surveyed through the physical presence of the owners on the property and through the monitoring that took place in later periods from the offices at the Gooderham Building, the conditions of wage labour at the plant remain inconclusive.36 The continued private ownership of the property today with the wrought iron fencing at the northern entrance provides a modern incarnation of surveillance at the

36 There are a number of archival records which refer to the ‘family’ of Gooderham and Worts (which included the employees) and others which provide evidence of company sponsored trips and minor league sports teams that performed under the title of the company (see Gibson, 2007a as an example). Similarly, Prentice (1949) in the Canadian Beverage Review outlines how the firm owed much of its success to its skilled workers who provided their service and craft to the plant over long periods of time. In particular, he draws attention to the generational transfer of knowledge at the plant and the benefits to employees for their service: “Old age pensions, sick benefits, health provisions and many other projects have not been “granted” as concessions to the employees…but are rather a combined effort of every member of the firm to insure that, each reaps benefits from hard work and sincere effort” (Prentice, 1949: 112). While there is certainly a propagandistic quality to this representation of labour and capital, there remains a great deal of potential to uncover the narratives of the workers at the site (and their general conditions of wage labour) through careful genealogical research.
site. In addition to the ownership and physical demarcation of the property, there is a 24-hour security guard who monitors practices to ensure compatibility with the function of the district.

Solvency Amidst the Fires of Nationalism: WWI and the Temperance Movement

Between 1900 and 1927, Gooderham and Worts encountered two significant (and largely concomitant) forces – World War I and prohibition – which shifted the physical development and future direction of the company. Shifting global relations and national policy changes led to the physical growth of built form and new functions, as well as the eventual sale of the property in 1923 to a non-familial buyer, Harry C. Hatch of Montreal. Leading up to the two major events, in 1902, several distilleries including Gooderham and Worts, Wiser’s, Hiram Walker’s Sons, and Corby’s formed, in partnership, the General Distilling Company (Otto, 1994: 11). New buildings were erected south of Mill and west of Trinity Streets for the endeavor, the land of which was sold by Gooderham and Worts to the newly created company.37 While Otto (1994) positions the underlying reason for the establishment of General Distilling as a mode of competition emerging from a collective desire to compete with a Montreal based manufacturer producing cheap industrial alcohol, the growing strength of the temperance movement across Canada also raises the possibility that the venture was orchestrated to provide a fallback for the distilleries involved. When George Gooderham died in 1905, the firm was passed down

37 As Otto (1994) notes, the land was sold back to the firm in 1919, and some of the buildings were torn down shortly thereafter.
to his two sons, George William Gooderham and Albert Gooderham who would face the challenges of the proceeding decade as president and manager of the firm respectively.\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{Wartime Industrial Complex}

The advent of WWI was preceded by a period of depression particularly devastating to the industrial segments of the economy where rising unemployment and stalled production capacity went hand in hand. The turn towards the manufacture of munitions worked to alleviate the loss of productivity, but as Glazebrook (1971: 192) notes, war orders were slow. In 1916, the British Government, facing difficulty in obtaining explosives for WWI, entered into a contract with Gooderham and Worts and the General Distilling Company to utilize the grounds for the production of acetone (Otto, 1988: 5). At this point in time prohibition in Ontario was already underway, preventing the production, storage, and consumption of alcohol (with the exception of medicinal and private use), a point I will return to in the coming pages. Suffice it to say that the inability for the site to produce alcohol provided optimal conditions for its use as a ‘national factory’ under contract with the Imperial Munitions Board (IMB). Operated by British Acetones Toronto Limited, the distillery produced 5,600,000 lbs of acetone and 11,000,000 lbs of butyl alcohol through the duration of the war, earning it the title of the principle producer of acetone within the British Empire (Carnegie, 1925: 154).\textsuperscript{39} Attempts were made to draw on the existing labour force at the site where possible,

\textsuperscript{38}The two sons retained control of the firm until 1923 when financial hardship and uncertainty led to the sale of the site to Hatch.

\textsuperscript{39}In the spring of 1916, the Imperial Munitions Board formed an arrangement with the General Distilling Company and the Gooderham and Worts distillery (Gooderham, 1919: 49). The site was the second national plant owned by the Imperial Munitions Board.
which required extensive training due to the different methods utilized (Gooderham, 1919: 60). Albert Gooderham (a Colonel) managed the site with the assistance of his son, their diligence recognized in the productivity of the plant, which exceeded expectations.

The function of the site for military purposes required several new structures to be built on the property and additions to be made to existing buildings. While the entirety of the General Distilling Company plant (located in the north-west portion of the property) was operationalized, only certain parts of the Gooderham and Worts plant were put to use. At the beginning stages these included the Coal Shed and Grain Elevator at the edge of the harbour, the Distillery and Mill Building, and the Boiler House. As time progressed British Acetones took over several additional buildings including the Rectifying House, Malt House, and Fermenting Cellar. There were only minimal modifications made to this set of buildings mostly owing to safety measures put into place given the volatile character of the solvent, or to reinforce the structural conditions (Gooderham, 1919).

New buildings were required to expand the production of acid and methyl ethyl ketone (M.E.K.) and were constructed south of Mill Street and east of Parliament Street, and north of Mill Street and west of Trinity Street respectively. British Acetones took hundreds of photographs of the buildings on site (interior and exterior shots), the equipment used, and the workforce employed as part of their report on the national factory published in 1919. The photographs depict the General Distilling buildings and

---

40 The M.E.K building was erected north of Mill Street and west of Trinity (owned by the General Distilling Company). This section of property is currently owned by the City of Toronto and is not included within the boundary of the distillery proper.

41 Included in these images is evidence that the participation of women in the plant took on a larger role than might be expected, ranging from office staff to work in the fermentation and bacteriology departments. The photographs are available as a complete collection at the City of Toronto Archives’ Fonds 1583, under the document British Acetones Toronto Limited, 1916-1918. Some of these photographs alongside excerpts from the report are also available on the Distillery District Heritage Website (http://distilleryheritage.com).
the acid plant prior to their demolition following the war (Figures 2.20 & 2.21). By 1926 most of the buildings in the north-west portion of the property were demolished as illustrated in an aerial vantage of the property (Figure 2.22). The use of the site for military purposes, while leaving few traces behind on the existing built form, contributed to its non-local linkages.

Figure 2.20: A photograph of the main distillery building for the General Distilling Company prior to its demolition in the 1920s. The building was erected in the north west section of the property and stood at five storeys. Source: Gooderham et al (1919). The photographs are available as a complete collection at the City of Toronto Archives’ Fonds 1583, under the document British Acetones Toronto Limited, 1916-1918. Some of these photographs (such as the one shown here) alongside excerpts from the report are available on the Distillery District Heritage Website (http://distilleryheritage.com/british.html).
Figure 2.21: Photograph illustrating the acid and M.E.K. plants under operation by British Acetone during WWI. The photo also illustrates the extent of the additions in the north-west section of the property and their interrelation. Source: Gooderham et al (1919). City of Toronto Archives, fonds 1583, item 62.

Figure 2.22: ‘Aerial view of eastern waterfront’, Nov. 17, 1926, Fairchild Aerial Surveys Company of Canada, Archives of Ontario (10028199). On Distillery District Heritage Website (www.distilleryheritage.com). The grain elevator and coal shop along the harbour are also clearly illustrated in this vantage.
Desiring Liquor

The retail sale of alcohol was prohibited in Ontario beginning in 1916 (under the Ontario temperance act) and then in the Dominion in 1918 under the directive that alcohol was required for the war measure.\(^{42}\) Included in the Ontario Prohibition Act was a clause stating that following the war a referendum would be held to allow voters to decide whether to keep the province “dry” or whether to amend or repeal the legislation. In 1919, voters in the province of Ontario confirmed prohibition (Star, 1919). The Ontario temperance act focused primarily on the consumption side of liquor traffic, meaning that through the duration of these measures, distilleries and breweries continued production, and consequently sold illicit liquor to the United States market (which at the time was also under prohibition). In 1923, George Gooderham, facing an uncertain future following WWI and prohibition, sold the distillery to Harry C. Hatch, a Montreal businessman, for $1.5 million dollars (Otto, 1994: 12). Hatch also acquired Hiram Walker & Sons, a Windsor, Ontario distillery in 1927, and merged the two companies under the umbrella of Hiram Walker – Gooderham and Worts. Given that the period of prohibition was particularly difficult for this branch of industry, the amalgamation of the two companies offered economic viability. The merger also worked to propel trade to the United States market during their extended period of prohibition. Hatch bought the majority share of Gooderham and Worts at an opportune time: following the war, the economy displayed great strength. When prohibition in Ontario ended in 1927 under the creation of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, liquor was no longer conceived as a

\(^{42}\) Leading up to these measures, the question of prohibition flooded the local news with appeals by citizen’s groups to think about the waste of money consumed on drink, and counter-appeals to think about the economic costs of stopping liquor production.
moral infraction. Most provincial legislation was overturned in the 1920s, and
arrangements to set up spaces for government sale were undertaken. As Valverde (1998: 97) suggests, following WWI, liquor consumption was fashioned as a “socially functional force to be channeled into healthy consumption.” It was owing to this discursive shift in the commodity of liquor that operations of commercial alcohol and spirits production continued unabated at the Gooderham and Worts distillery, albeit under different direction, for decades to follow.

Under the direction of Hatch, the last two permanent structures were added to the site in 1927: Rack House M and the Case Goods Warehouse located at the southern boundary, west of Trinity Street. Both structures are differentiated, architecturally, from the remainder of the buildings on the property. Rack House M, designed by T. Pringle & Sons of Montreal, was constructed as an eight storey plain brick box running north/south for barrel storage (Otto, 1988). On the east and south sides of the building, are two signs built into the structure with contrasting glazed white brick (du Toit Allsopp Hiller, 1994: Appendix B, 3) (Figure 2.23). Given the lack of ornamentation (including windows) the signage adds visual interest for traffic flows along the southern boundary of the property. Standing at four storeys, the Case Goods Warehouse, designed by V.L. Gladman of Toronto, is a plain brick building that was designed for the purpose of wholesale distribution. While the density of both structures is high in comparison to the nearby buildings, as Otto (1988: 12) suggests they are “large but unobtrusive…slipped into the fabric of the distillery in such a way as to support its operators without requiring the demolition of any important early buildings.”

43 Prohibition in the United States took place from 1920 to 1933.
Both Rack House M and Case Goods were slated for demolition in early proposals for the redevelopment of the district by Diamond et al (1990) on behalf of the City of Toronto and Hiram Walker (1991), and within the official planning framework passed for the property in 1994 given their year of construction. Despite these earlier projections, there was a general understanding that Cityscape would retain all of the structures within the district at the time of the sale of the property in 2001 (see for example Caulfield, 2005: 93). The Case Goods Warehouse was incorporated into the redevelopment, and now serves as one of two buildings for Artscape (the other being the Cannery Building). Rack House M was demolished in 2009 to make room for the Clear Spirit Condominium (Figure 2.24).
Conclusion:

The Gooderham’s and the Worts’ joined part of an elite dynasty of families in Toronto. While their respective empires were founded on the commodity of alcohol, their accomplishments in other facets of the city are well documented. In many cases, the reach of the families into the public and private life of the city was orchestrated via an interest in expanding and protecting their economic investments. Involvement with the rails (as major shareholders, directors, presidents) ensured a formidable relationship for their trade routes. Similarly, their civic involvements in areas such as banking and insurance earned the individuals and the firm a charitable reputation. Their ability to amass wealth supported the physical growth and development of the property and the
reach of the firm’s brand. At the time of George Gooderham’s death in 1905 (son of William Gooderham, founder of the firm), he held mortgages on 181 properties in Toronto, was proprietor of dozens more, and displayed a highly diversified portfolio of investments in mines, banking, and insurance (Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 2008). With the value of his holdings reaching over $9.3 million, his was one of the richest men in Canada:

The composition of [George Gooderham’s] estate showed how effectively [he] had diversified. Almost 90 per cent of his father’s wealth in 1881 had been invested in the distillery; in 1905 Gooderham’s distillery investment represented only about a third of his fortune (Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 2008).

But the story of the Gooderham and Worts distillery is about more than the personal and collective achievements of the Gooderhams and the Worts. It is about the physical growth and development of the property and the conditions underlying the periods of expansion. Throughout the history of the plant, decisions were made (by a number of individuals) to alter, add, or demolish particular buildings. The coherence between structures, despite the shift in architects and owners, and their ultimate retention as a unity is testament to the continued concern for architectural quality (and value) in relation to (potential) output.

In 1990, facing global competition and sizable expense associated with necessary equipment upgrades, the site closed its doors as an operating industrial plant. Prior to this, the last run of grain alcohol flowed through the site in 1957, at which time the complex streamlined production to industrial alcohol and rum. Throughout the second half of the twentieth century, production was gradually transferred from the Gooderham and Worts

---

44 This story is etched into the pages of many a history book. For a more recent analysis, these narratives are collected across a range of heritage narratives prepared by Sally Gibson on behalf of Cityscape for the Distillery District Heritage Website.
plant to Hiram Walker plants. In June 1990, alcohol production ceased altogether and the future of the collection of Victorian industrial buildings was called into question. Following the sale of the property to Cityscape and their financial backers (William Wiener and Lillyann Goldstein at that time) in 2001, the majority of the buildings outlined in this chapter (with the exception of Rack House M and the buildings which were demolished as noted) underwent a process of adaptive reuse.

In 2003, Gooderham and Worts was reopened as the newly minted Distillery District, a private centre with public access for everything ‘arts, culture and entertainment.’ The site today is presented as a skeleton of its former functions, beautified and cleansed to house new arrangements of production, consumption, and visualization. The Cooperage, Pure Spirits, and Stone Distillery buildings became art galleries and retail spaces. Two Tank Houses (No. 9 and No. 10) became a theatre school, and the Smoke House became a spa.45 The Pump House was transformed into an intimate café, and the Case Goods Warehouse gained new life as art studios and theatre spaces. The Malt House became an experiential retail store and the Paint Shop a brew-pub. These assemblages of built form create alternate rhythms of production: live music reverberates across the site in summer months, while weddings and photographers capture moments in freeze frame. Smells originating from bakeries and restaurants waft into the laneways, while walkers fill the site as consumers of architecture, history, and culture. History is relegated to the sphere of visual consumption in the current iteration of the district; under the process of adaptive reuse, the buildings were cleared of their content and recast as (empty) shells of time.

45 Since the writing of this chapter, the Oasis Spa and Wellness Centre closed its secondary location in the Distillery District due to financial difficulty.
I began this chapter with a series of photographs of the Gooderham and Worts distillery taken prior to its redevelopment. Throughout the pages that followed I have attempted to brush against the continuums of time, to fill the buildings, and the operators representing them, with a set of complex moments of production, consumption, and visualization. These moments contain the potential to break away from the homogenous course of history, the tales that Benjamin (1968: 262) so aptly labels as “Once upon a time” memorandums, and imbue them with possibility. While I offer these alternative entryways in chronological order, I contend that time is neither linear nor homogenous, but rather it is always present even when it purports absence.

The developers draw on the residue of the past (physical objects, old machinery, Victorian built form) in uncomplicated form as a backdrop to consumption (a surface rendering). There are political implications associated with this form of packaging, including the sanitization (and linear projection) of history, the erasure of labour practices, and the collapse of difference. Heritage designations are public acts which should attend to multiple pasts (including the orientation of the site as a working landscape). Critical engagement with the strategy of differentiation as residue recognizes place as a progression of events, assemblages, and meanings which are at times in contest. Contestation complicates the focus on high-end consumption that characterizes the district by unsettling the safe and orderly narratives of the past presently on offer (a commodification of the past to produce place distinction).

In chapter 3, I turn to the policies and practices which governed the redevelopment process for the Gooderham and Worts distillery in the contemporary period ranging from institutional regulations and designations to shifting policies
surrounding art, creativity, and heritage. Ultimately, during the early planning stages in the 1990s, the future of the district as a private mixed-use precinct within the city was secured. The industrial and cultural heritage of the site was a key element in the planning process, which makes the present constitution of history at the site as a surface rendering even more perplexing.
Chapter 3:
Reconstructing Space & Time: Redeveloping Gooderham and Worts into the Distillery District

In this chapter, I examine the planning process in the 1990s which shifted Gooderham and Worts from a space of potential industrial ruin into a mixed-use precinct with a focus on art and heritage. This shift effectively privatized a potential public good, raising questions surrounding the place and value of history in contemporary urban society. I argue that heritage and art are socially constructed and must be positioned in the context of changing policy and planning mandates in order to understand their current use. The trajectory for the valuation of heritage in urban space is reflective of the economic potential of selling the past through cultural policy. While levels of protection for heritage structures are becoming more effective, understandings of how to animate these structures are not following suit. Policy programming for the arts has shifted over time through the recognition that the sector catalyzes economic development. This recognition has shifted the focus towards the public consumption of art (Cameron and Coaffee, 2005) raising concern that cultural producers are treated as one dimensional actors. After contextualizing the planning process and policy programming, I examine how heritage and art are used as the basis for two strategies of place differentiation (coherence and negation) employed by the developers, the media, and the city to market the relational attributes of the site in the production of value. In the conclusion, I outline how despite the emphasis on the uniqueness of the site, the Distillery District resonates with the festival marketplace model which operates via a standardized formula for development. I argue that place differentiation as it is presently employed (via coherence and negation) works to manufacture distinction through the commodification of art and heritage. The result falls on the side of rhetoric whereby place differentiation operates by trading images that are disconnected from everyday practice. The effect of this manufacture of distinction is the creation of an exclusive space that is purified of contestation.

Introduction

In August 1990, the Gooderham and Worts distillery rested. The labouring bodies, the sounds of buzzing machines, billowing smoke, and olfactory distractions\(^1\) – the rhythms of production – seized under the spell of the global pursuit for profit maximization. Faced with a competitive marketplace and changing consumer tastes, the

\(^1\) As Lakey (1990) of the *Toronto Star* notes, “Inside, the grainy, choking smell of fusel oil – a by-product of the distilling process that assaults the senses like a stiff belt of Scotch but is used to make delicate perfumes – hangs heavily in the air.”
remaining operations (mostly rum and industrial alcohol) were transferred to the Hiram Walker plants in Walkerville, Ontario and Kelowna, British Columbia. For months following the closure, the machines remained in their original placement, a site filled with the shadows of its former operations. Jim White, one of three employees who remained on the payroll for property maintenance, describes the events of the closure:

…every department was [as] if the next day was coming. All the coats were still there, lockers were still there, work boots, sweaters hanging up as if the next day was a working day and it was [a] holiday and we were in on a weekend or a summer shut down or something. We left it exactly the same. We didn't touch anything for five or six months (cited in Historica Research Limited, 1994: 53-4).

The dust would settle on the site, but not for long. Prior to the closure, the clamor of reclamation had already begun. A set of twelve heritage reports were produced under the direction of the city of Toronto between 1988 and 1994 recording and collecting details of the site including its industrial heritage, archival records, signage, oral histories, and built form. Furthermore, a planning study and heritage assessment for the property was completed under the direction of the city of Toronto in 1990, and in 1991 a proposal for the redevelopment of the property combining residential, commercial, and light industrial uses was completed by the site owner. The Gooderham and Worts distillery entered into a complex series of acquisitions and mergers in the latter half of the twentieth century. In 1986, Hiram Walker-Gooderham and Worts Ltd was bought by Allied Lyons, an international wine and spirits company headquartered in Bristol, U.K. When operations

---

2 On February 26, 1992, a formal application by the owners was submitted to amend the official plan and rezone the site to allow a mixed use precinct which would utilize the majority of the buildings (Fisher, 1995: 36).
for Gooderham and Worts closed in 1990, the property was sold to the Allied Lyons pension fund (later known as Allied Domecq).³

While the property would wait until 2001 for large scale redevelopment to begin, these early activities and practices set out the framework for future transformations, and set in motion the private ownership model of a nationally (provincially and municipally) designated heritage complex. In this chapter I examine the planning process underlying the redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts into the Distillery District through the following set of questions: Given the heritage designation of the property, what led to the private sector ownership model? Did the redevelopment scheme in 1994 strike an appropriate balance between economic viability and heritage management? Why did cultural uses shift from a minor to a major focus of adaptive reuse following the sale of the site to Cityscape? How were heritage and culture incorporated into the district by Cityscape and what led to their commodification?

I begin by outlining how the early planning process unfolded through considerations of how to balance economic development with heritage preservation. The combination of declining public sector funds for capital investment, deindustrialization, and the costs associated with brownfield remediation for the site owing to its industrial use, produced two important realizations: that the site would need to be redeveloped through alternative uses besides industry, and that redevelopment would need to be orchestrated by the private sector. When Cityscape bought the site in 2001, their proposal drew on a two prong approach to redevelopment (adaptive reuse and culture-led

³ A subsidiary for Allied Lyons, Wyndam Court Canada, controlled the property. Cityscape bought the site from the pension fund for Allied Domecq (following a merger between Allied Lyons and Pedro Domecq in 1994 forming Allied Domecq) in 2001.
regeneration) and included plans to construct three market condominiums to offset the costs of remediation and structural damage, and to ensure economic viability.

The inclusion of heritage and art at the Distillery is based on market impetus and aesthetics. While the site is protected through heritage designation by all three levels of government, these designations do not provide full protection (meaning that there is a reliance on the developer to agree to the terms of preservation). At the Distillery, the interpretation and valuation of heritage is selective, where it focuses on elements of the past which are safe, orderly, and without contestation. Aspects which would disrupt this projection of the past are negated (such as the recent plant closure and the associated job loss), and aspects which support this narrative are made to cohere (focused on the visual presence of the past in material form). The inclusion of art at the site is geared towards public consumption as opposed to an emphasis on the creation of spaces for artistic production. The classification of the site as an ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ centre projects unity (coherence) despite the contradictions between these activities. This desired centre (as illusion) excludes understandings of art as disruptive or disorderly, and sets at play a form of engagement of art as spectacle or art as economic catalyst. Recall that policy programming for the arts has shifted over time based on the recognition that the sector can help fuel economic development. In other words, there is an economic rationale for the inclusion of art in urban redevelopment, driven by the (image) value of ‘creativity’ in contemporary urban policy. I argue that heritage and art are commodified at the Distillery for their experiential and aesthetic value, with the end goal of manufacturing place distinction. I focus on two strategies of place differentiation that are currently employed at the site (negation and coherence) and highlight the disjuncture that
arises between discourse and practice in place-making. Despite attempts to market the site as a space of distinction, the site resonates with the festival marketplace model which is based on a formula of repetition and standardization. While the strategies of differentiation as negation and coherence as employed by place-makers are fraught with contradictions, I utilize these moments of discord to open up a set of spaces for critical dialogue regarding the linkages between art, heritage, place identity, and redevelopment.

**Officiating Change**

In the subsections that follow, I examine three aspects of the process of officiating change: a) the planning and policy programming for the site through a land use perspective, b) Gooderham and Worts within the context of North American deindustrialization and brownfield remediation, and c) leasing space within the district between 1990 and 2000. Ultimately, each of these aspects had an impact on how the redevelopment of the property proceeded in the early 2000s.

**Land Use Planning: Economic Constraints and Alternative Arrangements**

Prior to the cessation of distilling at Gooderham and Worts, discussions emerged regarding how to create an economically viable alternative for the industrial complex. Zoned for industrial use at the time of the closure, immediate redevelopment of the site was not feasible. The challenge was to prepare a site plan that would be economically feasible.

---

4 The company of Hiram Walker operated a sales division at the Gooderham and Worts site beginning in 1984, as a tenant of Gooderham and Worts. Hiram Walker & Sons retained the distilling license for Gooderham and Worts, but the company was disintegrated. As Paul Allsop explains, “[Gooderham and Worts] is incorporated under the Province of Ontario rather than the Federal incorporation, but still has a distillers license and the distillery here will produce a certain amount of product under the Gooderham and Worts distillers license and then transfer it to Hiram Walker. So the name hasn't been lost, it is used as a distilling name for shipment” (cited in Historica Research Limited, 1994: 9).
viable, while also responding to the cultural and heritage value of the site. In 1990, the City of Toronto produced an assessment of the urban design and heritage significance of the site in response to an application by the owners to redevelop and rezone the district from “General Industrial” to “General Use Area” (CTLUC, 1994: 131). A year following the release of the study prepared by the City, Hiram Walker-Allied Vintners-Allied Lyons Pension Funds released *Gooderham and Worts Toronto: An Urban Design Proposal*, outlining a possible scheme for the redevelopment of the complex. The proposal argued that the redundancy of the buildings, coupled with the expenditures for their maintenance, meant that redevelopment was necessary to preserve the complex (Hiram Walker, 1991: iii). The proposal sought to connect the district to the public realm by transforming the buildings into a mixed-use development through the basic, yet symbolic, act of removing the fences around the site (Hiram Walker, 1991: iii). The proposal included three major elements: integrated design and the extension of the public realm, the provision of pedestrian spaces, and the provision of living and working spaces. Importance was placed on the Trinity Street corridor for its unprecedented heritage value and the remaining structures on site were catalogued according to their heritage significance (placed on a scale from full retention, partial retention, to replacement). The plans projected the demolition and replacement of a number of buildings including the Case Goods Warehouse (currently an Artscape building) and Rack House M (recently demolished to make room for the Clear Spirit Condominium), and the integration of the form of some buildings and the shells of others in new development.

The proposal came under early scrutiny for its alleged disregard for built form (earmarking the demolition of thirteen buildings and the retention of only the facades of
others) and its plans to push the density of the site beyond its threshold.\(^5\) Reactions to the proposal in the press ranged from accolades – “the plan [is] a stunning redevelopment proposal that will breathe new life into the abandoned buildings” (Armstrong, 1994a) to disparagement – “Rip it apart, pretty it up with interlocking brick, neatly mowed grass, with new buildings squatting on top of old ones, and you lose the raison d’être for preserving it at all” (Berton, 1993). The most vocal protests came from Heritage Canada who described the proposal by the site owner as “disappointing” due to the destruction of built form.\(^6\) The majority of the opposition was directed at the incompatibility of economic development and heritage preservation, and emphasized instead the possibility for the site to be preserved as a publicly owned museum (see Fisher, 1995). The Toronto Historical Board initially opposed the proposal in December 1993, but later endorsed it, an about face that led to accusations in the press that they were “bowing to political and commercial pressure” (Armstrong, 1994a).\(^7\) They had voiced some early reservations to the proposal, questioning the appropriateness of turning the site into a “festival marketplace,” but they broadly accepted the tenor of the redevelopment to preserve a large amount of the historical district (Barber, 1994).\(^8\)

---

\(^5\) The plan was created by Roger du Toit Architects Ltd, a Toronto based firm, under the direction of Allied Lyons and was submitted to the Toronto Planning and Development Department.

\(^6\) Heritage Canada was characterized in the press as being opposed to the proposal “based on simple misinformation” (Barber, 1994).

\(^7\) The Toronto Historical Board is also known presently as Heritage Toronto. The agency plays an important role in establishing and maintaining regulations and policies for heritage properties. The agency, a volunteer directed board which is appointed by city council, was established in 1960 with the purpose of managing several city owned museums. In 1973, they produced the Inventory of Heritage Properties which at present contains over 7000 buildings. Given its designation on the registry, the Distillery District is governed by Heritage Toronto and Part Four of the Ontario Heritage Act.

\(^8\) Heritage Canada responded to the approval by noting that public interest in the historic landmark must remain a priority (Canada NewsWire, 1994).
Despite the opposition, the City of Toronto Land Use Committee voted unanimously to support a revised draft of the proposal which adjusted the projected demolitions from thirteen to two buildings (Case Goods and Rack House M) (Armstrong, 1994b) and City Council approved the plans in 1994. Four by-laws were passed by City Council on May 31, 1994 to amend Part II of the Official Plan. The by-laws relaxed the zoning, set up heritage easements for the conservation of buildings, and designated the lands as an area of site plan control. The major objectives which guided the site-specific framework in 1994 reinforced the need for heritage conservation, comprehensive redevelopment as opposed to fragmented piecemeal revitalization, and a diversity of land uses. The aim was to ensure that the area would remain balanced and publicly accessible to site interpretation given its importance to the history of the city. In total an allowance of 880 dwelling units were approved in a 210,000 square metre mixed-use redevelopment (CT, 1994: 1994-0396, p. 5). The site was divided into five districts, and guidelines specific to each area were set to govern future uses and development (Figure 3.1). The Trinity Street Heritage district was designated as the focus of heritage resources (consistent with previous assessments and proposals), and all new development was positioned along the boundaries of the site (at the northern, eastern, and western limits) so as not to detract from the symbiosis and scale of buildings, the geometry of lanes and courts, and public access to the key remainders of industrial heritage. Under these

9The by-laws are 1994-0395; 1994-0396; 1994-0397; 1994-0398. Heritage easement agreements refer to the registry of buildings, or elements of buildings, that must be retained and the subsequent allowances for alterations and development.

10Large iron gates abut the intersection of Trinity and Mill Streets. The gates were erected during WWI as a measure of protection when British Acetones leased the site for acetone production (Historica Research Limited, 1994). Trinity Street looking south carries a strong visual aesthetic via a collection of buildings dating from 1859 to 1885. As such, this vantage is a popular and recurrent image in film shoots.
Figure 3.1: The division of the site into five districts emphasized the Trinity Street corridor as the focal point.

by-laws and amendments, Council was granted authority to increase height and density limits in all of the districts, with the exception of the Trinity Street Area. The possibility of invigorating the local recessed economy with a $300 million dollar proposal was attractive to a variety of local actors.

However, more organized forms of opposition to the proposal followed its approval, and extended the debates surrounding the balance between economic viability and heritage preservation / public access. Three private citizens groups – the Toronto

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}}\]

\textsuperscript{11} The provisions for the modifications to the plans rested on two conditions: that the heights of new buildings remained within the maximum limits and that the owners responded to a number of provisions, including the creation of a Heritage Masterplan. I will return to these issues in the coming pages.
Region Architectural Conservancy, the Community Heritage Project, and the Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations – brought the plans to an OMB hearing in 1995. Alec Keefer of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario described the proposal as having a “staggering lack of imagination” and asked: “Why…can't they find a new use that's truly appropriate to the complex's original function? An industrial or institutional use, for instance, something that wouldn't require the slick new finishes of Class A offices and luxury condos” (cited in Barber, 1994). The citizen groups were characterized as being extremist in the media, based on their apparent “interventionist tactics,” minority representation, membership struggles, and their use of terms such as “barbarians” to describe the developers (see for example Ferguson, 1995). Other accounts delved into the concerns levied by the groups over the height and density of the proposed redevelopment (see for example McKelvery, 1995). The OMB found in favour of the redevelopment scheme and dismissed the appeal to By-law 1994-0396 in May, 1995.

In the context of these reports, proposals, assessments, and appeals, what happened to the idea of developing the site as a publicly owned museum? During the city-wide recession of the early 1990s, the possibility that the city could redevelop the site as a public good was dismantled. Cynthia Wilkey, current chair of the West Don Lands committee, and a member of the task force which produced the site plan for Gooderham and Worts, describes the economic constraints:

We supported the extra density because we knew that there weren’t public sector funding solutions for the Gooderham and Worts distillery. They were not going to find public sector dollars to turn that into a museum of whiskey…The only way that it could really be developed was to give [the developers] the kind of development density that would create the profit
that was needed (personal interview).

This is not to suggest that the committee bowed towards economic pressures: public sector constraints were a significant aspect of the conversations. Fiscal constraint at the municipal level is a product of major shifts in global capitalism beginning in the 1970s which led to entrepreneurial and neoliberal city policies. Considerations relating to the dual function of the site as a publicly accessible preserved district and as a viable financial endeavor frames much of the debates surrounding the project. It is important to point out here that while the planning process encompasses a set of guidelines and restrictions that place limits on development, how these limits are stretched and maintained in the assemblage of built form adds another layer to the production of space.  

While the planning process which began in the 1990s was formulated on measures of protection and was spurred by public-private relations (protecting the collection of buildings and their coherence as a narrative of history), the strategy, in practice, was exercised according to a top down re-visioning of space by the private sector. The fact that the site is privately owned and operated is significant as it frames the level of public engagement and consultation in the planning process. It also frames the nature of public access. This early planning for the site, regardless of the conflict that ensued, shifted Goodeham and Worts from a space of potential industrial ruin, the type that Edensor (2005b) describes in his work on Britain, to a series of buildings

---

12 The practice of these two layers of production (perceived, conceived space) in everyday life or lived space forms another layer to complete a tripartite structure (Lefebvre, 1991).

13 If a heritage designated site is publicly owned, there is an obligation to ensure public access, and animation of site histories. While this animation can face limitations, when a site is designated and privately owned the owner must agree to stewardship.
destined for return.\textsuperscript{14} How their return would be orchestrated upon the framework set in place, and by whom, was still to be decided.

\textit{Narrativizing Deindustrialization and Brownfield Remediation}

Around the time that the site discontinued production in 1990, a broader process of deindustrialization was unfolding in North America. Increased global competition resulted in a dual process of the relocation of manufacturing plants to newly industrializing parts of the world and in smaller towns, and “planned obsolescence” through the lack of investment into equipment upgrades (High, 2003: 92). Concomitant with the relocation and closures of plants, unemployment rates across North America were rising in the 1970s and 1980s. This period marked the crisis in Fordism when the dominant form of capitalist industrialization for most of the twentieth century was being dismantled (Tickell and Peck, 1992: 190).\textsuperscript{15} As High (2003: 96) explains, the underlying causes of these plant closures were the product of a number of related factors including “technological change, declining product demand, poor management, bankruptcy, new environmental regulations, consolidation, divestment, high labour costs, and the advancing age of facilities.” It was in the context of these shifting terrains that Gooderham and Worts closed its doors and the fate of its future as a collection of

\textsuperscript{14} As Edensor (2005b: 313) suggests, once an industrial site is abandoned, “the previously obvious meaning and utility of objects evaporates with the disappearance of the stabilizing network which secured an epistemological and practical security.” These containers of built form “litter” the urban areas of Britain, awaiting their next life.

\textsuperscript{15} The crisis of Fordism (mass production through standardization, mass consumer markets, Keynesian management) reached its zenith during the recession of 1973, though there were markings of its decline prior to this point. As Tickell and Peck (1992: 190) suggest, the shift away from Fordism was “due not only to ‘external’ shocks such as the oil crisis, but also – importantly – to internal factors, notably increasing worker militancy, progressive technological stagnancy and the saturation of consumer markets.”
buildings was called into question. As noted earlier, the remaining operations were transferred to the Hiram Walker plants in Walkerville, Ontario and Kelowna, British Columbia. The relocation is said to have resulted from the costs associated with modernizing the plant in order to remain globally competitive. But the need for technological upgrading is not an overnight occurrence. As High (2003: 110) suggests “the decision not to invest in a plant eventually resulted in its closing.”

As the production and operations of companies such as Gooderham and Worts closed their doors to manufacturing, the residue of their previous functions remained in the grounds through built form. Derelict or underused commercial and / or industrial facilities are often complicated by contamination which makes redevelopment of these spaces arduous. Labelled as “brownfield sites” these areas, if remediated, offer the promise of job creation, attraction of businesses, environmental clean-up, improvements to quality of life, and an enhancement to the image value of the city. The 1990s in Toronto marked a period wherein redevelopment of derelict or contaminated lands was pronounced (concentrating on old “industrial” zones), especially towards the end of decade, which coincided with a boom in the residential sector (De Sousa, 2002: 301-2). The main thrust of activity came in the form of conversion or reconstruction of floor space, but a great deal of additional floor space was also developed.

---

16 Most of the costs associated with the remediation of brownfield sites in Ontario fall on the private sector, with the public sector acting as regulator (De Sousa, 2002: 298). This is demonstrated in the case of the remediation of Gooderham and Worts. Walter Davies, responsible for the redevelopment of the site in the 1990s, disclosed to one reporter his surprise with the extent of the soil contamination on site, adding that “A lot of developers might have looked at this site and turned around and walked away from it” (cited in Lautens, 1999). In the case of the distillery, coal tar from a nearby gas plant had leaked into the soil, and an underground stream carried pollutants into the site. In 2000, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, produced a document titled “Brownfields Showcase” which highlighted a number of successful reclamation projects in Canada, including the redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts (MMAH, 2000: 13).
The municipal and provincial governments responded to the reactivation of space through brownfield activity. In 1996 the province of Ontario established a set of guidelines for contaminated sites (De Sousa, 2002: 303), and at about the same time zoning by-laws were relaxed for the King-Spadina and King-Parliament areas (two old industrial zones referred to as “The Kings”). As a Globe reporter notes:

In April, 1996, Toronto city council adopted a plan to deregulate land-use controls in [King-Parliament and King-Spadina], releasing its iron grip on development and allowing empty factories to be converted into apartments, condominiums and offices. They also made it possible for people to live and work out of the same space, which had been illegal until then (Honey, 1998).

The exodus of manufacturing and the recession in the 1990s signalled the need to change land-use controls to better meet the economic, cultural, and social potential of the King-Spadina and King-Parliament areas. The relaxed zoning for the King-Parliament area followed the implementation of the planning framework for Gooderham and Worts. Instead of having an immediate effect on the site, the policy reconditioned the future of “The Kings” through the realization that attracting heavy industrial uses to the area was not conducive to long-term planning. In its place, there was an emphasis on uses that offered compatibility with the previous built form and density, including light industrial and commercial activities such as the film, media, design, and technology sectors (see TUDS, 2002: 1). While zoning was relaxed, built form guidelines were maintained in order to ensure integration of development (see Miles, 2005: 84).

The nature of the redevelopment of the Distillery is precedent setting, considering its proximity to nearby proposed transformations. The West Don Lands, another

---

17 The City of Toronto King-Parliament Secondary Plan (CT, 2002) is an extension of these earlier ideas regarding the overall objective to attract new investment to this area of Toronto.
brownfield redevelopment, is positioned directly east and north-east of the site.\textsuperscript{18} To the south of the Distillery on the other side of the Gardiner Expressway is the East Bayfront area (an industrial parcel) and neighbouring it is the Portlands area (commercial and harbour uses), both scheduled for redevelopment. All of the aforementioned areas are being transformed under the authority of Waterfront Toronto (formerly The Waterfront Revitalization Corporation), established by the three levels of government in 2001 to oversee the revitalization of the waterfront. Historically, Gooderham and Worts fostered a strong relationship with the harbour until the shoreline was moved approximately 500 metres south (Gibson, 2008c).\textsuperscript{19}

The redevelopment of the Gooderham and Worts distillery works as an anchor and model for the transformation of neighbouring lands. For example, in the West Don Lands Precinct Plan (TWRC, 2005b: 44), there is a statement regarding the need to create a fluid relationship between the built form and context of the Distillery and the West Don Lands given that the former will be a key reference point: “The scale and grain of the

\textsuperscript{18} Prior to the planning efforts of Waterfront Toronto, the lands were set to undergo a comprehensive redevelopment strategy beginning in the late 1980s. The culmination of these efforts resulted in the Ataratiri Plan, a document which is now used as a reference point for current planning initiatives (CTPDD/CTHD, 1990). The failure to construct the earlier vision for the surrounding areas offered the developers of the Distillery District two important platforms: a blank slate when it came to “fit,” and minimal resistance. If the lands that hug the district were developed prior to the sale, the impetus to respond to the vision, design, and form present in these neighbouring areas to ensure some level of coherence may have ensued. Secondly, the only on-site tenants at the time of the sale of Gooderham and Worts to Cityscape in 2001 were the tenants of three condominiums built by Options for Homes between 1997 and 2000. Services in the area for these tenants were minimal and most welcomed the redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts to support their real estate investments and provide more proximate provisions. The West Don Lands formed part of Toronto’s 2008 bid for the Olympic games. Failure to ensure the bid, threw the lands into question once again. If the City had secured the bid, this also may have affected the redevelopment of the Distillery. In 2009, as noted earlier, Toronto won a bid to host the 2015 Pan Am Games. The athletes village will be located on the West Don Lands, after which the area will be converted into a mixed-use neighbourhood.

\textsuperscript{19} This connection to the waterway remained largely unchanged until the second half of the century. Annexation in the 1890s led to the movement of wealthier citizens from the downtown to the northern limits of Toronto. The placement of Gooderham and Worts along the eastern harbour, afforded possibilities for trade through water routes, and once the railways hugged the shore, through land transit.
buildings and spaces of the Distillery District Neighbourhood will extend into the West Don Lands, shaping both proposed buildings and public spaces in the immediate vicinity east of the Distillery.” In addition, there is a great deal of emphasis placed on the ability of the Distillery to revive civic planning for the reconstruction of the eastern portion of the waterfront (see Caulfield, 2005: 87). While the buildings themselves may offer a reference point for nearby transformations, the luxury condominiums and high-end shopping face of the district present an exclusive enclave of consumption which counters the image of civic planning.

Leasing Space: 1990 - 2000

Following the approval of the planning framework in 1994, Allied Domecq (the site owner) set out to implement its vision. Despite continued attempts to lease space on the property for retail and office purposes throughout the 1990s, the first permanent tenants came from three apartment towers, built by Options for Homes, a non-profit cooperative corporation between 1997 and 2000. The three towers satisfied the provision for social housing set out in the official plan and by-law amendments. The Options for Homes buildings were constructed to fit with the Victorian feel and incorporated existing historic building structures as podiums (Tank House No. 43 and 44

---

20 Walter Davis of Davis Smith Development, acted as an agent for the previous owners of the site (Allied Domecq Pension Fund) throughout the 1990s. He was charged with the task of finding tenants for the site. As one of my interviewees notes: “he was responsible both for building our three buildings [Options for Homes Apartments] and also finding tenants for this site, which was a way of finding a means to restore the old buildings. His efforts didn't seem to be very satisfactory or effective. He was always coming up, ‘oh I've got this store moving in and this store moving in,’ but he would never name them and we were never allowed to know who he was talking to” (Julie Beddoes, personal interview). Finding a core group of tenants to lease spaces on the site was difficult during this time. By renting the interior and exterior spaces of the site, the film industry created a consistent flow of income that was used for restoration purposes and to cover taxes.

21 Under By-Law 1994-0396, a minimum of 25% of the total number of approved dwelling units were required to be social housing (CT, 1994).
and the Molasses Storage Building, No. 8 and 9). On the occasion of the ground breaking ceremony for the first tower, the “rebirth” of the district was declared in the *Globe*:

“Tomorrow morning, some smiling developer is going to crack a bottle of Canadian Club whiskey against a backhoe and change history” (Barber, 1996). Fittingly peppered with the image of whiskey, the ceremony represented the first time in nearly 70 years that a new building was added to the complex. That the new construction included a set of cooperative-style apartments is an important component in the process. Michael Labbé, president of Options for Homes, describes the first wave of tenants as developing interest in the district, and acting as a catalyst for the process of redevelopment (personal interview). The Options for Homes model is based on relieving entry barriers to home ownership. Units are sold below market value for the first wave of residents. The lowered costs are a product of the non-profit’s vision to avoid expensive marketing campaigns, luxury amenities, and model homes. The affordability factor is assured for the first round of buyers, after which the value of units is determined by market forces.

By shifting individuals and families from the rental market into home ownership, Options for Homes alleviates the stress on the housing sector more generally. But the first wave of tenants of the three buildings at Gooderham and Worts did not wholly represent those in need of social housing, with demographics ranging from professionals and individuals downgrading from larger homes, to blue collar workers and retirees attracted to the district’s aesthetic. As Labbé explains, the first round buyers came as a bit of a surprise to the company:

> We tried to build buildings that would accommodate families…renting in the St. Lawrence area that would be interested in buying in the area and we produced a stack of three bedroom units on the corner…When I looked
at the results, what we had was a stack of retired people. It was one of the more expensive suites and they wanted it as they sold their homes. [The demographics were] not particularly child intensive, and I think it’s pretty well remained that way. We were selling to incomes of about $20,000 less than the rest of the condos downtown…We were not selling to the established 45 year old professional couple with tons of money, except for a couple that really got in for the district (personal interview).

Julie Beddoes, a resident of one of the Options for Homes buildings, reflects on the lack of diversity amongst the tenants:

> It’s not really representative of the total population in that it’s much whiter, probably more affluent, more professional. I mean there is a sprinkling of minority groups not in any way comparable to the whole city demographic (Julie Beddoes, GWNA, personal interview).

The tenants of the Options for Homes buildings were attracted to the aesthetics of the site alongside its valuation as a heritage district and the buzz surrounding its redevelopment. This attraction responds more to the tenors of taste (what Bourdieu, 1984 would describe as presentation and representation) than to affordability (necessity). Many of the first wave tenants self-identify as “pioneers” forging into new frontiers of the city. For example, in a promotional DVD produced by Options for Homes, residents interviewed from the Gooderham and Worts buildings emphasize the derelict and vacant character of the site: “it wasn’t hip to move into an industrial wasteland, which is what this place [The Distillery] was” (Dennis Bartels, cited in Options for Homes, promotional DVD). In the 1990s following from the success of areas such as SoHo in New York, the potential for retrofitting warehouse buildings into “underground art scenes” had already taken shape in Toronto (Bain, 2006). As Bain (2006: 424) suggests, a process of social and economic upgrading was already underway in areas such as King Street West, wherein new media firms were displacing the arts community (Bain, 2006: 424). In other words around the time that the Options for Homes apartments were being constructed, the aesthetic appeal
of industrial spaces for domestic uses was already taking shape. Michael Labbé of
Options for Homes marks the construction of the three condominiums as the catalyst for
the redevelopment of the Gooderham and Worts site:

Finally with three buildings in place and people living there, the owners
were able to sell it to the eventual developers of the Distillery District. It
was the instigating force that demonstrated people’s willingness to go to
the site, and it created a sufficient market impetus so that the sale could
happen. So it was interesting. People definitely saw themselves as
pioneers (personal interview).

The tenants of the Options for Homes buildings at the Gooderham and Worts property
formed the Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA) which is
actively engaged in planning issues, urban design debates, the beautification of adjacent
lands, and public amenities within and outside of the district. There were few services
available to the Options for Homes residents within a radius of several blocks. As a
result, the proposed redevelopment of the district under Cityscape was met with little
resistance, with most residents desiring the changes on offer (on-site restaurants, retail,
and services). The location of the property outside of the city centre emerges in
discussions with tenants and key stakeholders as a major reason for the delayed land
speculation and ultimately the site’s preservation.

Making Space: Enter Cityscape

By the end of the 1990s however, the Gooderham and Worts property remained
largely undeveloped with the exception of the three apartments, and relatively unknown

GWNA was responsible for the implementation of a streetlight at the corner of Parliament and Mill
Streets, and a landscaping precinct along Mill Street which they actively care for. They act as a liaison
between Cityscape and the three Options for Homes buildings, and hold seats on several neighbouring task
force groups.
within the urban imaginary. In 2001 while working on another development in the city of Toronto, Cityscape heard of the Gooderham and Worts property from a film scout. This link would have a decisive impact on what would become the Distillery District.

Cityscape’s interests and track record in revitalizing character buildings through the tactics of creativity and historic preservation fuelled their attraction to the property. A tour was conducted of the site in May of 2001, cementing Cityscape’s interests. They contacted Allied Domecq (the site owner) by telephone in Bristol, and signaled their intent to put in an offer. At this point in time, Allied was not open to the idea of selling the district. The concept for the redevelopment came to Cityscape during their first visit, but the partners would wait until the first week of September, 2001 before the property would be listed, and until December 1, 2001 before the sale was complete. Following the collapse of the property market post 9/11, many of the other bidders pulled out due to the climate of uncertainty (John Berman, Cityscape, personal interview). This enabled the corporation to purchase the lands at a lower cost.

Cityscape’s vision draws on a two prong approach: adaptive reuse (the retention, maintenance and restoration of built form), and culture-led revitalization (the inclusion of workers in the creative sectors). The majority of the structures housed on the property underwent a process of tenant-driven renovation ensuring individuality across units. In exchange for the renovation costs, tenants were offered below market leases for an agreed upon period, a point I will return to in chapter 4. The developers tackled the structural issues facing the property (infrastructural improvements to modernize sewer, water,

---

23 The public benefits package in the official plans for the property was reconfigured in 2003 to reflect Cityscape’s emphasis on art and culture (see the Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application, TEYD, 2007: 3).
heating, and electricity). In terms of their strategy to produce a space for creative workers, this was facilitated early on in the process through personal invitations by Cityscape. Furthermore, an early lease arrangement with Artscape supported the mandate of the site as a cultural destination point and legitimized capital flows.

In addition to the focus on adaptive reuse and arts-led regeneration, according to the plan for the developers, three market condominiums were to be added to the site within five years as part of the residential component of development. During the first phase, the construction of a 32 storey glass point tower incorporating a five storey podium (Pure Spirit Condominium) located at the north-west quadrant of the site was to be added (and this was completed in the summer of 2008). Coordinates for the structure did not diverge from the planning framework or the official plan. The subsequent phase of development includes the construction of two point towers, at 40 and 35 storeys respectively (Clear Spirit and Gooderham Condominiums) at the south-east limits of the site and a ribbon building at the southern boundary which will be used as amenity space. The height and density allowances passed under the planning framework in 1994 were rearranged to build tall, lean modernist structures, as opposed to short boxy structures. The three condominiums, when completed, will create a buffer of glass and steel around the Victorian industrial complex (Figure 3.2 and 3.3). Rack House M,

---

24 architectsAlliance was commissioned by Cityscape (and its financial partner Dundee Realty) to design Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the development.

25 In November, 2008 the proposal for the construction of two point towers (Clear Spirit and Gooderham Condominiums) and a ribbon building was approved at an OMB hearing (a total of 669 residential units). The previous proposal by the owners – Distillery SE Development Corporation – in November, 2006 included two point towers at 48 and 40 storeys and a ribbon building at 3 storeys totaling 800 new residential units to the site. The City did not respond to the original application within the specified time frame forcing the case to be heard by the OMB. A plan of action was agreed upon by all parties (City of Toronto and Distillery SE Development Corporation) prior to the hearing to reduce the height of the towers through a set of revised drawings, and to initiate another public consultation with GWNA. The current proposal includes amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law 1994-0396 (OMB, 2008).
constructed in 1927, was levelled in 2009. The plan is to incorporate the bricks into the podium of the Clear Spirit Condominium. Despite early proposals which projected the destruction of this particular building, there was a general understanding that the current developers would retain all of the structures on site at the time of the sale (see for example Caulfield, 2005: 93). Reactions to the plans for dismantling and then reassembling Rack House M, were mixed, with some supporting the rights of the developers to enact such changes given their service to the preservation of the complex, and others demonstrating indignation, such as the following response pulled from a

Figure 3.2: On Trinity Street looking north-west at the Pure Spirit condominium near completion (personal photo, summer 2008).
Figure 3.3: Renderings for the Gooderham Condominium (pictured on right) and the Clear Spirit Condominium (on left). The rendering is positioned looking west from Cherry Street (http://www.architectsalliance.com/portfolio/in-progress/distillery-district).
popular Toronto blog: “The footprint is being revived, not the building. That's like not caring about the death of a person because you've kept a tracing of their shadow” (Urban Toronto, post #1020, comment posted December 21, 2007). The addition of the three condominiums at their proposed heights, will be precedent setting as the neighbouring transformations proceed (Waterfront lands and West Don Lands in particular). The additions will also attract a more expansive community of middle to upper class residents to the site, and shift the urban imaginary of the south-east end of the city through modernist sightlines.

For the remainder of the chapter, I examine the two prong approach to the redevelopment in more detail. More specifically, I examine how understandings of history / heritage and culture / creativity shifted throughout the decades leading up to the redevelopment, evidenced in policy documents and media accounts. Within the two approaches, a dance of classification and declassification emerges. My aim in outlining these relations is to highlight marked absences in the manufacture of distinction.

Selecting Time & Dealing History

Often the villain is more interesting than the hero, you don't want everything all white washed (S1, heritage stakeholder).

Classification is an elemental part of understanding the language in and of the city. The designation of the site as a “National Heritage Site” for example, is dependent upon

\[26\] In an interview with John Bentley Mays (2008: G2) of the Globe and Mail, Peter Clewes, the architect behind the vision, spoke of the need to avoid contextualization and instead embrace contemporary design: “We need to create buildings of our time. Architecture is a record of where a city and a culture was at a particular time. This precinct is an industrial artifact, a social presence within the culture of Canada. It's important that we not blur the distinctiveness of this precinct, but rather amplify it.” The contrast between the “industrial artifact” of built form and the glass and steel point towers, designed by Clewes, confronts readers of the space with questions concerning context and scale.
an understanding of the shifting discourses of the value of history: who and what constitutes a site to be of national historical worth? How do these values shift over time and where do they originate? How do these designations respond to shared histories, ordinary landscapes, personal memories, and social meaning? The property constituting the Distillery District (55 and 60 Mill Street) was classified as a heritage property in 1973 by the Toronto Historical Board as part of their *Toronto Inventory of Heritage Properties* list. This provided the property with official recognition by City Council. Three years later, the architectural and historical significance of the property was recognized by provincial legislation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law 154-76 passed by City Council). Gooderham and Worts would wait until 1988 before receiving federal designation as a heritage resource (under the Historic Sites and Monuments Board).27 None of the three designations provides full protection of a heritage property.

In the case of the Ontario Heritage Act for example, up until the 2005 amendments to the act, the property owner was required to submit an application to City Council to permit alteration or demolition of a heritage building. If Council rejected the permit, the property owner was forced to wait a set amount of time (180 days), during which attempts to negotiate heritage preservation would take place. If no settlement could be reached, once the wait time wore off, property owners could potentially demolish the heritage building. As Bridgman and Bridgman (2000) suggest, ‘designated’ buildings (such as those protected under the Ontario Heritage Act) are often more vulnerable to demolition or subject to change as compared to municipal ‘listed’ buildings (such as those identified on the Toronto Inventory of Heritage Properties). Amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act in 2005, provide stronger protection for heritage buildings:

27 The federal designation has no legal bearing as noted by Fisher (1995: 52).
Give the province and municipalities new powers not only to delay but to stop demolition of heritage sites. Enhanced demolition controls would be balanced with an appeals process to respect the rights of property owners. …Further expand the province’s ability to identify and designate sites of provincial heritage significance. …Provide clear standards and guidelines for the preservation of provincial heritage properties (Ministry of Culture, 2009).

In June, 2006, new legislation to further protect heritage properties in Ontario was passed under the City of Toronto for a Stronger Ontario Act (2006). This legislation requires owners of ‘listed’ properties (those properties carrying cultural heritage value which are included on municipal lists but are not designated) to provide notice of intent 60 days prior to the removal or demolition of buildings. This legislation works to protect all cultural heritage properties across the province, including properties which lack official designation status.

While these new legislations did not apply to the Gooderham and Worts property, heritage designation under all three levels of government ensured the protection of the buildings. In addition, the developer (the site owner) was willing to accept the terms of heritage preservation if balanced with economic viability. Writing in the context of the planning process as it was unfolding in the early 1990s, Fisher (1995: 53) describes the contradiction at play wherein a property “recognized at all three levels as a public benefit…remains locked behind fences and inaccessible to the public.” He highlights the potential degradation – including weathering and vandalism – of built form if the property remains “abandoned” for an extended period of time (53).

Following the sale of the site to Cityscape and their financial backers in 2001, by-law 1994-0396, passed for the site in 1994, was amended to reflect the redevelopment scheme proposed by the new site owners. As a result, by-law No. 749-2003 was adopted
on July 24, 2003 by City of Toronto Council and included a greater emphasis on art and culture. Most pertinent to the discussion on public accessibility and recognition of the cultural and heritage value of the property, was the inclusion of the following stipulation:

provide and maintain a Site Interpretation Program for the Area, including the provision and maintenance of a publicly accessible Site Interpretation Centre having a non-residential gross floor Area of not less than 400 square meters, in addition to the provision of other site interpretation areas within the Area (City of Toronto, 2003, Section 5(6)(d)).

The amendment defines the ‘Site Interpretation Centre’ as “a facility, accessible by the public…to educate the public regarding the heritage…through methods such as the display of artifacts, equipment, archival material, photographs and plans, and the provision of audio visual material” (Section 7(2)(o) of By-law 1994-0396). As I will illustrate in subsequent sections, despite the emphasis on public accessibility to site interpretation, there is currently neither a centre nor any other form of animation on the ground at the site besides official heritage plaques. While in the early stages, there was a centre located in the Stables building (No. 51-52) which displayed photographs and artifacts, played films, and sold souvenirs, in 2005 the centre was relocated to the Stone Distillery (No. 3) to make room for a Condominium Sales Centre (now occupying the Stables). Following this it was downsized to a few brochures and moved into the Segway Ontario unit (which conducts the site tours).

The heritage value of the property defined the parameters of redevelopment following the closure. Heritage can work to stimulate aging economies, meaning that it is valued both as a means of social / cultural understanding and as an economic catalyst. Taking up the enterprise which is established around the commodity of heritage, Hewison (1987: 29) makes the following observation:
The look back in nostalgia has become an economic enterprise, as the commercial interests of manufacturing and advertising have recognized. This nostalgia is in part one for a lost sense of authenticity…Commerce reinforces the longing for authenticity in order to exploit it.

The economic valuation of heritage coexists with the preservation movement in this sense, as it allows for the retention of old buildings for new purpose (producing economic viability). If heritage is defined as the valuation of the past for “a legatee for whom this inheritance is intended” (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1990: 25) than the nature of the economy of heritage will shift according to the producer(s) of this valuation. The producer(s) of this value (often status groups) provide a level of symbolic interpretation to physical structures or arrangements (aesthetic, cultural, political, socio-economic) for particular end goals (Barthel, 1989).

Writing on the South Street Seaport redevelopment, Boyer (1992: 189) positions historic preservations and other representations of the past as “endlessly repeated copies…Busy creating simulated traditions, urban developers seem intent on stockpiling the city’s past with all the available artifacts and relics, thereby obscuring the city’s actual history” (see also Coleman and Crang, 2002). In shifting from the question of what is heritage to what does heritage do harkening back to Rose (2002), it is not a matter of negotiating a true past versus an imaginary one, but rather placing attention on what elements are included and excluded based on the ordering and valuation of the past. As Crang (1994: 351) suggests, “It is not a matter of celebrating the popular against the bourgeois, nor siding against one in favour of the other – the two are inextricably linked as moments in a process.” It is the performance of heritage and the reading of this presentation of heritage by subjects which contains possibility for alternative arrangements. So while there are moments and processes which aim to contain history as
selective narratives, the reading of these messages, and thus the nature of the message / process itself, is never static (it is open to alteration, change, and resistance). In the remainder of this section, I deal with the construction of history into heritage as opposed to history itself, which I define as a multiply articulated set of structures, moments, processes, and events. History is implicit in these accounts, singularized and contained for an intended market, so that it is always impartial, absent, and / or constructed. I subdivide the section into two categories: aspects that are included in the construction of the past, and aspects which are excluded, silenced, or minimized in these folds.

*Constructing History: Linearity and Unity*

As a heritage designated site, the history of Gooderham and Worts is reconstructed in site tours, in brochures, and on the ground according to a selective reading of the past where emphasis is placed on the historical reach of the distilling operations, the collection and value of Victorian built form, the equipment in the interior spaces of the buildings, the pipes and chutes in the exterior spaces harkening an industrial age, and details of the families who owned the site and the architects that they employed. Ultimately, the history of the district is reconstructed (organized) according to a distant past that is safe, orderly, and cleansed of contestation. The inability for Gooderham and Worts to compete globally, provide job security, or act as a catalyst for population growth and development (the immediate past) are aspects which are minimized in the selections. The construction of heritage necessarily requires a process

---

28 For example, between the closure of the site in 1990 and its reopening in 2003, numerous newspaper articles worked at great pains to trace the history of the site through the achievements of production and the men that mastered the economic glory (see for example, Jones, 1994).
of classification that highlights and obscures in order to narrativize with purpose (in this case commercial intent).

The physical orientation of the Gooderham and Worts district was retained in the redevelopment scheme, with emphasis placed on the geometry of lanes and courts (CT, 1994, By-law 1994-0395, 15). As Langdon (1995: 49) remarks, in the contemporary age, there is a shift towards “the traditional urban framework of streets, squares, and pedestrian-scale spaces,” techniques that were long employed by cities in the past. By retaining aspects of the historic built form, Gooderham and Worts is an example of the renewed interest in tradition that Langdon outlines. Beyond the shift to the framework of the past, there is an equal and attendant shift towards the incorporation of past aesthetics (either their recycling or pastiche). Allusions to history are decidedly present in entrepreneurial developments, whether used to oil the shift from industrial to post-industrial landscapes, or as a tool to stress differentiation (Hubbard, 1996). The question is, what does a renewed interest in past-forms (seek to) enable in the contemporary city?

In the private redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts, the motivation for profit is paramount. Details about the history emerging from the site owners can be classified according to two mediums: the official heritage website for the district (www.distilleryheritage.com) and the material offerings and site interpretation available on the ground. While the website collects details concerning a wider and more complicated engagement with the chronology of the district (ranging from oral and

---

29 This is not to suggest that there are not other motivations that guide the practices of the developers besides profit, nor is it meant to suggest that there are not economic motivations guiding public sector formulations of history. Rather, it suggests that the site relies on economic viability for its survival, garnering only minimal amounts of assistance through grant programs and awards.

30 “Site-owners” in this instance refers to the Hiram Walker-Gooderham and Worts subsidiary, Allied Lyons (which later became Allied Domecq), and Cityscape (including their financial partners).
building histories, archeology, and reports, to artworks, ephemera, and heritage snippets written by an in-house historian\textsuperscript{31}, the nature of historic interpretation available on site is self-directed and incomplete, limited to the visualization of built form, the occasional material offerings, and on-site publicity. Histories rarely overlap or form moments of contestation. Instead they are smoothed into positive snapshots of the past. Heritage for the developers adds character to built form and space. It is an aspect of the site that is readily marketable: a fable to promote character, a backdrop for consumption and commodity exchange, an image to direct experience, a system of valuation, and a set of objects to be admired / collected.\textsuperscript{32} What emerged from the planning framework was an emphasis on public accessibility and site interpretation in the future development of the district. What is on offer on the ground and on the website is markedly different, raising questions regarding the meaning of terms such as “public access” and “site interpretation” emerging from the planning framework. It is useful here to provide some examples of these two mediums of knowledge production.

The internet allows a broad network of users to engage with the Distillery (by way of its past, present, and future), opening up alternative forms of accessibility for those who may never physically visit the site. The official heritage website is a comprehensive tool through which to conduct self-directed guides through the spaces of the distillery. While there are subsections which collect texts and images based on their compatibility (for example there are categories for art, documents, and people), there is no dominant

\textsuperscript{31} Sally Gibson is the Manager of Heritage Services at the Distillery District. As part of the strategy to increase public knowledge regarding the site’s histories, Gibson prepares a weekly short article on a different aspect of the history / heritage of the distillery which is available electronically on the Heritage Website (www.distilleryheritage.com).

\textsuperscript{32} This is not to suggest that this reading of heritage is unique to the developers. Many of the tenants that I spoke to similarly viewed the history of the site through built form and spoke of the aesthetics of the old (whether industrial or historical) as providing a useful backdrop to their space and ultimately their business.
narrative woven through the information. It operates in a similar vein to Benjamin’s (1999) *Arcades Project*, where meaning is derived through the wanderings of the reader. Whether and how consumers explore the website is beyond the boundaries of this research. The website does offer a potential model for the arrangement of histories on the ground (where no dominant narrative organizes information and meaning). The accessibility afforded within this technological format does not preclude the need for on-site interpretation and / or animation.

On the ground, history, while present, is inanimate. This raises an important consideration regarding the nature of the commodity trade of history in the contemporary period. Telescoped into the present, the operators of the site work to instil a sense of longevity and meaning onto those walking through its pedestrian only corridors by placing relics from its use as an operating distillery at key focal points: an original millstone stands in the courtyard, a plaque adorns it that documents the travel route of the object in 1832 to the town of York; stills in the summer time stand on guard in the exterior courtyard, flowers placed atop provide a more aesthetic meaning. An old safe dating from the 19th century is housed in one of the buildings, next to a stand of tourist brochures and across from the ATM machine and the lavatories (Figures 3.4-3.6). The function of the millstone to grind wheat into flour marks the nascence of the site, when the large windmill stood at the eastern end of the property. The identification of this object, and the lack of visible identification for the other objects, confronts readers of the space with an inflection of history as exchange value.
Figure 3.4: An original millstone marks the beginnings of the site (personal photo).

Figure 3.5: Stills placed in the exterior courtyard contribute to the aestheticization of space (personal photo). Where did the stills come from, and what is the relationship between Henry of Pelham (a Niagara based winery) and the site?
In many of the buildings, the old machinery remains, at times cloaked with contemporary art pieces (working as an easel) and at other times remaining silent in the spaces with no indication of its prior function, or its previous placement on the site. The consumer collects the bazaar-like fragments of time; the visible aspects of the past (built form, objects, machines) create a hollow system of signification. In one of the rack houses, the particles of industry and time collect. It is here that old relics of the site, old
machines that once turned and toiled, and beams that once supported weight anticipate their next life.\textsuperscript{33} As one tenant suggests:

\begin{quote}
Nothing gets thrown out, everything gets used and I really like that. I went into the rack house and they gave me the opportunity to use the old wood. I took the big oak beams and I cut them in half and made tables out of them, so they'll have a new life too (Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery, personal interview).
\end{quote}

Tenants of the site are able to request artifacts for their spaces. But as a retail tenant suggests, the artifacts are not always appropriate to the individual units: “They asked me if I wanted an artefact. An artefact in here is really not relevant unless it’s relevant to the space it’s in” (R2). In addition to reacting to the false placement of these items, this individual is reacting to the anonymity of the pieces which create erasures in the order of space, place, and time.

It is the buildings themselves that inform an inflection of value, as opposed to the markers or remainders of activity, of which there are few material offerings and / or interpretations. As one reporter notes, “In none of the remaining buildings are there any descriptions of the original use of the facility or the manufacturing processes involved. There aren’t any photos of what was inside, let alone the equipment used in any stages of the distillation process” (TS, 2005). By not preparing a sense of the histories of Gooderham and Worts, the legend of the past is restricted to a set of tracings: incomplete and disconnected. Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 12) distinguish between a map and a tracing as follows: “The rhizome is…a map and not a tracing…What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real….The map…fosters connections between fields…it is detachable, reversible,

\textsuperscript{33} The reuse of interior woodwork is listed within the urban design guidelines passed in the 1994 planning framework (CT, 1994, Bylaw 1994-0395: 15).
susceptible to constant modification…it has multiple entranceways, as opposed to the
tracing, which always comes back ‘to the same’.” In other words, the map fosters
connections and modifications, whereas the tracing is a return to sameness. I draw on the
term tracing in relation to the construction of heritage as it outlines how the meaning of
built form is reduced to a marker of progress, recounting a period of foundation, the ashes
of which become the object of containment. History on the other hand falls under the
order of a map.

Cityscape publishes a small guide called Distilled each year, which outlines the
features and functions of the district. The presentation of the guide has changed a great
deal since the premiere issue was released in Spring / Summer 2004 under the title The Distillery Historic District (The Distillery District Magazine, 2004). Rather than a
biannual run, the guide now appears once annually, is half the size of the first edition, and
is focused almost exclusively on advertising (the first edition offered feature articles).
More important than these layout / content changes, are the changes to the representation
of the past. In 2004, two pages are dedicated to outlining the chronology of the site, from
its “pioneer” [sic] beginnings in 1831 to the change in hands in 2001. While the 2004
print was focused almost entirely on major events, acquisitions and sales, and figure
heads and entrepreneurs, the most recent edition of Distilled (2008) frames the history of
the site in three short paragraphs, the first recounting the founding of the site (without
including a single date), and the second and third noting the changes under Cityscape.
The byline for the latter reads “National historic site transformed into Toronto’s centre
for arts, culture and entertainment” (2). Also included in the 2008 guide is a section titled
“Did you Know?” which offers trivia on the past and present of the site (such as the
oldest building, and when the Gooderham and Worts distillery became the largest producer of whiskey in the world), and a section titled “Heritage Treasure Hunt” where the images of four objects are provided for visitors to locate on site. The rough sketches of interpretation or animation of these objects offers little in the way of their utility or value.

While early plans for the district noted the importance of housing a museum for site interpretation and public access (Diamond et al, 1990), Cityscape is planning to create an interactive museum where visitors can find plaques throughout the site and dial up a number to learn about the history (John Berman, Cityscape, personal interview). Already this mode of interactive knowledge production of the past is written into the on-site publications. This more interactive museum space, while still in the planning stages, may not substantively change the disorientation of the histories of Gooderham and Worts. How these histories are made active, performed, enacted, resisted, and interpreted, by visitors can alter this form of knowledge construction. Interactive museum spaces hold the possibilities for writing minor histories, based on public memory, collective understanding, and personal and shared meaning. Whether these minor histories will be included in the interactive museum is yet to be known. The lack of animation or interpretation of the histories of the property on the ground over five years after the public opening, speaks to the level of priority for this aspect of the redevelopment. While the condominiums are under construction, the narratives and orientations of the past remain sidelined. It is important to reiterate that ‘site interpretation’ is a stipulation under by-law No. 749 adopted in 2003 to reflect the redevelopment scheme under Cityscape. In other words, the developers are legally obligated to provide historical orientation. The
lack of enforcement by the City to ensure that this takes place within a reasonable amount of time speaks to the tension between economic viability and preservation (the rights and interests of the developers versus the rights and interests of the public).

**Contesting History: (Contemporary) Labour and Everyday Life**

Narratives of the past (as heritage) are drained of contestation and struggle in the present constitution of the distillery, focusing instead on symbolic figures and the domination of an industry. Rarely, in these narratives is there extensive mention of the workers that laboured on the site, the nature of the work that they performed, the social aspects of their employment, or their perceptions of the district. These networks and everyday experiences fall outside of the construction of heritage value; heritage in accordance with the redevelopment, for the most part, responds to the lives of the dominant culture and their creations.

On the heritage website, there is a more comprehensive engagement with the past. One of the twelve documents created under the Heritage Master plan prior to the redevelopment of the site carries substantive import.\(^\text{34}\) The Gooderham and Worts Heritage Plan #3 (Historica Research Limited, 1994) is a collection of four interviews conducted with long service men from different ranks of the plant. Emerging from these conversations are snapshots of their conditions of labour, reflections on the organization of the site (economically and socially), and the nature of a distilling industry under the

---

\(^{34}\) Report #1 “Aboriginal and Early European Settlement” (Otto & du Toit, 1994) of the Heritage Master Plan is another useful example of the multiple recordings of history possible at this location, drawn around Aboriginal land occupation based on food and gathering patterns, and pre-industrial European settlement patterns in accordance with the shoreline. While outside of the boundaries of this project, this serves as another layer of the histories present but not readily available or articulated on site at present.
threat of processes of globalization. These inventories offer movement into the dominant narratives that represent the site in uncomplicated form: their import rests in the way that the long service men viewed the property as a series of functioning industrial buildings serving specific purposes for distilling, and their personal and collective attachments to place.

The valuation of the buildings as heritage structures is disconnected from the valuation of the site as a functioning industrial complex. In an interview conducted by Chris Andreae of Historica Research Limited, Paul Allsop, the former Vice President and Plant Manager of Gooderham and Worts, is asked how the company viewed the property in the 1970s prior to its designation under the Ontario Heritage Act (Historica Research Limited, 1994: 12). Allsop responds by recounting an event when the roof of the Maltings Building required a great deal of work. It was proposed that the most cost effective response would be to tear down the building. An application for a demolition permit was put forward, but prior to any action taken, the owner of the site (Harry C. Hatch) was informed of the ensuing plans and an order was sent down to the site to withdraw the permit. Following this exchange, the site was officially designated under the Ontario Heritage Act in 1976 and more restrictive guidelines were implemented. What is interesting to note here is that tearing down the building (today the home of Lileo, an experiential retail store and juice bar) was an informed economic business decision which would protect the company and the buildings at large from financial pressures.

What enabled the structures to survive in the periods when there was no formal protection

---

35 This moment is also articulated within the Hiram Walker (1991:44) proposal as an event which spurred preservation efforts. When the application for a demolition permit for the Maltings Building was received, “the buildings were listed but not designated by the Toronto Historical Board. The Board immediately sought to designate the complex as a historic site under the “City of Toronto Act, 1967” a process which resulted in City Council passing by-law 100-74 which sought to protect the historic value of the site.
was less a recognition of their historical value, and more a strategy to ensure that the plant remained viable.\(^\text{36}\)

The viability of the plant waned during the years leading up to the closure, placing more than thirty workers under the constant threat of job loss. As Jim White describes, the announcement of the termination came as a surprise:

> When the word came down in April, of 1990 that the plant was shutting down, it was like ‘Oh, no.’ … It was a surprise for most everybody here but they knew it was coming because everyone that was here had been told that for years and years and years. ‘Well, we may have another year left, we may have two years left.’ There was always that threat of being shut down and then it became a reality (cited in Historica Research Limited, 1994: 52).

The shock came from the termination of employment, as opposed to the termination of the operations. As Allsop explains, many employees were aware of the plans to add retail and residential development to the site, and knew that an operating distillery within that mix would not be feasible (cited in Historica Research Ltd, 1994: 21). But the impression bestowed upon the employees was that their employment would remain secure during the development. White (cited in Historica Research Ltd, 1994: 52-3) describes an encounter where Allsop himself was led to believe that there would be job security:

> ‘Don't worry. There will be lots of jobs. You can be cutting grass or changing lights. You don't have to worry about it. The company is going to look after you.’ I think it was a week later that [George Chandler, Allsop’s boss] came in and dropped the axe and a lot of them [the workers] were really shook up.

The residual memories of the workers contribute to the social history of the plant. Yet, these memories do not form part of the dominant reading of the past, those

---

\(^{36}\) See Historica Research Limited, 1994, p. 13 for details on how the managers overseeing the site through this period were conscious to not draw attention to the property by spending money on the site.
representations, images, and / or stories that are visibly pronounced at the site, on the website, in marketing material, newspaper and magazine articles, and in the tours.

Speaking with one of the gallery owners at the Distillery, the power and interest in these reserves of knowledge is made apparent:

People will come in and you can see the ones who are looking at the space oddly, like ‘wow what’s happened here?’ They are old workers from when it was a distillery and they tell me stories. I love to meet them and I love to find out about the personal stories they have about the space [Stone Distillery Building]. They tell me things that even the people giving the tours didn’t know, and now they’re telling those things to people. Why there’s lead seals on every level of that distilling tank, it’s because people used to siphon off the alcohol and drink it when they worked here. They had to seal each level so that wouldn’t happen. I heard about the siphoning off of the weighing tank too, how they did it specifically with a bucket and a hose. It’s really interesting. Dangerous environment (Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery, personal interview).

Part of recounting the past is ensuring that these forms of memory and personal history are woven into the fabric of the space. The governance of labour and the practices that resisted those modes of control respond to the everyday life of the site as an operating distillery. Their absence reinforces the nature of the construction of heritage at the site under private capital.

The early tenants on the site explored the complex prior to its redevelopment. Many of them shared stories about the tours that they were led on through the buildings. In one such interview, I spoke with a tenant who worked at the site as a carpenter in early 2003 to pass time waiting for his studio space to be ready. When I asked him whether the histories of the site were accessible, he made the distinction between architectural history and mythology:

37 Artscape directed the renovations for their set of tenants in the Case Goods Building and part of the Cannery. This differs from the arrangements for the rest of the site wherein individual tenants managed their own renovations.
I don't think it is that accessible. There was once an information centre which is now a condo sales centre. It had some artifacts, ongoing exhibits of photographs of the property as well as exhibits of contemporary works and there were people in there to help animate the history for visitors. That was probably a more effective way of getting the history out which I think is being undersold right now, when there isn’t a good point of contact for visitors…I’m interested in the peculiar quirkiness of the buildings and the actual story of Mr. Gooderham and Mr. Worts is more a fable to me…I just find the physical characteristics of the buildings, how I experienced them initially, how they have changed, what functions they now serve but still incorporate some aspects [such as] the historical artifacts that have been left on the site, some that have been propped up to look like they’re original artifacts (Robert Akroyd, Akroyd Design, personal interview).

Architectural history for this tenant is valued based on his experience of space: the discovery of the physical residue of the past, and the multiple entranceways into their order within the present moment (a map rather than a tracing to return to the distinction made earlier). The mythology of place on the other hand is more restrictive and speaks to a fable which is divorced from experience. Barthes (1957) draws on the term mythology in reference to an illusory idea that reflects the dominant interests of society. To return to the tenant, the representation of the past through the ‘actual story of Mr. Gooderham and Mr. Worts’ is arbitrary in relation to his everyday life, whereas the architectural history (which he acknowledges is also somewhat propped up) is more real. This distinction between the place history of the site and the personal histories of the tenants is useful as it speaks to the layers of histories that are cast into the site as the palimpsestual residue of time. Without the animation of, or accessibility to the past, this tenant has drawn his own messages in the refuse of built form. Many tenants cite the atmosphere provided by the built form as fuelling their attraction to the site. However, their knowledge of the history is limited. For example, a tenant narrated how she recently discovered that the harbour once reached the southern limit of the district:
Maybe it’s because I didn’t grow up in Toronto proper and I didn’t know that and yadda, yadda, yadda. That’s not necessarily the Distillery’s fault, but I don’t think I passed anything on site that says that. You have to do it their way, you have to take the tour, instead of just letting people wander around and discover things (T1, Artscape tenant).

Similarly, during an interview with Wayne Parrish of The Sport Gallery, questions surrounding the same historic detail are raised:

W.P (Wayne): The question I have for you is was this really right on the water at one point?

Me: Yes it was.

W.P: Everyone has always told me that and I’ve had difficulty visualizing it.

Me: There’s some great pictures of it…

W.P: I’ve seen those pictures. I didn’t know whether to believe them or not.

A high number of the tenants that I interviewed admitted that they knew little about the history of Gooderham and Worts, noting how useful it would be if the developers provided a snapshot of the main events and the history of their individual units so that they can pass this information along to their customers to heighten experience (and potential revenues). That this information is not readily made available to those working on the site creates a disjuncture between history and image perception. History is positioned as an aesthetic backdrop: an image of the past used to fuel consumption.

It is in the space between the actual and the virtual elements of the site – those elements that are past-present, remaining today in an alternative form but present on site prior to the closure of production, and those elements that are present-past, where the

---

38 Following the period of time when the interviews were conducted, the developers hired an in house historian and most of the building histories were made available to tenants in electronic form. I have retained these narratives within the chapter as they capture a period four years after the opening.
emphasis is on conditioning the past through present intonation and mimicry – where history as commodity is waged on a partial replication of time, a scrambling of social history that negates and coheres under the banner of consumption. As one interviewee notes: “It has turned into McHistory, but unless you turn it back into a distillery, how doesn't it become McHistory? When we talked to the City of Toronto guy who understands the By-law [1994-0396] and the easements and the protection of the buildings, he says that they've gone beyond what the law obliges them …We're really thrilled with that, it's much nicer to be next to an artsy place than a wrecking yard.” (Julie Beddoes, past president of GWNA, personal interview). Given that the developers have gone ‘above and beyond’ what they are legally obligated to do, there is a general level of acceptance by this interviewee with the outcome, despite the commodification of history.

In this section, I have illuminated different histories at the site, and the construction of heritage in the spaces of the Distillery heritage website and on the ground. In the subsequent section, I turn to the construction of culture as a dictum for economic development. The inclusion of the past (as history / heritage) does not differ substantially from the inclusion of culture at the site: both are commodified and packaged for their experiential / aesthetic value as strategies of differentiation to manufacture distinction.

As Edensor (2005b: 312) suggests,

In the outlets of commodified memories, at heritage sites, in museums and other exhibitionary spaces, in retail spaces, themed realms and designed sites, procedures are mobilized to place and contextualize objects. In these ordered settings, objects are spatialized so they may serve, for instance, as commodities, icons of memory, cultural or historical exemplars, aesthetic focal points or forms of functional apparatus.
Through the simultaneous process of negation and coherence, objects / subjects of heritage and culture are organized into place to produce an ordered setting for consumption.

**Built form and Containing Culture**

Investments in the arts and culture sector in Toronto typically fall on the side of mass exhibitions and grandiose displays that artificially raise per capita spending. As a result of the scale of these investments, funding is redirected away from individual artists, and small to medium size collectives and organizations. Described as a cultural renaissance, several major public cultural institutions in Toronto underwent architectural additions or renovations at the turn of the century. The Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), Ontario College of Art and Design (OCAD), and the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) spent millions of dollars on urban design additions and modifications, led by internationally recognized architects: Daniel Libeskind, Will Alsop, and Frank Gehry respectively. The transformations aestheticize space, while working to position Toronto as a “world class city,” to attract residents, businesses, and tourists. Along with the trickle down effects that are often expected from these injections of capital are the associated costs. As Vikki Anderson of DVxT, a theatre performance company at the Distillery notes,

> It’s a hard climate in Toronto right now because a lot of foundations that used to give money to smaller companies, that money just sort of disappeared in the last four or five years because of all the projects. It’s great I love all that stuff happening but we rely on foundations to give us $5,000 or $10,000 somewhere along the line and you just don’t get anything from them anymore. The money isn't there (personal interview).
If Toronto wants to position itself as a creative and livable city it must spread funding and investment across the sector from individual artists to major cultural institutions in order to create depth.

Incorporation of this sector as part of official city planning is waged through an economic rationale, at the expense of social and cultural implications (Paddison, 1993). For example, the most recent makeover for the city of Toronto included an expensive (and outsourced) branding campaign that culminated in two words at a price-tag of four million dollars, “Toronto Unlimited,” and a series of promotional events. The “Live with Culture” campaign was birthed under this wave of re-branding, aimed at promoting and marketing the arts and cultural communities of the City throughout the period of September 2005 to the end of 2006. Neither the caption nor the promotions disarmed the inequity characterizing the municipal agenda, or the arts and culture sector. But as one reporter notes, the focus on the city “has shifted from the civic realm to the cultural…these projects [in reference to the cultural renaissance mentioned above] do not just address the institution’s need for more space, they’re about building and transforming Toronto” (Hume, 2006). It is the direction through which a cultural focus builds and transforms the city, and the associated costs of riding this wave, that is at stake. In this section, I begin by detailing the shift in the City of Toronto’s policy programming towards a cultural / creative agenda through an examination of the process of securing space for the arts in the 1980s, and the eventual recognition of the value of the arts and cultural sector to economic development. Finally, I examine the incorporation of arts and culture into the Distillery District as part of a broader process to draw upon creativity as a catalyst for redevelopment.
Securing Space for Cultural Activity

Prior to the uptake of arts policies in the municipal development agenda in 1990, concerns over artists being priced out of the city were already being waged. Several studies were commissioned by the City of Toronto during the 1980s to take inventories of the requirements of the arts and culture sector (see Evans, 2001: 171). Several groups in the profit and not-for profit sectors attempted to correct the displacement caused to the sector through the securitization of real estate. In 1986, Artscape, a non-profit organization, with a mandate of finding sustainable and affordable provisions for the creative sector through culture-led regeneration, was formed.\(^{39}\) In the early 1990s, the attention of the organization shifted towards real estate, and they were able to secure several buildings in the city of Toronto for long-term studio space. In 1995, they opened the first legal live / work space building for artists in the city at 900 Queen S. W in West Queen West (Artscape, 2007). Artscape facilitates a broad dialogue between various parties engaged in the creative sector, earning them a reputation for community building within and outside the city.

It was within this context of securing space that Urban Space Property Group bought its first building, 401 Richmond Street West, in 1994.\(^{40}\) Determined to showcase how a for-profit real estate development company could contribute to the provision of space for the arts and culture sector, the owners lowered their risks, as well as their profit margin by attracting a range of small scale cultural producers interested in ideas of

\(^{39}\) Artscape grew out of the Toronto Arts Council under the belief that in order to achieve its mandate the non-profit enterprise would need to act autonomously. Toronto Arts Coalition, 2006. (http://www.torontoartscoalition.org/newsletter/v17/Artscape.htm)

\(^{40}\) Urban Space Property Group owns three heritage buildings in downtown Toronto: the 401 Richmond Building, the Robertson Building, and the Gladstone Hotel.
diversity and community building. Both organizations (Artscape and Urban Space Property Group) have demonstrated resilience to market pressures and have fostered safe havens for cultural workers. Around the time that these groups were practicing culture-led regeneration, the arts and culture were garnering recognition for their economic benefits in more “official” outlets.

Recognizing Culture & Creativity

In 1991, the City of Toronto Planning and Development Department (CTPDD) published ‘Cityplan ’91.’ A section of the report was dedicated to arts policies in Toronto. In a climate of escalating prices in rental markets, a call for action was issued to reverse the flow of artists out of the Toronto region. The significance of a mandate for the arts was noted in the precedence of such an undertaking: “for the first time in its history, the City is including arts policies in its Official Plan” (CTPDD, 1991: 381). Issues of increased opportunities for arts education, access to the arts for communities and neighbourhoods, funding, and adequate spaces for facilities, live / work, and work related activity formed a comprehensive strategy for increased assistance to this sector. In other words, around the time that the Distillery closed its doors to production, there was a general shift in the development agenda of the City towards direct support and policy recommendations for the arts.

In the late 1990s, art was seen as an agent of economic development (see Kong, 2000; Leslie and Rantisi, 2006). In 2000, Toronto’s City Council commissioned a

---

41. The 1976 Official Plan identified the need for space provisions for the arts and culture sector and recommended the construction of several cultural facilities throughout the city to create cultural and visual appeal. This earlier recognition for the arts and culture offered precedence for expanding provisions for the arts and culture to include more expansive guidelines with a focus on distribution, promotion, and awareness (see pages 383-4, CTPDD, 1991).
Culture Plan to guide the city’s cultural development through a ten-year period. The plan emphasises the ability for Toronto to draw on its arts, culture, and heritage base in economic development policies to become a creative city. The resonance of these plans with Florida’s (2002) seminal – and highly criticized – work on the “Creative Class” is evident. Creativity, according to Florida, has become an important feature in economic development, operating as the driving force behind interurban competition. In order for cities to remain competitive they must work to attract creative labour (which Florida refers to as “talent”), through the promotion of quality of life measures (such as tolerance). According to Florida, creatives are the dominant class. His emphasis on human capital as the driving force behind economic development (or rather a specific segment of humans relabeled by Peck (2005:740) as a “finicky class of creatives”) conceals the homogenizing force of these ideas and poses a challenge to the contemporary link between art and the city. Specifically it values creative types based on their ability to attract and retain skilled service workers. Artists need to be disaggregated from an occupational classification that places them alongside engineers (Markusen, 2006), and the term ‘creativity’ needs to be appropriated, and placed within research (and policy) which allows for contested meanings and expression outside of the dominant class. As Catungal et al (2009) argue in relation to the creative city script being employed in Liberty Village, the emphasis is on public consumption over cultural production, leading to issues surrounding displacement and place-making. This is consistent with observations on the role of the arts in gentrification (see Cameron and Coaffee, 2005)

42 City Council adopted the document, Culture Plan for the Creative City, in June, 2003.
The creative script for economic development in Toronto is repeated in numerous policy reports and measures. In its 2003 report, *Enough Talk*, the Toronto City Summit Alliance (TCSA) stressed the importance of arts and culture as a key employment sector in the Toronto regional economy. In 2006, in a document titled “Imagine a Toronto: Strategies for a Creative City” it is impressed upon readers that the creative age is upon us, and Toronto must work through the opportunities and challenges that accompany this moment, or get left behind its competitors (Creative Cities Leadership Team, 2006). Most recently, in 2008, Toronto Mayor’s Economic Competitiveness Advisory Committee released the *Agenda for Prosperity* report stressing the need for development in creativity, culture and entertainment. The following action was proposed:

Adopt a cultural planning model to identify clusters of creative sectors and activity, evaluate cultural assets, promote a place-based approach to creative sector development and establish creative hubs and districts as geographical concentrations of interconnected individuals, organizations and institutions involved in the arts, cultural industries, new media, design, knowledge building and/or other creative sector pursuits (28).

The incorporation of these measures in urban policy highlights the shift towards creative city planning and contextualizes the climate for the redevelopment of the Distillery.

In the 2008 premiere issue of *Toronto Magazine* issued by Tourism Toronto as a complete guide for the city, discourses of creativity run rampant. A feature article by Toronto resident Richard Florida on “The Creative City,” outlines the shift from “an industrial to a creative economy,” with the remark that “Toronto is set to become a model of sustainable creativity that the world will one day emulate” (49). Christopher Hume, architecture critic with the *Toronto Star*, writes about “Starchitects” with the mantra that “anyone interested in seeing firsthand the power of architecture should visit Toronto” in reference to the major cultural projects alluded to above (38). Without a grain of
Criticism, Toronto is presented as a glimmering cascade of dreamscapes. Art and creativity have emerged as important elements in the urban economy, tools through which to build and expand the image and representation of place using a neoliberal urban agenda. It is critical that art and creativity are explored beyond economic measures, and that pressure is placed on ensuring that the incorporation of these aspects in the urban provides an opportunity for local (and contested) meaning production and expression (surrounding where investments are placed and how the selection process unfolds). By placing attention on ‘starchitect’ flagship developments, and by expressing a unitary statement of the city as a preeminent creative city, a disjuncture is produced between discourse and practice. Who is included in these representations of Toronto? Who benefits, and who suffers in a creative city urban agenda?

Incorporation of the Arts

Under the vision of Cityscape and amidst the clamour of the creative cities agenda employed by the City of Toronto, the Distillery is predicated on the arts and culture as a catalyst for redevelopment. A great deal has changed in terms of the perception of the arts and culture sector since 1990. By drawing on the discourses of “creativity” and “culture” under an economic rationale, the presence of the arts and culture sector in urban space has garnered a more visible presence (through what Cameron and Coaffee (2005: 46) label the public consumption of art as opposed to the creation of spaces for the production of art), but the long-term protection of these spaces has not shifted accordingly. The inclusion of the arts within the Distillery takes place in two forms: a) individual tenants involved in the consumption side (art galleries, boutique spaces, design
retail spaces, and jewelry retail stores), and b) individuals and groups that fall on the production side (theatre companies, painters, ceramists, photographers, jewelers, craftspeople, and small scale producers). For the latter, studio spaces are housed in two buildings on site (the Cannery and the Case Goods Warehouse) which are leased by Artscape, but there are no formally designated live / work spaces for cultural producers.43 Rather, the emphasis on art and culture falls on the side of consumption, wherein cultural producers as well as their products are commodified. The tale of the appropriation of artists for capital is repeated elsewhere. Positioned as transformative actors in the process of urban redevelopment, Zukin (1995) writes that artists sustain coherence at a site through their ability to positively frame and “humanize” real estate development. Their ability to alter space in symbolic and physical ways (manufacturing cultural distinction and aesthetic appeal) makes them an attractive ingredient in redevelopment initiatives (Zukin, 1982, 1995; Cole, 1987; Ley 1996, 2003; Smith 1996). Research on the arts as a catalyst of urban change illustrates how the preference of consumers and the realm of consumption are highly intertwined with economic shifts and production. Following the refashioning of space, artists are often driven out, as those with greater economic capital appropriate local cultural forms.

Cityscape partner John Berman, aware of the relationship between art and economic development, suggested in 2002 to a reporter with the Toronto Star that, “making the Distillery District art-centric will keep it human” (cited in Goddard, 2002). Part of keeping the site “human” means fostering an environment, through long-term
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43 This is not to suggest that there are no cultural producers living on site. The Options for Homes condominiums contain a small proportion of cultural producers. I am making the point that their work space and living space is geographically divided.
incentives, that retains the arts community and breaks the trend towards eventual
dissolution. Artscape was one of Cityscape’s earliest partners. In an attempt to correct
issues of artist displacement as a result of upgrading, a twenty-year below market lease
was negotiated to secure space for roughly 60 individual cultural producers and cultural
organizations and groups. The organization lent legitimacy to the redevelopment
project early on through the occupation of two buildings at the southern boundary of the
site. Contacted directly by Cityscape, Artscape formed part of the first wave of tenants.
But Artscape set its eyes on the site close to a decade prior when it submitted an
application [to Allied Lyons] in the early 1990s to transform one of the buildings on site
into a Dance Performance Centre (CTLUC, 1994). While nothing came from these early
conversations, Artscape was contacted again by Cityscape in the fall of 2001 to discuss
the possibility of leasing space. By the fall of 2002, the lease was worked out and tenants
began moving into the spaces in 2003 (Bruce Rosensweet, Artscape, personal interview).
As Miles (2005: 83) suggests, “The benefit for the developer [in bringing Artscape onto
the site], who foregoes some potential market value profits, is an assured change in
ambience from the outset that acts as a magnet for the sales of residential units.” Given
that the organization is not-for-profit (receiving minimal funding by the city and the
federal government), it faced the difficult task of financing its own conversion; Artscape
did not own the real estate for which they sought funding which made them ineligible for

44 The twenty-year below market lease provides an interim period of protection from the effects of
upgrading. At the end of this period, there is no assurance that the lease with Artscape will be renewed for
a second term.

45 Several other anchor tenants were personally contacted by Cityscape in the initial stages of the project,
and invited for site visitations. In the next chapter, I examine the redevelopment from the perspective of
the lease holders. I merely wish to draw attention here to the invitations offered to particular tenants, which
set at play a strategy for cultural diversity and control.
a mortgage, and the government would not guarantee the loan outright. The organization turned to Margie Zeidler (of Urban Space Property Group) to help finance the conversion.46 The inability for a non-profit organization to access the funds necessary to secure space limits the ability of the arts and culture sector to contribute the very attributes that the City believes are vital to its economic health.

The current revitalization places emphasis on the consumption of cultural object and cultural producer. Artist live / work spaces were considered as a possible land use for Gooderham and Worts in 1990. The rationale for inclusion of live / work spaces pointed to the tight housing market in Toronto and the suitability of the buildings due to their design:

The idea is that large and unfinished spaces with ceilings of at least commercial height could be effectively built to meet the shortage and try to prevent artists from being forced out of downtown Toronto because of high rents (Diamond et al, 1990: 107).

The buildings, under the proposal (six rack houses in the north-east quadrant of the site) would form “an artists’ campus” and took inspiration from locations such as Granville Island which transformed some of its warehouse spaces for a similar purpose (Diamond et al, 1990). In the case of Granville, “the artists, in effect, acted as bait to attract people to the island and its other more commercial functions” (Diamond et al, 1990: 111). The artists’ campus was incorporated into plans for Gooderham and Worts in order to enhance site interpretation, offering economic stimulus while positively framing the profile of the site. The single storey storage buildings were not easily transferred to the land uses laid out in the report (residential, commercial, industrial, office, and retail) but their preservation was deemed necessary to the overall heritage of the property. Uses for the

46 This demonstrates the networks that exist between organizations and groups working in the arts and culture sector.
storage buildings spanned across artistic endeavours (studios, workshops, a sound stage, and galleries) and would be leased / allocated to artists for a specified period of time. Drawing from the experience of similar models of artist campuses in the U.S. (PS1 in New York and Torpedo Factory in Virginia) and Canada (Granville), the report emphasizes the idea of a rotating fund for art space: “all three facilities have shared a common problem. Artists who are assigned space become very proprietarial…The point of the effort should be to provide artists with help, not property” (Diamond et al. 1990: 111). By highlighting the “common problem” of artists desiring proprietary rights, the report positions artists as transformative actors (where they take up a position of transition) in the redevelopment of space, and not as full citizens seeking stability in land tenure.

Similarly, live / work spaces were proposed at the southern limits of the Triangle Lands to act as a “buffer” for general residential usage. Given the critical shortage of appropriate and affordable arts spaces in the City, the “annoyances” associated with the location (noise and vibration from the railway line making them unsuitable for residential uses) were thought to be overshadowed by the benefits: “Those artists seeking this type of accommodation are likely willing to trade off the annoyance of environmental conditions for the opportunity” (Diamond et al, 1990: 108). Artists were incorporated into these early plans for their ability to attract, bait, and buffer. The agency and identity of artists beyond economic measures (as walkers, producers, consumers, actors) is underdeveloped in scholarly literature and in policy programming, despite its influence in defining space (Mathews, 2008). As Bain (2003: 305) suggests

…if artists are to be understood as anything other than urban pioneers and initiators of urban revitalization efforts, they need to be appreciated more
fully in their own right, as a social group with a distinctive occupational identity and a heightened awareness of the availability, regulation and character of urban space.

Plans for the conversion of Gooderham and Worts positioned artists as an underclass, where they were valued for their ability to develop space as short-term (or rotating) tenants. On the Artscape website, the organization’s role in the redevelopment is clearly articulated: “Artscape’s involvement in the redevelopment of the Distillery District helped attract the arts community and other creative entrepreneurs to the potential of the site and virtually a year later the entire site – 440,000 square feet – had been leased” (Artscape, 2009). Emphasis is placed on the role of the organization to catalyze redevelopment, with little mention of the suitability of the site for arts purposes or the experiences of tenants who are currently occupying (or have occupied) space at the Artscape Distillery Studios.

The illegal occupation of zoned industrial spaces in the City of Toronto by the arts community prior to the 1980s led to the formation of many groups and organizations (and pointed policies) dedicated to attaining provisions for this sector to reverse displacement. The zoning changes that followed allowed a remapping of the arts in previously underused spaces in the city, but it also propelled interest more generally towards arts appropriate spaces that reflected changing tastes and values of inner city habitation. The discursive construction of the value of the arts and culture fuelled a mode of heightened capital investment.  Art and culture serve as symbols of the Distillery District, channelling desire through a set of visual signifiers that supports both the identity of the space, and of its users as culturally fashioned. It is used strategically as a coherent visual

---

47 This is not to suggest that spaces conducive to the arts and culture sector are not also conducive (and open) to a range of tenancy possibilities, or that other uses would not also fuel a wave of capital investment.
representation, smoothed into positive expressions that lend credence and distinction to the development. While art can sustain dominant values and interests, it also has the potential to challenge the dominant order of space, place and time (Jacobs 1998; Hubbard et al 2003). For example, Somdahl-Sands (2008) writes about how Mission Wall Dance, a site specific performance piece in the Mission District, San Francisco, tackled notions of civic identity by politicizing the effects of gentrification in the neighbourhood. Given that the setting and context of art conditions and frames its meaning, it is necessary to question why works are created and for whose interests. As mentioned previously, art is singularized at the site, drawn into the present constitution for its catalytic potential and aesthetic characteristics.

**Placing the Space of the District: Mediating Differentiation through Coherence and Negation**

The re-visioning of space under Cityscape is based on a strategy of differentiation, where particular attributes are collected and others are rejected in the name of profit. In this section, I examine how place identity is produced through two strategies of differentiation: negation and coherence. Recall from the opening chapter that these two strategies often work hand in hand and are based on relation or association. Regardless of the attempt to create unity in the discourse of the site, the Distillery is caught up in a system of references to other spaces, times, images, memories, meanings, and activities by way of its built form and identity, and the framework underlying its transformation. How does the desire to differentiate space challenge the incorporation of heritage and art at the site? How does the discourse of differentiation shape practice?
The relational attributes of space are illuminated by Foucault’s (1972: 23) discussion of a book. As he suggests,

The frontiers of a book are never clear-cut: beyond the title, the first lines, and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network…The book is not simply the object that one holds in one’s hands; and it cannot remain within the little parallelepiped that contains it: its unity is variable and relative. As soon as one questions that unity, it loses its self-evidence; it indicates itself, constructs itself, only on the basis of a complex field of discourse.

A geographic site, like a book is caught up in a system of references to other sites in terms of its built form, identity, and the framework underlying its transformation. It is also bound to other spaces, places, times, images, memories, and activities. Meaning is produced according to ‘a complex field of discourse’, to return to Foucault, which is relative and transient. For example, the Distillery is planned following the model of Granville Island, Vancouver, but it is also bound to other cultural precincts, festival marketplaces, and streetscapes based on its organization, representation, and aesthetics. These relations to other spaces, sites / sights, and experiences are personal and collective, intentional (as in the case of a top-down production of difference) and positional (socially embedded modes of classification). For example, a gallery operator on site describes her initial impression of the district using references to other cultural precincts: “You could just see the potential with the buildings and the spaces that it kind of has the feel of Granville Island or Gastown in Vancouver, or Faneuil Hall in Boston, or even sort of Old Port Montreal. It just had that character….I knew immediately that this would eventually be a great location” (G1). In an interview with John Berman, one of the principals of Cityscape, I asked whether they had considered other models or places when planning the Distillery. Berman similarly incited a list of references, and disclosed that Cityscape
discussed their plans with representatives from Granville Island and looked at Pike Place Market in Seattle, Faneuil Hall in Boston, and college towns in the U.S. (evoking images of expansive courtyards and impressive buildings) for inspiration (personal interview). In the same way that the book is not merely the object that one holds, the Distillery is not merely the visualization or image perception that one sees: they are both variable and relative.

It is useful here to provide a discussion of how the relational attributes of place as a mode of differentiation as *coherence* are made apparent in the press through an attempt to classify and ultimately to value. The media is important in the narrative of redevelopment for its dissemination of information and production of knowledge (and popular discourse). The referential quality of place leads to a maelstrom of comparisons of the district in the press to other sites of adaptive reuse, including Faneuil Hall Marketplace in Boston and Covent Garden in London (Knelman, 2003). The site is also compared to fictional accounts, witnessed in descriptions of the Distillery complex as “Oliver-Twist-ish”: “thoughts of Charles Dickens’s Miss Havisham cannot be far from mind” (Conlogue, 2003). Alternatively the Distillery District is described in terms of far-away places – “a flower market in Amsterdam” (TS, 2001) – a street in Paris: the Pure Spirit Building “looks more like it belongs on a street in Paris” (TS, 2003). The site is named through reference to places that share similarities. These models are not necessarily placed in the present (as already expressed through fictional resonance).

48 In this section, I focus on the discourses and flows of information produced by the media. This chapter also engages with the production of the relational characteristics of the site by the developers, and the legal and institutional frameworks conditioning the redevelopment. In the subsequent chapter I examine how the vision of the site is actualized in practice by a set of tenants.
Memories of past places are incited as part of the production of an arborescent system that structures space.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) distinguish between arborescent systems (totalizing, hierarchical chains with linear progress) and rhizomatic systems (horizontal, non-hierarchical linkages). As they suggest, “Arborescent systems are hierarchical systems with centres of significance and subjectification, central automata like organized memories. In the corresponding models, an element only receives information from a higher unit” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 18). I evoke this distinction in order to engage with the hierarchical ordering of the site in relation to other spaces, places, and times (where meaning clings to previous thoughts and images) along channeled paths. The press works to position the Distillery in the examples offered above by producing hierarchical chains that organize value. Furthermore, when the site is addressed in the press it is always treated as a whole and emphasis is placed on visual apprehension. “The area now looks and feels a bit like lower Broadway in New York City, or at least it might have been about 130 years back” (Goddard, 2002), is an evocation of meaning that empowers memory. The system also creates superiority through relation: “if things work out in the future, the area might be what Yorkville should have become” (Goddard, 2002). Producing similarity between places through a system of relations fosters a mechanics of meaning that hinges on the representational realm. Even if the reader of these images is not acquainted with Parisian streets or flower markets in Amsterdam, or is unfamiliar with Dickens, or for that matter unknowledgeable about New York in the 1870s, these images bear notions of resemblance, couched in a mode of desire that is
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49 The reference to Yorkville is differentiating between the potential of this neighbourhood in Toronto in the 1960s when it imbued a strong sense of creativity, cultural resistance, and individuality, versus its present state as a highly commercialized high-end district.
imagined or imaginable. These “positive” references work to orchestrate a process of differentiation, where classification is advanced through a set of signs that signify value, order, and meaning (manufacturing a lexicon for distinction). When the developers cite a list of places that were consulted during the planning stages of the Distillery, they are working to frame the site through a mode of resemblance (as coherence). The evocation of other sites / sights manufactures distinction for the Distillery, but it also distinguishes the references themselves (New York, Paris, Amsterdam streets) from other places, spaces, and times.

Beyond the attempt to “positively” place the site referentially, there is an equal and attendant attempt to dissociate the site from a series of relations. In this case, a strategy of differentiation as negation is enacted in order to counteract similarity and to formulate meaning. One of the more repetitive claims made under this guise includes the statement that “the Distillery is not a themed space.” As Matthew Rosenblatt, one of the partners of Cityscape suggests “We could have made a lot of money if we’d sold it off as lofts or condos, or we could have gone the other way...But we didn’t want to create a Black Creek Pioneer Village [an historic recreation in the city of Toronto], or a Disney World. We wanted to make something the whole city could share in. So we envisioned it as a centre for arts and culture” (cited in Breen, 2003: 44). Black Creek Pioneer Village as well as Disney World are cast as superficial sites – extreme forms of reuse that lack vision – set in opposition to the suggested intimacy and sensitivity deployed in the reuse of space and time. The suggestion of “wholeness” (the projection of unity) veils
the exclusivity of the space by emphasizing inclusion and coherence.\textsuperscript{50} Regardless of the term that the developers use to sell the site, the landscape is clearly based on a simulation of the past. As Boyer (1992: 200) suggests, “simulated landscapes of exotic and imaginary terrains, cleverly combining the fantastic with the real, become the ideal background props for our contemporary acts of consumption, set-ups that intensify the commodity’s power of seduction.”

Adding to the suggested inclusiveness of the site, there is a naturalization of redevelopment at play. The technique of adaptive reuse deployed at the Distillery, according to Rosenblatt, is a form of “urban farming” where “the most fertile seeds for an early harvest are in arts and culture” (cited in Lewington, 2002a). This mode of collision between a themed site and a site of “urban farming” (a non-themed, natural process of cultivation) marks a strategy of differentiation that remains invested in a “this and not that” relation. This is urban farming. This is not a themed space. The use of the term “urban farming” privileges the nature of urban reuse at the site, replacing one system of social codes with another, organizing redevelopment into binary oppositions of good / bad, superior / inferior, to “place” the site in a hierarchy (an arborescent system). Similar to any practice of farming, there is always the potential for disease, weeds, and climatic instability: as Rosenblatt goes on to note, “One wrong tenant could ruin the whole thing” (cited in Hume, 2003). This is why the four partners hand-selected each tenant, to control the organism. The use of tenants, or “operators” as Rosenblatt calls them, that have

\textsuperscript{50} In the next chapter I will pick up on this theme of participation in a discussion over how many cultural producers (in the Artscape buildings) as well as some retail tenants on site cannot afford to make purchases in the shops, galleries, and / or restaurants, and how this works as a barrier to membership that is imbued with power. For example, when asked what the relationship is between the Artscape building tenants and the tenants at large, several cultural producers articulated how they feel as though they are sitting at the “kiddy table.” What these individuals articulate is the lack of range offered at the site in response to different consumer markets and price points.
“character” (no chains or franchises) prepares a system of meaning where, through association, the site retains (or manufactures) an overall marker of distinction. In this metaphor of urban farming, the developers retain the ultimate position of power as the managers of the crop. The production of fear (as instability) ensures the retention of this position, and retains a top-down system of governance.

While the decision to exclude enterprise giants deserves praise, the claim of a chain free environ is misguided: “Cadillac recently launched two of its new car models on one of the patios. Ikea held its catalogue preview party in the Tank House” (Ross, 2003). Blocking entry of major franchises is an important step towards revaluing alternative markets, but in this case it operates as a strategy for place differentiation. Enterprise giants, without fashioning the space, use the space to heighten their fashion appeal; the developers co-mingle with the different, offering a stamp of unique character, as transcendental taste purveyors. In this sense, it is not surprising that Segway Ontario is marketing a tour for corporations to engage in team building exercises: the tour is branded as a unique experience which heightens the appeal of the corporate label and those who labour under its name (Segway of Ontario, 2008). The tours work to commodify history (through visual apprehension) while simultaneously increasing the value of the corporate brand. Indeed, the use of the site by various corporations is celebrated in print, where the image of a “new” luxury car on uneven cobblestone heightens consumer flagrancy. Stated differently, it does not weaken the identity or representation of the site. When the MG Car Club of Toronto marked its 50th anniversary at the Distillery, as another reporter notes, an event called “Brits on the Bricks,” there were references of the sites’ similarity to an MG factory, where the buildings have a
personality which “reflects the cars, and you can almost imagine them being designed and built there” (Vance, 2005). Whether the site actually bears resemblance to the mid-century production of automobiles, it is clear that the flexibility of the Distillery to become a factory, or an advertising backdrop is socially constructed through these texts. But the description of the site’s similarity to an MG factory is devoid of labour conditions; the image of production is smoothed into positive representations. Despite the image of planting seeds in the urban wild as one critic notes, “the Distillery District did not develop organically, was not grown in stages by artists, gallerists and shopkeepers determined to remake a neighborhood...the District was developed by big-money...and simply declared a hot new destination, it feels more like a mall than a community” (Vaughan, 2004). These sentiments expose the system that imitates through the creation of singularity in meaning.

The current redevelopment of the Distillery is naturalized according to a set of signifiers that veil the mechanisms of repression. Representations that negate the vision of the site are made to appear non-threatening to the whole. Representations that promote the vision of the site form repetitive classifications. This is urban farming, this is a centre for the arts and culture the whole city can share in, this is not a themed space. This is not to suggest that the consumer of space falls helpless to the discourses that imbue the site. As Degen et al (2008) argue, the relationship between the built environment and experience must be expanded to allow multimodal ways of seeing and more active modes of participation. Place differentiation is highly contested, wherein there is often a disjuncture between discourse and practice seen in the example of a non-chain store claim.
Heritage and art are commodified in the construction of identity, dismantled of complexity and drawn in as sound bites and aesthetic backdrops to image place.

**Conclusion: “Where Everyday is a Festival”**

By now, the formula for these kinds of things [in reference to the Distillery District] is familiar. They’re called ‘festival marketplaces’ in the trade; the models are Boston’s Faneuil Hall and New York’s South Street Seaport. They’ve proven that heritage can be a valuable commercial asset. But after the novelty has worn off, you’re left with a slightly creepy feeling. Is it appropriate to graft tourist-trap boutiques and ice-cream parlours onto 19th-century workplaces? (Barber, 1994).

The concept of the “festival marketplace,” representing the construction of a themed retail environment (Goss, 1996; Ley, 1996) resonates with the Distillery District. James Rouse, a property developer of new towns and suburban malls turned his sights to the production of festival marketplaces in 1976, with the creation of Boston’s Faneuil Hall Marketplace, a development strategy so successful that it provided a template for other cities (see Hannigan, 1998). Examples in North America include South Street Seaport in New York, Harbour Place in Baltimore, Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, Granville Island in Vancouver, and the Byward Market in Ottawa. These spaces are themed with a festive identity and are primarily privatized public spaces. They deploy restorative efforts to retain historical built form, and carry an atmosphere of conspicuous consumption. They typically contain mainly independent shops and restaurants and are often situated in close proximity to historical waterways. They claim uniqueness despite their relation to one another.

Boyer’s (1992: 181) introductory description of South Street Seaport could easily stand in for the Distillery: “Once considered a leftover space of derelict structures,
narrow streets, and abandoned piers, it is today an upscale marketplace catering to employees from the Wall Street area, curious tourists, and urban explorers.” The Pure Spirits Oyster House and Grill, one of the owner operated restaurants at the Distillery was recently listed in *Toronto Life* (2008) as a place “Where Bay Street goes to eat, drink and close the deal.” The festival marketplace model is, as Sawicki (1989) suggests, a manifestation of public-private partnerships, but success for the private sector in these initiatives does not always translate into success for the public sector (which often heavily subsidizes the project). Similar to Boyer’s introduction to South Street Seaport, Sawicki (1989: 359) provides the following definition for the festival marketplace model:

The festival market can be generally described as an anchorless retail center with a unique mix of specialty shops and food offerings showcased in unconventional architecture. ‘Specialty retail’ refers to distinctive, one-of-a-kind merchandise with an emphasis on gifts and crafts supplied locally. Shops are typically small, and total gross leasable area ranges from about 220,000 square feet (Boston’s Faneuil Hall, Underground Atlanta) to 80,000 square feet (Norfolk’s Waterside, Toledo’s Portside)… They are not primarily retail centers, but entertainment centers, anchored by restaurants.

The Distillery falls into most of the classifications used to define a festival marketplace. Where the district differs is in its ownership model (private sector as opposed to public-private partnership), and in its location outside of the main thoroughfare where these projects are normally housed. As already noted, private sector ownership frames the level of civic participation in the planning process (the private sector is not accountable to the public unless this is measured through consumption levels).

Under the current redevelopment scheme, aspects are negated and collected in order to prop up a distinct identity for the Distillery that is supposedly differentiated from other urban areas. However, there is a contradiction between the discourse of distinction
(where the site claims uniqueness in the order of rhetoric) and the application of
distinction (where the site performs sameness). As Boyer (1991: 188) argues, within
festival marketplaces, place identity is couched in “the reiteration and recycling of
already-known symbolic codes and historic forms to the point of cliché…a schema or
program that generates a narrative pattern, a kind of memory device that draws
associations and establishes relations between images and places, resemblances and
meaning.” At the site, aesthetics and sensory experiences are controlled, maintained,
and homogenized. It is the governance of these relations that directs exploration
within the multimodal space of the Distillery District.

Place differentiation is a complex process. While speaking with one of my
interviewees about her experiences with culture led redevelopment in Toronto, a
provocative reflection emerged on the relationship between visualization and ways of
seeing:\footnote{51 I am differentiating here between “visualization” as image perception,
and “ways of seeing” as the perception of ideologies contained (hidden or apparent)
within visual images.}

I was in Santa Monica last year and they have this fabulous pedestrian
street there and I went in…and there are wonderful topiaries that they had
formed and found and fountains and things and as I started walking in I
said ‘this is so beautiful.’ The buildings were beautiful old buildings. I
was taking pictures of the architecture and then I realized everything was a
chain [store] all the way along, every American chain, so the content
wasn’t there. At first it was beautiful so it looked wonderful, I wanted to
be there, but then I just thought everything here is just so boring. It’s not
the little jewelry maker, the person running the little one off business that
you wouldn’t find anywhere else. And I think that that’s where the
Distillery people were really clever to make it as special as it could be.
They were going to have to take a hard route, because that’s a really hard
route and financiers don’t like it because they want you to have Tim
Horton’s as a client because they’re a AAA covenant tenant (Margaret
Zeidler, Urban Space Property Group, personal interview).
Lurking beneath the glossy abstraction that whets the visual appetite, the image of the pedestrian street described in this passage is broken. Its rampant sameness with streets in other cities lessens its value; the architecture is redressed in relation to the function of its interiors. What is produced in the repetition of these forms is a pseudo-playground where the middle class can escape the crowds and chaos of the streets for a leisurely stroll, and play in the glitter that sweeps through these spaces as commodity spectacle. The Distillery District is a themed space that carries a set of signifiers that convey safe consumption. The question confronting the site is whether the containment of independents under a no-chain store policy, the unique collection of industrial Victorian architecture, the long term provisions for the arts, and the pedestrian flavour – a formula which is repeated as archetype in many redevelopments – provides anything other than a more sophisticated reiteration of sameness. While the visualization presents more depth than the Santa Monica street, it is still caught within a controlled environment premised on consumer flagrancy. The private sector approach to planning, while ensuring the retention of the core structures on the property, led to the commodification of its parts (in particular art and heritage). Miles and Paddison (2005: 834) pose the following question in relation to contemporary cultural policy: “to what extent is culture-led regeneration more about rhetoric than it is about reality?” The trading of images in relation to the Distillery (from automobile manufacturing to flower markets) and the construction of a particular language of redevelopment (urban farming, hand selecting operators) is certainly suggestive of a surface rendering of place (a play of difference). Given the difficulties in measuring the success, sustainability, and outcomes of culture-led regeneration, it is important to turn to an analysis of how discourses are produced and
how they are operationalized to govern space (what the discourse *does*, how it produces material effects). The two prong approach to the redevelopment of Gooderham and Worts under Cityscape (adaptive re-use of historic structures and arts-led regeneration) fabricates an infrastructure for consumption. History is commodified at the expense of nurturing local knowledge transfers of the histories of industrial development, and the residual memories of workers. There is a great deal of potential to collect minor histories from on-site visitors who were connected to the distillery pre-redevelopment which would complicate the dominant narrative of progress currently on offer. Similarly, the apparatus of consumption (as an ordered setting) provides little support for cultural production beyond a set of studio walls (however important they may be in the present real estate market!). Instead, art and culture are drawn into the order of place for their ability to aestheticize consumption and to spur economic development (at the expense of nurturing creative exchange).

The site is “in progress,” a term often touted by the press to refer to the redevelopment work still underway (see also Caulfield, 2005: 94-5). The term “in progress” marks out an eventual end point, but it also works to destabilize the singularity of the site. In other words, rather than reaching an ultimate end, it is always in a state of becoming. These two meanings of the site, in progress towards completion, and in progress, as process, in a state of movement, form a coalescence of meaning. The former emphases revitalization as the creation of something new, and the latter emphases flexibility and experimentation producing fluidity in movement and exchange. It is important to remember that the buildings that designate the Distillery District proper as a distinct unity of space and time do not carry a set of ready-made evocations. The
conditions that fashion(ed) their interiority and exteriority are never in a state of fixity; they are door, beam, window, machine, and particles that are organized as unity through systems of power.

Despite attempts to theme the site under a coherent vision, individual and collective understandings of what it means to utilize the space emerge in discussions and debates over representation, governance, and the valuation of art, heritage, culture, entertainment, and labour. In the next chapter, I examine how flexibility in meaning and practice is produced in response to the discursive web of naming space, and how it is productive in shaping and unraveling the identity of its users and its boundaries, both imagined and material. In this sense, while negation and coherence are deployed by the developers to commodify the landscape, the two strategies also provide an opening for dialogue and critical engagement.
Chapter 4: Trading Signs: Untying the Singularization of Space

If urban redevelopment constitutes itself as a set of power relations that impose unity, I argue that it is necessary to turn to the strategies that fuel this constitution in order to open up spaces for diverse and creative disruptions that run against the unifying grain of the redevelopment process. In this chapter, I examine the response by the tenancy to the rhetoric of place differentiation employed by the developers. I frame this discussion along three axes of place identification for the site: a) that it provides an alternative mode of consumption; b) that it offers a focus on creativity and cultural expression; and c) that it provides an unparalleled historic quarter in the city. Despite attempts by the developers to produce a coherent place identity for the Distillery, conflicting ways of seeing and experiencing the site by the tenancy unravels the unity. What results is a constant dance between classification and declassification in a landscape of consumption: While the site claims independence from spatial homogeneity, the desire for economic viability and profit draws it back to the production of sameness through a mall mentality. Culture and creativity are drawn into a strategy of differentiation for the purpose of distinction (a form of cultured cultivation), but unequal power relations between tenant factions, a disjuncture between culture and entertainment, and the tokenistic inclusion of cultural producers complicates these descriptors of space. Lastly, the history of the site is commodified as amenity space for condominium development and as a marker of a distinct consumptive experience. Overall, the strategies of differentiation employed by the developers (negation and coherence) are oriented outward and prevent internal dialogue and exchange at the site. I argue that what emerges when negation and coherence are critically reexamined is an understanding of the Distillery as a contested space, wherein its unity lies in the very act of its untying.

Introduction

By 2012, following the completion of all three market condominiums by Cityscape (adding to the three cooperative apartments already on site by Options for Homes), 2000 people are expected to live at the Distillery (Distilled, 2008). The buildings on site house over 70 restaurants, theatres, retail shops, galleries, educational tenants, and office spaces, and over 60 Artscape units housing arts organizations, studios, shops, galleries, and theatres (see Appendix C for a directory of tenants for 2004 and 2009). The composition of tenants (excluding Artscape) has shifted substantively since
the initial public opening of the site. For example, in 2004, galleries constituted 31% of the tenant base, followed by retail at 27%. By 2009, galleries constituted 17% of the tenant base, with the highest shares captured in retail (31%) and offices / services (31%).¹

The decline of galleries and rise of office / service spaces in particular in a district premised on arts, culture, and entertainment is perplexing. The early planning proposals put forward by the City of Toronto and Hiram Walker in 1990 and 1991 stressed the importance of office space in the reconstitution of the site. Following a decline in demand for office space in the inner city in the 1990s, however, revitalization efforts shifted in order to ensure economic viability (see Caulfield, 2005: 92). The suitability of the site for office / service space given the struggles to provide consistent foot traffic throughout the year, and the challenges in sustaining tenants who are establishing new businesses, is not surprising.² It does raise questions concerning the long-term feasibility of the site as a space of cultural consumption.

I take up the notion of consumption in this chapter through an examination of how commodities (material objects) are imbued with meaning at the site through their production (as primarily hand-crafted, unique wares), and how they are marketed (an investment of meaning which is highly intertwined in the case of the Distillery with the production process). As Hannigan (1998: 55) notes, festival marketplaces draw consumers “in through the nostalgic appeal of quasi-historical architecture and attractions, whose attributes are then transferred psychologically to the items for sale in the gift shops

¹ These calculations are based on the Distilled guides from 2004 and 2009. There is some repetition within the classifications where a small number of tenants are listed as both retail and gallery, but the overall shift in composition is captured in these figures.

² This observation regarding the lack of consistency is based on site observation wherein the summer months attract crowds of visitors, and the winter months are quiet. This observation was corroborated by the tenants during the interview process as they described the seasonal rhythms of the site.
and boutiques.” In addition, I examine how spatial experience, labour, and identity are commodified in the landscape to image place. I map the discussion through the experiences of tenants who work to negotiate the identity of the site as a landscape of consumption, while negotiating the identity of their individual businesses. Important to the narrative of the site as a landscape of consumption is Ley’s (1996: 298) notion of the ‘convivial city’ which translates into “consumption with style, requiring a performance from the purchaser as well as the vendor, a flaunting of the canons of good taste, a mutual celebration of the product.” In other words, the Distillery is “a place apart to confirm an individuality here” (Ley, 1996: 299) and an individuality here to confirm one’s cultivated taste.

The discursive construction of the Distillery by the developers conditions a particular way of seeing the site. In this chapter I examine competing discourses for the site emerging from the tenants, specifically how they negotiate the top down governance of space. I begin with a discussion on naming the vision of the district – a process which works to position meaning – before turning to how the tenants engage with the vision in practice. The public unveiling of the newly redeveloped Distillery in 2003 identified the district along three major axes: a) as a destination point for Torontonians seeking to escape the banality of the mall and the modern chaos of the main streets; b) as a district premised on creativity and cultural display; and c) as a unique historic quarter unparalleled in the city. I use these three axes to explore the tensions that have arisen since the public opening of the site in 2003.³

³I draw upon newspaper reports and blogs to analyze how the site is constructed according to particular narratives, what images are used to represent the site, and how the changes taking place are categorized (supported / resisted) by a broader public.
While the discourse used to communicate the Distillery is predicated on a desire for distinction, there are prevailing contradictions within these three expressions of place identity that result from a disjuncture between discourse and practice. I argue that naming the function of the district, despite its aims to produce a coherent identity, is unraveled by the multimodal ways of seeing and experiencing space by the tenancy. Primarily this disjuncture is a result of how the process of naming works to position and market space externally – to attract visitors, residents, businesses, publicity – rather than building internal dialogue and exchange (active modes of meaning production).

Marking Incongruity in Vision: Discourse and Practice

The official re-naming of Gooderham and Worts as “the Distillery District” was met with little resistance or animosity, expressing instead the transformation of space. The developers did not own the legal rights to the name “Gooderham and Worts” meaning that a name change was inevitable. What I want to focus on this introductory section is not the name itself (the Distillery District) but rather the messaging used to name the function and identity of the district (the vision) and the response to this messaging. I begin by sketching instances of incongruity between discourse and practice before turning to the process of branding space in the contemporary city as a strategy for revalorizing the real estate market. Lastly, I examine the ways in which the tenants complicate the vision through multimodal readings and experiences of space (a disruptive potential).

The use of terms such as “urban farming / non-themed,” “arts, culture and entertainment district,” and “heritage district” work to express meaning but they also
present a disjuncture between the discursive construction of the vision of the site and how that vision is put into practice. This disjuncture is present in the festival and event programming as well as in the selection of tenants to fill the space. For example, the festivals and events that took place at the Distillery in the first couple of years (Ribs Fest, Woofstock, Jazz Fest) were an attempt to attract a range of visitors, but they produced a disjuncture between the temporary events and the type of consumers that they attracted, and the vision that was sold to the tenants. In addition to these temporary practices, the selection of tenants to fill the site is also perceived to be incongruent with the initial vision. As one gallery operator suggests:

I wasn’t there at the beginning to hear what the vision was. When I first got there I thought by and large most of the businesses were complementary. Now you’ve got a daycare and a private school and other things that are coming into play. How do they fit? I don’t understand…. As far as I can make out, it’s simply a matter of we have this space, we have to fill it, who showed up and put down the money. [This is] obviously deviating from the initial proposal that it was going to be a cultural hub (Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery, personal interview).

A ‘cultural hub’ in this instance is set as an exclusive arrangement wherein particular practices are thought to disrupt its coherence. As a result of the disjuncture, many tenants question whether the vision of the site “speaks” to them. Others work to appropriate the vision so that it is meaningful for their interests, and a few work outside of it altogether (either by leaving the site or through a process of dissociation). In the latter case, several tenants note that their customer base and reputation are products of their own destination status, an identification that falls outside of the Distillery frame:

I think the type of business that we are, we’re also a bit of a destination. So I don’t think it really matters where we are. I don’t think it would matter because of the business, being part of a district or not. But I think in terms of our thinking of the greater good, and sort of giving back to the city, that it was nice to sort of be here and offer this for other people, as a
cultural destination. So it was more of us thinking in that way, not necessarily business wise (G4, gallery operator).

While it is difficult to imagine that charity trumped economics for this gallery in the decision to locate in a cultural precinct, the narrative clearly dissociates the interests of the gallery from the interests of the district. It also works to position a unique identity for the gallery using a strategy of negation (producing an articulation of difference between two sets of interests), and sets at play a binary of inside / outside in relation to the site.

Articulations of how the vision should be orchestrated provide insight into the tensions that currently exist between the tenants and the developers, and between tenants. For some tenants, issues surrounding the vision have arisen due to a lack of continued consultation with the tenancy. As one gallery operator notes:

At the beginning, the landlords really asked a lot [of questions about] what we thought should be here, and we gave them a lot of advice. Then I think that at some point they thought [they didn’t need to ask anymore]…You know they’re young and it’s hard in the world of culture to understand a hierarchy of achievement, because in culture it’s very easy for people to say, ‘I don’t know anything about art, but I know what I like.’ Nobody would say, when you’re referring to medicine or doctors, I don’t know anything about medicine, but I can make really good decisions about what pain killers this child should have. I think it’s all too easy for people to not understand that hierarchy and not understand how people have an astute ability to make visual decisions and what their backgrounds are in coming to those decisions….The last thing in the world any of us really wanted this to be is a tourist attraction and I think the difficulty was in sorting out that stuff. I mean I think the [Cityscape partners] probably don’t have or come from a cultural background…and so, they brought down sort of tourist things because they felt if they bused people in here it would be busy (Jane Corkin, Corkin Gallery, personal interview).

As another gallery operator suggests, “I think it’s just that tension of what is this place? Right now it’s kind of like a non-place. They should just figure it out and let us know [in reference to the developers]” (G4). The non-place described by the tenant refers to the
dilution of a coherent place identity which is produced in the attempt to fill the space with visitors. Similarly as a retail tenant suggests,

The place has been around now for five years and it still does not have any real exposure in the city: that tells me it’s not being marketed properly. I don’t know if it’s cost prohibitive to do it, or if it’s that they’re not hitting the right market. The whole deal with this place is to make it appear to be high end. The fact is you don’t open a place and be high-end, you develop that. I don’t care if we’ve got galleries like Sandra Ainsley who’s world renowned and stuff, [if] people don’t know she's here, how can you develop kind of an upper-end environment here? You’ve got to attract those people (R2).

While there is clearly perceived incongruity between vision and practice amongst certain factions of the tenancy, the Distillery exists in its current state due to the actions and investments of Cityscape. The tenants of the district utilize Cityscape’s vision and capital investment to make a profit from an exclusive clientele; the developers draw on a particular arrangement of tenants for their catalytic potential to revalorize real estate. As suggested in chapter 3, place identity operates via rhetoric wherein the practice of the site does not wholly match up to its marketing.

Spatial Branding

Hannigan (2002: 187) outlines three dimensions that are present in spatial (re)branding strategies: the ability for simple recognition, the construction of “comfort and certainty,” and legibility for consumers “in an increasingly crowded marketplace.” This list of dimensions is a useful point of entry for understanding how space is read and experienced through a consumptive mode of meaning transmission, as well as the rationale for the inclusion and arrangement of particular characteristics. The elements

---

4 I am making the distinction here between the production of the discourse of the site and the practice of this discourse through festival and event programming.
included within branding strategies have shifted over the past three decades, as noted by Hannigan (2003: 354): “Whereas previously local communities had been content to play up local historical and cultural events and facilities, now the state of the art was to enhance the urban landscape with arts and entertainment destinations that are globally branded.” Signifiers of space that form part of the global brand respond to the order of imitation (Guggenheim, Tate, McDonalds, Disney) rather than to the construction of situated differentiation.

There are several costs to these arrangements. As Evans (2003: 417) evocatively notes, “Hard branding the city through cultural flagships and festivals has created a form of karaoke architecture where it is not important how well you can sing but that you do it with verve and gusto.” The construction of these landscape identities is tied to the process of city branding more broadly. A number of scholars have drawn upon the transition of Bilbao, from an industrial to a post-industrial centre, as an instructive example of regeneration through arts infrastructure. The transformation pivoted around the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, a Frank Gehry creation opened in 1997 which aimed to symbolize a new image and representation of the region. In the case of Bilbao, the relationship to place was fractured under the global stamp, noted by the lack of acquisitions of local or regional artists made within the first three years following its opening (Evans, 2003). The success of the site is negotiable, with some criticizing the regeneration strategy for its lack of employment creation (Gómez, 1998) and others stressing the multiplying effects that may not be immediately visible (Plaza, 1999). Plaza (2008) recently offered a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of these forms of cultural heritage, applicable also to the Tate brand, a national line of British museums

---

5 The Guggenheim art museum is a global chain, with offshoots in Milan, New York, and Abu Dhabi.
(now housed in four locations). These include the impact of the regeneration site on the tourist trade (marked according to employment creation and tourism statistics), the level of dependency on the heritage industry within the economy as a whole (with economic diversification signaling greater effectiveness), the level of market integration (complementarity within the zone of redevelopment between tourist directed and non-tourist directed goods and services), and gains in the city’s overall economy (general productivity in the economy promoting greater ability to absorb price tensions). This set of criteria (which deals primarily with economic success as opposed to cultural, political, or social success) is a useful reminder that investments in cultural heritage must be accompanied with complementary policy and programming to help situate and broaden potential growth and development.

The inclusion of infrastructure designed by star architects (‘starchitects’) such as Frank Gehry to boost tourism and re-image place is now a common feature of renaissance or regeneration planning. Toronto’s ‘cultural renaissance’ began in the early 2000s and includes the construction and / or transformation of thirteen arts and cultural institutions by renowned architects (Live With Culture, 2009). Of note, the Distillery District’s Young Centre for the Performing Arts designed by Kuwabara, Payne, McKenna Blumberg Architects is listed as one of the institutions undergoing transformation under this heading. As cities around the world watched the multiplier effects of Bilbao Guggenheim – five million visitors and economic activity amounting to $500 million

---

6 Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects (KPMB) is a world renowned Toronto-based firm which is wholly or partially credited with three additional projects under Toronto’s cultural renaissance (Canada’s National Ballet School; Royal Conservatory of Music: TELUS Centre for Performance and Learning; and Toronto International Film Festival Group: Bell Lightbox) (Live With Culture, 2009).
within the first five years – the reaction was unequivocally “We want one of those” (Rybczinski, 2003: 138).

There are clear examples of extreme forms of branding through cultural infrastructure (such as the Tate, Guggenheim, or Disneyland), but more diluted forms of branding that appear to be as local as they are global and as old as they are new, present some conceptual difficulties (such as the Distillery). In 2003, the Distillery entered into the urban imaginary and the public domain in one foul sweep. While the district possesses “character” and “tradition” – character as the “connection among unlike elements, and tradition as the mode of perpetuating these links” – which Molotch et al (2000: 816) argue are necessary ingredients for “place difference,” it struggles to define itself outside of a negative relation (it is ‘this’ because it is ‘not that’). As Molotch et al (2000: 818) suggest:

An urban tradition arises through interactive layering and active enrollments over time, something that is difficult to produce all at once. Despite the skills of talented planners and architects, people can read the Disney landscape as ‘instant,’ and in that sense it is something entirely different from, say, a Santa Barbara that did its urbanizing over the longer interactive haul.

What happens when a new identity and function are placed over top of a space which developed over a longer interactive haul? Does the concomitant process of renovation and new development – such as that found at the Distillery – constitute newness or does it constitute continuity? In the next section I examine how the tenants respond to the Distillery brand in order to illustrate the overlapping readings and ways of seeing the image of the district.
Imaging the Site as Anti-brand?

When I asked the tenants what attracted them to the site initially, the majority cited aesthetics (building materials, visual sight lines, historical details) and affection (I called the developers immediately, I couldn’t see myself anywhere else, it was love at first sight). The second most popular response was the vision behind the redevelopment (the emphasis on art and culture, independents rather than chain stores, and historical adaptation). One gallery operator emphasizes the initial attraction to the site based on its status (the commodities themselves and the space in which these commodities are on display):

I’d been looking in Toronto for a year and a half for a retail location for an art gallery. I looked at Queen Street, I looked at the area around the Art Gallery of Ontario, I looked at Yorkville… [M]y conclusions were: Yorkville was incredibly pretentious and snobby and had a kind of arrogance that I thought totally inappropriate in any business, and certainly in the art business; Queen Street was too amateurish in the sense that the galleries were open some days and closed others and it seemed as if everybody was running them as a hobby, without a great deal of rigor; and the area around the Art Gallery of Ontario was sort of hit and miss…I came here on a Saturday night…I saw Sandra Ainsley’s space, I looked in and…there was a $250,000 dollar [glass sculpture] sitting in the middle of this gallery in this abandoned warehouse space… It took me no time to make the decision. I signed faster than anybody who signed a lease here because it seemed obvious to me (G3).

The obviousness of the potential of the site that the tenant raises is based on a way of seeing which is cultivated within a particular social class milieu. The display – an abandoned warehouse – shifts the site away from the pretension of Yorkville despite the obvious linkages between the two art scenes (established high-end galleries in heritage structures). Imaging the site attends to more than the desire to position place for the purpose of capital accumulation; imaging also attends to an engagement with space which occurs in material and imaginative ways on an individual and / or collective level.
Attempts by the developers to unify the site under a singular vision are made arduous by the multimodal texture of the Distillery. This multimodality is evident in the range of responses offered by the tenancy when I asked the following question: “If you could select one image that you feel best represents the Distillery what would it be?” The responses are expansive, ranging from iconic forms, experiential narratives of the site, to abstract generalizations. Drawing on these categories (icon, experience, and conceptualization), I organize the responses to provide a synopsis of the perception, conception, and practice of place. I also engage with the ways in which the image forms complex arrangements of spatial understanding and practice that untie the unity of the Distillery brand (an untying which in effect provides a frame which holds the idea of the Distillery together).

The iconic images selected by the tenants reinforce the visually prominent aspects of the historical and industrial architecture including the cupola, the Stone Distillery Building, the chimney, the cobblestones, and the Gooderham and Worts sign that reaches across Trinity Street with great prominence. This list represents the most commonly cited representations for the site emerging in the interviews. It also represents the most commonly used images of the site appearing in advertisements, on logos, and in promotional material (forming the dominant visual expression(s) of place). The iconic images are drawn from details of the site which attain a particular status through their recognition. As an Artscape tenant notes, their selected image is of “the Stone Distillery. The façade of that building is what is used in the logos. I think it’s very commonly understood as the memorable image of the site” (A3). By making explicit reference to the status of the sights selected, the Distillery as brand and the cultural value of the
Distillery begin to bleed together. The images selected resonate with the individual in question, but they also respond to the dominant discourses of the site (that which appears in press reports, promotional material, and brochures). In terms of the latter, dominant discourses of the site are subverted, resisted, and actively enveloped by tenants. In other words, ways of seeing the site form complex arrangements based on individual and collective experiences, ideas, and understandings of space which are at times complementary and at other times contradictory (the consumption of the messaging in other words is itself a production). The tenants at the Distillery occupy a dual position where they work to fashion space (a mode of strategic power) and work to dismantle this fashioning of space (the production of their own trajectories as tactics).

Experiential aspects of place are incited to represent space, deriving meaning from the rhythms of individual and social participation. Experiential images are located somewhere between the iconic and the conceptual. Here the focus is on everyday life and the sensuous qualities of experience. For example, the experience of place is transferred to historical periods, reflective of a desire for the site to represent a cultural moment: “Really this space takes me to the early 1920s...the period that artists like Picasso wanted to get together, a space like that” (Fay Athari, Arta Gallery, personal interview).

Wrapped into the transference of time, is the penetration of memory into the context of place: “I’d still say mud, because it was so pervasive in the first year of being down here. There was just mud everywhere and it was a construction site, these spectacular buildings and mud” (Robert Akroyd, Akroyd Furniture, personal interview). Still for others, the consistency of a particular experience is tantamount, “Balzac’s Café [laughing]. It’s like the life force of this place.” (Vikki Anderson, DVxT, personal interview). How the
tenants move through space, and more broadly, the nature of their practices within space, are integral components in understanding the meaning and experience of the district.

Amongst the more popular responses to this question was to shift the imageability of the site into a conceptual framework. Conceptualizations form an important relationship to practice, wherein individuals are able to draw relations to space, time, and place via an abstract generalization and expression. This enables a respondent to incite meaning through an alternate system of value. For example, the following interviewee returns to an originary moment pre-redevelopment to represent the site: “When I picture the Distillery, I picture it how it was before. I picture those old diagrams, the old paintings of the distillery the way it was, untouched and being used as a distillery.” (Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery, personal interview). In contrast to this representation, another tenant notes the contemporary feel of the site, “One of encouraging people to explore – artistic exploration – things of that nature…it’s not about seeing an old distillery in operation” (Syd Beder, Lileo, personal interview). These different viewpoints of the site characterize the tension between preservation and development where the desire to contain is met with a desire to expand. The temporal re-placement of the Distillery is also present in linkages to the site as a modern day cultural happening, where it is compared to “Yorkville in the 1960s” (R2, retail tenant) and to the fantastical: “Going back to the day of outside malls, shopping, sort of like a Dicken’s type Christmas Carol type thing” (Michael Ber, Sound Design, personal interview). Lastly, some tenants focused on the competing interests of the site, comparing it to “something that has weighted possibility” (T2, Artscape theatre tenant), or “mish
mash...a situation that is at odds with itself” (Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery, personal interview). As one Artscape tenant notes,

as a resident of this city I look at this place and I just roll my eyes...There are problems...whether it’s going to be successful or not I don’t know. Their [the developers] perception of success will probably be if they sell out their condominiums. I would like to see them [the developers] go, to see someone else take over this place. I’d rather see it as one huge cooperative. I would really rather see it that way and then it would be real, it’s kind of fake. It’s like fake fur. There’s my image (A2).

While the majority of tenants see a great deal of potential at the site, the current branding strategy deployed by the developers (and the associated changes taking place under this form of management) is at odds according to some tenants, with the vision that attracted them to the site initially. Representations of the conflicts taking place at the site (between tenants and between tenants and the developers) in response to this question, speaks to the level of friction that currently characterizes the space. Pushing the limits of the conflicts at play, an analogous relation is drawn to

A cranky child. A child going from good moods to bad moods, being cranky and not so cranky, having not quite reached its potential: it doesn’t have the calm and maturity and wisdom of being older. It has tons of potential, but it is still rubbing against all kinds of problems (G3, gallery operator).

The Distillery’s unity is derived from the multifarious threads that come together as conflict and contestation: its untying is in part what holds the idea of the Distillery together. As Massey (2005) notes, places are internally multiple, based on an assemblage of processes that are often unrelated and at times in conflict. Rather than working as passive recipients to the conditioning of space emerging via the naming process, these users of the site draw on the expansive potential and parameters of space, time, and place, by casting meaning around varying modes of being and becoming. The responses
highlight the multiple layers of the site, from the material icon, to experiential relations, and finally to the historical, imaginative, and metaphorical (the conceptual). The range denotes a series of representations of the site that are simultaneous and multiple (as a vision). The images of space also engage with a system, or systems, of thought and practice that fall(s) outside of the frame produced by Cityscape. Multimodal ways of imaging the site can untie the unity of place branding (allowing unity to be constructed through contestation). For the remainder of the chapter I detail the three axes that were used to frame the district (no chain stores, culture and creativity, and heritage) and the response to this programming by the tenancy, the media, and users of blog sites. I do this to highlight the contradictions that emerge between discourse and practice, and to illustrate how the disunity of the district produces a desire for coherence (a unity). In other words, while the centre produced by the developers is dismantled (exposed as illusion) by the multimodal ways of seeing and engaging with the site by this set of social actors, the desire for coherence produces a new structured centre (a unity as disunity). This deconstructive exercise, despite its return to coherence as illusion, highlights how power can be operationalized in alternative formations in place-making (a process whereby centres are dismantled and replaced).

**Seeking Independents**

[T]he idea [behind the Distillery] was to avoid the retail homogeneity and banality of globalization sweeping the planet (Hume, 2004).

In a newspaper article in the *Star*, Elvira Cordileone (2008) celebrates the “independent retail districts” scattered throughout the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) as offering holiday shoppers consumption that is filled with “joy.” The Distillery is listed alongside “old
style merchants” and “main street storefronts” as a preeminent site of ‘alternative’
consumption. The desire for “authenticity” is evident in these classifications which
promote a return to previous forms of urban experience (the historicization of consumer
experience). In a similar fashion, the quote which opens this section emphasizes the
individuality of the site in relation to the banality and programmability of other sites. In a
global market filled with sameness, the drive for the idea of authenticity feeds into a
discursive system which concretizes “individuality,” “uniqueness,” and “differentiation”
through negation. As Jameson (1992: 11) notes, the commodity in late capitalism
contains value based on its use:

The concept of the commodity cuts across the phenomenon of reification
…from a different angle, that of consumption. It [the object] no longer
has any qualitative value in itself, but only insofar as it can be ‘used’: the
various forms of activity lose their immanent intrinsic satisfactions as
activity and become means to an end.

In this sense, the use value of place difference is a means to an end (distinction). Place
differentiation is produced and enacted through image and identity but it does not hold
qualitative value in and of itself. In this fashion, a woman reported to a local newspaper
how shopping at the Distillery allows her to flaunt individuality and avoid the stigma of
mass-production, describing the wares of the site as “handmade”:

I would rather buy handmade things at a smaller store. It’s got a more
personalized touch and you know that not everyone else owns the same
item. You can tell people that it’s a one-of-a-kind instead of having the
same stuff everyone else does. It’s not mass produced in a sweat shop
(Lara Bezant, cited in Bennett, 2006).

Mass-production in this context creates embarrassment, an articulation of identity that is
based on consumption (buying individuality via handmade goods and services). This is
an articulation of class identity waged through aesthetic purchase. As Bourdieu (1984: 4)
suggests, “aesthetic perception is necessarily historical, inasmuch as it is differential, relational, attentive to the deviations (ecarts) which makes styles.” In other words, perception is not based on the aura of aesthetics, rather it is based on a way of looking within a given context. “Handmade” goods were not always positioned as optimal, and mass produced goods were not always thought to embarrass: these are relational statements of the negative (handmade goods in this instance collect value based on their differentiation from mass-produced goods). As Bourdieu (1993: 106) so aptly suggests “To introduce difference is to produce time.” This practice relates to the cycle of styles, where naming a new style marks the preceding styles as passé. In this section, I examine the complications that arise from the no-chain store policy at the site in terms of its long term feasibility, flexibility, and the ways in which it is used to fashion a distinct consumptive experience under a top down system of governance. I then turn to the ways in which the renovations of the spaces performed by the tenancy echo the desire for distinction premised on individuality through product lines, purchase points, and atmosphere.

_Naming the Site Distinct_

The decision by Cityscape to ensure a high quantity of independents at the site through a no chain store policy, works to differentiate the site from the banality of other spaces of consumption (via negation).\(^7\) Specifically, the site differentiates itself from

---

\(^7\) Cityscape claims that they are not “fanatic” about the rule, rather it was put into place to ensure quality and character tenants (John Berman, Cityscape, personal interview). The policy works to block major chains, but is flexible towards the potential success of tenants at the site to expand their business operations. For example, Balzacs is an independent café at the site. At the time of its opening at the Distillery, it had another location in Stratford, Ontario. Since its opening at the site, it now operates in several locations in Toronto.
traditional malls with their anchor stores through its emphasis on independents (an identity which subsequently constructs a themed environment). Deviations from this tenet fall on the side of service providers which are located on the ground floor of the new condominiums, so as not to detract from the score of independents in the more centralized (and heritage designated) areas of the site. These deviations are recent additions and respond to the provisions needed for the residential stage of the redevelopment. Most of the tenants at the site are receptive to the policy of no chain stores, noting the resultant uniqueness of the businesses. For example, the no chain store policy was important to Artscape as it ensured that tenants as a whole were chosen based on their creative strength (Bruce Rosensweet, Artscape, personal interview). As Rosensweet explains, chain stores produce a more generic feel (more like a mall) whereas non-chains ensure that what’s inside the building is as important as what’s outside. A smaller number of tenants deliberate over the definition of the term “chain” and / or whether “chains” might be beneficial (economically) to building the site. As one tenant argues, rather than a policy against chains, “it should be entrepreneurial. If a chain-store was to come down here and they were to treat this area with respect and if there were a criteria that the design had to fit with what was happening down here, I wouldn’t be opposed to it” (Syd Bedder, Lileo, personal interview). Asked if he thought the policy would eventually be modified over time, the tenant (who sells mass designer brands) replied:

Yeah, I think that it will change. I think that that policy will change…Not that I wouldn’t love more independents but I think that there are unique chain retail stores that have a really unique identity. As retailers seem to

---

8 Cityscape focused on building “community” at the site prior to the residential and commercial expansion stage of the redevelopment. The service providers that form the ground level commercial floor of Pure Spirit include Fresh and Wild (a franchised supermarket) and TD Canada Trust bank.
specialize more and more, you kind of get those more eclectic retailers (Syd Bedder, Lileo, personal interview).

Many of the tenants, despite their initial attraction to the site on the basis of the no chain store policy, respond to questions regarding the long term feasibility of this strategy with uncertainty. Some tenants wonder whether the developers will stick with their initial vision or succumb to global brands as a result of economic pressures. The temporary inclusion of corporations at the site for special events works against the vision of the site as a chain-free environment that was sold to the tenants, inserting flexibility into the policy. As a restaurant owner explains,

They’ve allowed Pizza Pizza on site selling pizza…is there any difference between that and having a unit [temporary stall] on site? No. So what does that really mean?...Is there any restriction? No. Rules are for whoever wants to make the rules and whoever wants to break them can break them (Victor Brown, Perigee Restaurant, personal interview).

What is upsetting to this tenant is the flexibility of the vision and the direct competition for a customer base which occurs when a national food chain is temporarily set up in the exterior spaces of the district. To suggest that the policy is negotiated with ease would be erroneous. Cityscape has faced some difficult decisions throughout the redevelopment process by barring entry to major corporations. In other words, the decision to reject a major corporation from occupying space at the site is difficult financially, at least for the short term:

It may have been their philosophy, but I’m sure at times they must have been tempted to say we could use a [higher] lease rate…that would really help us from a cash flow point of view. Having the right financing to be able to withstand that [pressure to bring in a chain] I think is a big part of what is contributing to the sense of the site and what will be its success down the road (Wayne Parrish, The Sport Gallery, personal interview).
While there may be short term loss, it is likely that this arrangement will spur long term interest and investment given the ability of the site to differentiate itself from other consumptive spaces on this basis.\(^9\) However, the inconsistency of the policy produces anxiety for some tenants as they work to market themselves to a broader public. But as one visual artist explains, if the space included major corporations then you have no culture, it’s empty. It becomes what can you buy, and then there’s no ideas being traded, there’s nothing being produced, right?...I think the Distillery is excellent in that they just stopped. They didn’t let the McDonald’s through...If you can have the vision that artists are here, and that creative types are here, theatre and dance and art, then you have a longevity, that people see a future to it. Other than that it becomes making a buck, right? (Marjolyn van der Hart, impressionist artist, personal interview).

What this artist describes is an emptiness that comes from the perception of fullness. While the mall offers the fullness of crowds, it is perceived to be empty of content. The artist distinguishes between two forms of consumption: a non-chain site of consumption and a chain site of consumption. Recall that consumption is a production (production as the making of, or use of, that which is consumed) (de Certeau, 1984). This is the case whether dealing with a product derived of mass production, or a product which is handmade (consumption does not change according to the product being sold, although the significations applied to the product and the experience of that purchase may change). In other words, a chain does not make an urban space (the Distillery) any more about consumption than a non-chain.

\(^9\) While the site is able to differentiate itself from Queen Street and Yorkville, it shares similarities with other festive marketplaces (consider Granville Island and Faneuil Hall) (chapter 3). This is not to suggest that the focus on independents is for naught, as the policy directly supports alternative markets.
While most tenants will agree that the site does not carry the atmosphere of a mall environment, there are a considerable number who see the management of the site as adopting a mall mentality:

Part of what they did wrong here is they have a bit of a shopping mall concept in their brains and I don’t know if that’s right or wrong, but when you’re dealing with individualists, tenants that have real vision are individualists, you can’t deal with individualists with a shopping mall concept. I mean we’re not Loblaws and we’re not Shoppers Drug Mart, we don’t have that kind of mentality, and we don’t run those kinds of businesses (Jane Corkin, Corkin Gallery, personal interview).

As an example of the shopping mall approach perceived by some, part of the lease agreement contains a provision stating that all tenants must adhere to regular operating hours for the purpose of consistency. The logic behind this provision is to ensure that visitors to the site are not disappointed to find that certain businesses are closed on a Monday, or that some businesses are closed earlier or open later than others (John Berman, Cityscape, personal interview). The provision is not popular amongst the tenants, particularly amongst the art galleries:

They [Cityscape] were trying to run it like a mall, and I had to conform to certain hours, and as somebody that’s there six days a week, working the hours, I can tell you when traffic is coming and not…that drives certain businesses out as well cause simply put they can’t afford to staff the place for the amount of hours that they want it to be open (Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery, personal interview).

However, the desire to ensure consistent hours at the site is shared by some of the retailers who note that site marketing in general needs to be reoriented:

I think as far as marketing, I know they market it as an arts and entertainment area, we get a lot of exposure as far as an arts and entertainment area, but there’s also a lot of retail stores here too. I’m not just speaking for myself, but there are a lot of retail stores here, and more retail stores will open up. They have to treat it more like a mall, and run it more like a mall (Michael Ber, Sound Design, personal interview).
There are clearly differences in the meaning of a mall environment, which hinge on a tenant’s position (cultural and economic) at the site. These positions are important as they lay bare the contradictions at the site in terms of how differentiation / distinction is presented. While the independent status of the site is used to differentiate the space from the mall, there is a desire by some tenants and the developers to manage the site in this fashion. This is an example of Saussure’s (1959) negative difference whereby the conceptualization of the site as ‘independent’ is defined in contrast to other concepts within the system of language (in this case ‘the mall’). A binary relationship is formed between mall / non-mall, chain / non-chain, with each characterized by its negation to other signs within the system of language.

The relationship between the feel of the site and the management of the site (which in effect produces a particular atmosphere) are differentiated by the tenancy. This is not simply a divide between tenant types (cultural producers, gallery owners, retailers, etc.) but responds to individual understandings of the vision of the site and the ways in which this vision should be operationalized. The desire to differentiate the site from the banality of homogenous spaces of consumption is shared amongst the tenancy. However, how this difference is produced and practiced, varies. Returning to the strategy of differentiation as negation, this is a binary relation which produces negative difference in order to construct identity; the differences amongst the tenancy in the formation of identity speaks to the multiple chains of signification that are fashioned in the constitution of space. As one tenant suggests, “It’s like when we are no longer children, we are already dead, the same idea. If the Distillery is just a place where you have a lot
of mediocrity, I’d rather not have it, because it’s going to leave people with a not so good impression” (Shao-Pin Chu, Shao Design, personal interview).

The spatial identity of the Distillery as a distinct space struggles to appeal to a public conditioned to passively consume. The site differentiated itself from other shopping centres by emphasizing its unique pedestrian quarter, cultural prominence, and boutique charm, but it faced the challenge of combating the perceived (and real) exclusivity of the space. The perception of the district as an exclusive space is certainly present:

“They have strong support amongst the people who are active in the West Don Lands Committee and the organizations that are active. I think people don’t want to see it become a ‘Mc’ something or another, really just a fancy strip mall, or food court. I think the one thing that people in the neighborhood would say about it is that they’ve attracted a lot of high-end businesses and high-end restaurants and it makes it not as likely to be used by the neighborhood as an everyday resource….I think they need to grapple a bit with creating a little bit more of affordability in terms of food…the entertainment’s pretty affordable….I think they need to attract more people that will come on a repeat basis, more people from the neighborhood and people come and wander through it. You can go to Balzac’s and get coffee, but it’s still not quite a place where I would just say let’s go and get dinner at the Distillery District. I think there’s going to be eventually a big market, but [not] unless they change the concept a little bit. I guess in a way, it’s hypocritical: people love the concept, don't want to have to pay for it (Cynthia Wilkey, West Don Lands, personal interview).

Part of the perception of exclusivity comes from the lack of relationship between the site and the neighbourhoods which surround it (Corktown, St. Lawrence, Old Town). Indeed the purchase points are considerably higher in the district than elsewhere in the city (with the exception of high-end shopping locales such as Yorkville, Rosedale, and Forest Hill). In part, this is a product of the emphasis on independently produced wares (and rare and unique brands) as opposed to mass produced (and readily available) goods.
Many of the tenants whom I spoke with explained that shifting consumer interests toward small-scale production requires patience and education. In part this is due to the ways in which “[w]e passively consume everything, from toilet paper to culture” (G3, gallery operator). It is this passive consumption that makes the differentiation of qualities such as originality, creativity, and labour difficult to evaluate according to some tenants. In addition, as already suggested, aesthetic perception itself is temporal and relational, meaning that the evaluation of these qualities requires mediation. As an on-site goldsmith explains,

You can’t compare me to People’s Jeweler’s and Mappins [two large commercial chains] because they have huge amounts of resources in order to get their prices down. Whereas me you’re buying for product, you’re buying for design, you’re buying for quality, you’re buying for personal connectedness with the person, and you’re paying $60 an hour, that’s what I charge (Leif Benner, designer / goldsmith, personal interview).

A number of tenants echo that there is a disconnect between the production process and the point of sale. Most tenants agree that a re-evaluation of labour in the public imaginary is necessary; many try to establish this connection on-site by allowing consumers to observe the creative process, and through discussions with consumers at the point of sale regarding the labour process.

Beyond the education of consumers and the exclusivity of the Distillery brand, the district claims a unique experience of consumption wherein value is produced not only in the status of the commodity, but also in the status of the environment in which the commodity is acquired. Bourdieu (1984) situates the preference by (certain classes of) consumers for presentation or representation over necessity as holding the desire for distinction. This desire for distinction, in the case of the Distillery, is derived in part through the experience of the act of consumption. As Miles (2005: 892) suggests, “the
culture of the cultured class is cultivated; it is like the cultivation of taste in the 18th century; it is equally a way of life expressing the value of culture (or culture as a value) in acts of cultural consumption which extend beyond the visual and performing arts to design and architecture, new media, food and drink, fashion and modes of transport.” For example, in addition to buying gourmet high quality chocolate from SOMA at the Distillery, you are also buying an experience:

I very easily could have gone to Scarborough and gotten an industrial unit and started making chocolates and just wholesaling them. There’s sort of a feel to having a very cool space that you kind of open up and welcome people into, where they can get a better idea of what you’re all about, who you are, your products. It becomes more of a buying experience. The whole history, the bricks, the whole feel of the place, the post and beam, that was important to the feel that we were trying to achieve (David Castellan, SOMA, personal interview).

Similarly, Syd Beder of Lileo, a concept retail store at the site which sells ‘chain’ name brands describes the importance of display:

We tried to really keep the balance of our neighbors who are almost all art galleries, so we incorporate that into our showing of clothes. Every garment has a hand tag that we treat like a piece of art, so there’s a historical brief on each designer, when they started, where they’re from, and a little twenty word description of their influences, just like you may see on a piece of art (personal interview).

Beyond shaping the experience of consumption (from the perspective of the seller and not the consumer), the products on display also gain value via their placement at the site (on the basis of place marketing), and the context of their arrangement (where for example a contemporary art piece set against a stone wall produces a particular aesthetic). The desire by the tenancy to differentiate themselves and their products in the marketplace is also present in the renovations performed in each unit.
Creating Difference in Kind

Each tenant was not only hand-selected in order to prepare an atmosphere of distinction, they were also asked to perform their own renovations ensuring a difference in kind. *Difference in kind* refers to a qualitative discrimination between spaces based on their renovation.\(^\text{10}\) The first round of tenants re-cast the spaces of the Distillery to house a range of functions (with the exception of the Artscape tenants who moved into spaces which were already renovated to a basic level).\(^\text{11}\) In return for their investment, the majority of the tenants were offered lower rents for a specified period of time.\(^\text{12}\) Based on my interview data and site observation, conducting the renovations in this manner produced several outcomes: a) greater potential for long term stability (considering the level of investment procured by each tenant into their space and the return in rent reductions for a defined period of time); b) minimization of the risks associated with new districts for the developers (considering costs were shared with the tenancy); and c)

\(^\text{10}\)I am making the distinction here between difference in kind (a qualitative discrimination) versus difference in degree (a quantitative discrimination).

\(^\text{11}\)A number of the Artscape tenants transformed their studio spaces through interior design elements and / or by adding production equipment (in particular in the working studios). Given that the Case Goods Warehouse is not protected under heritage designation, there was a high degree of freedom in the renovation process.

\(^\text{12}\)After an agreed upon period of time (ranging from three years to ten years depending on the tenant), the rent was reevaluated at market value. Several tenants disclosed the marked jump in rents following this gestation period as placing a great deal of economic pressure on the performance of their business. For example, a tenant who was forced to leave the site due to financial difficulties disclosed that after the agreed upon period, his rent nearly doubled:

> Once my three years were up, the rent went up 40% which was not necessarily justifiable in terms of revenues and foot traffic. So still comparable mind you, rent wise and lower then a similar space on Queen West or King West, you know that’s where the galleries are, but we’re not there yet. It’s going to take some time to develop the site....who determines what market rate is? Market rate as far as I’m concerned should be determined at least in part on revenues and foot traffic and none of that was taken into consideration, regardless of the fact that they do get monthly statements as to what your revenues and sales are (Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery, personal interview).

The frustration over the extent of the rent increase for a tenant struggling to establish himself is evident in this narrative.
differentiation between spaces. The renovations ranged from those performed through sweat equity to multi-million dollar makeovers by renowned architects and designers, marking each of the spaces with a unique flavour. The nature of the buildings on the site allowed a certain degree of creative freedom during the renovation stage. Writing about Toronto’s cultural renaissance, Hume (2006) of the Toronto Star draws on the Distillery’s Young Centre for the Performing Arts, designed by the Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg firm, as an example of promising architecture in the City of Toronto which provides both form and content:

Projects such as the Young Centre in the Distillery District represent a new level of attention to the detail of our cultural infrastructure. Created out of two 19th-century redbrick boxes, this is a facility designed for maximum flexibility; every space can serve two, three or even more purposes. Architect Tom Payne managed to create a centre that combines enormous sensitivity to the context of this historic neighbourhood while establishing a robust sense of place.

The expansive industrial spaces of the Distillery provided a palette for this kind of experimentation. Shao Pin, a cultural producer who is located outside of the Artscape buildings, describes the strategy of the developers to catalyze development within the district:

Originally they wanted me to be on Trinity Street to take one of those spaces. They were all available besides Sandra Ainsley’s gallery and Balzac’s coffee…[The spaces] weren’t ready, and they were a little bit narrow and long. So I said John [Berman], do you have anything else? Finally he took me here [The Molasses Storage building]. They were hoping to develop the centre area first. They were hoping for me to occupy one of those spaces so I could make it work, so I could start to make things beautiful. That’s what [John] told me: ‘We have to bring artists so they can make places beautiful, so we can develop.’ So they were being honest. It’s too much work for them to do it by themselves …Besides if you have artists, every place is unique, because the artists will make the decision of how to arrange the spaces rather than the developers. So they finally took me here and so I decided that ok, this looks like an ideal space, it’s not that centred, not so much traffic, in fact
it’s the slowest spot of the Distillery… So I said ‘John, I like this place, I’m thinking if you can put a wall there, put a wall there’… I had to work with architects and all the contractors to work out the details and everything, so I pretty much designed my space and so it’s very nice, I like it. They gave me a water heater and two hoses, one for draining and one for plumbing, and that was it (Shao Pin Chu, Shao Design, personal interview).

Defining the site and differentiating its practices from “typical” spaces of consumption is conditioned, in part, through the renovations of the spaces. In order to provide a context for the differentiation between spaces, I want to detail some examples of the renovation process for different units. The Cooperage building is home to the Sandra Ainsley Gallery, which specializes in glass and mixed media from major contemporary artists (Figure 4.1). The atmosphere in this space is imaged by the press as a powerful display of fantasy, where delicate blown glass sculptures collide with images of industrial production (Goddard, 2002). Interestingly, it is also cited by one source as the ultimate date place (Bennett, 2005). Eleanor Brydone, who was involved in the restoration of the space, notes how their “design principle was to accept found archeological flaws revealed in the building’s century-old architecture” (cited in Breen, 2003: 44). The Corkin Gallery, a photography gallery housed in the Pure Spirit Building, provides a similar smack of visual appeal (Figure 4.2). Shim-Sutcliffe Architects were hired on for the project, and provide an impressive balance between artistic display and architectural detail. Jane Corkin, discusses the renovation work performed in her space as an excavation process,

they carved out these great big pillars, that these huge vats sat on at the distillery… and then dug down three feet so that we could get the height we needed to do the stairwells… the ceiling and the outside walls of course is all the original and the pillars. It has a very contemporary feel, the whole infrastructure is new… It feels beautiful when you come in, the sight lines are really quite exquisite (personal interview).
Figure 4.1: The Sandra Ainsley Gallery, The Cooperage, Post-renovation exhibiting works by Dale Chihuly. Images by Canadian Architect (2003) "Industrial Design" (http://www.cdnarchitect.com)


Distill, also housed in the Pure Spirit Building, blends the rawness of a space brought to life with a coat of paint (following years of use by the film industry, the walls were in too
much disrepair to sandblast) with a collection of paintings, ceramics, jewelry, and textiles created by local artisans.\textsuperscript{13} The Gibsone Jessop Gallery, housed in the Stone Distillery, took an industrial approach to return the space to its original form, stripping the walls of paint, and adding perforated steel as a hanging device in order to remain consistent with nineteenth century materials. Perigee Restaurant, known for its omakase gastronomic delights (where the patron entrusts the chef to personally select the courses), is housed in The Cannery building and incorporates a dropped open concept kitchen in a space which retains the historic beams and brickwork. The Young Centre for the Performing Arts bridges two tank houses (Tank House 9 & 10) to form an impressive array of theatre and rehearsal spaces (Figure 4.3), and Lileo, a concept retail store, fosters exploration and movement through lighting effects and design elements in The Maltings building (Syd Bedder, personal interview).

These spaces document physical creativity at the site as visual arcade. The renovation of the spaces prepares a difference in kind, and supports the individuality of the site. At times, eyes are drawn, at a level of distraction, to exposed brick walls, industrial piping, and raw ceilings. While this is all part of the exploration of the site, the beginning stages following the opening in 2003 were characterized by visitors more interested in the physicality of the spaces than the functions which filled them. This was due to the entry of a collection of Victorian architecture into the urban imaginary, previously hidden from the public gaze. The connection established between the physical site and the public was important given the isolation of the distillery from the downtown corridor. While roaming eyes are less common in the spaces today, there are still

\textsuperscript{13} Distill moved to another unit on site subsequent to the interview (Building No. 47)
Figure 4.3: Young Centre for the Performing Arts. The Young Centre combined two tank houses to form a network of performance spaces (personal photo).

occasions when this way of seeing is found, a point I will return to later in the chapter. The classification of the site as a space of independents carrying rare and one-of-a-kind wares, works to catalyze consumption through a particular type of distinction: to be a consumer in this space is not simply to consume an object at the purchase point, it is also the collection of an experience and an identity. The tenancy works to understand the weight of these terms and their conditions for consumption while creating new layers of atmosphere, meaning, and representation through their own practices.

In the next two sections, the notion of place differentiation is analyzed through two additional elements which form the Distillery brand: culture and heritage. Whereas in the previous chapter I focused on the top down planning and governance of these
components, in this section I search for aberrations from the construction of unity in practice.

**Culture as Commonality: Creative Homologies / Creative Aberrations**

I think the site’s got a lot of value. I think it’s got a lot of potential. I don’t think there’s enough imagination or creativity in terms of what the site lends itself to (Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery, personal interview).

The arts and culture sector is used strategically at the Distillery as a coherent visual representation, smoothed into positive expressions that lend credence and distinction to the redevelopment. On the official website, the mission statement for the site reads as follows:

- **Our Mission** is to develop The Distillery as Canada's premier arts, culture and heritage precinct;
- To nurture The Distillery as a burgeoning creative zone, providing a forum for artists and creative industries and a platform where ideas can be performed, displayed and developed; and
- Together with its tenants and partners, we will continually strive to recreate The Distillery, thereby encouraging a natural evolution of products and ideas ultimately inspiring Torontonians and visitors from across the globe (www.thedistillerydistrict.com).

This is a depoliticization of “culture” wherein it is drawn into a top-down governance of space for profit maximization. Each of the tenants contributes to the cultural identity of the site, but how these contributions are labeled and by whom is a key aspect in understanding the nuances at play. Understandings of the meaning of culture emerging from the tenants are multifaceted.

The addition of the Young Centre for the Performing Arts – a joint venture between George Brown’s Theatre School and Soulpepper Theatre Company in 2006 –
lent a cultural pulse to the site and ensured return visitors through the sale of subscription packages. Many of the tenants position the inception of the Young Centre as anchoring the original vision. Despite the incorporation of a new cultural web of theatres\textsuperscript{14}, the named function of the Distillery as a centre for everything ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ led to tensions over the compatibility of these terms. What was the vision of culture for the space and who was defining this aspect? How was it differentiated from other spaces of art throughout the city such as Queen Street, Yorkville, Harbourfront, The Junction, and King Street? What was the relationship to entertainment in a site predicated on the arts? Did the site remain a space of creative energy, pushing at the boundaries of art, or had it fallen into the throes of entertainment, where festivity reigned supreme?

When I asked art gallery owners and cultural producers where they thought the strongest art scene in Toronto is at present, most pointed to Queen Street, Yorkville, and in some cases Harbourfront Centre and King Street. For example, one gallery operator responded by stressing popularity, “Right now, I think it’s still Queen [Street West]. Anyone who comes to Toronto, they know about the Queen area, even though there’s not that good of art going on there, but it’s still famous” (Fay Athari, Arta Gallery, personal interview). These selections represent well established art scenes in the city and leave out emerging, avant garde areas such as the Junction. A few interviewees selected the Distillery, noting the mix of arts and culture practices (including performance spaces) as differentiating the site from other art districts. Present in these responses was the perceived commercialization plaguing other arts spaces in the city, and the suggestion

\textsuperscript{14} Prior to the addition of the Young Centre on site, there were several theatre groups housed in the Artscape buildings.
that while the Distillery is still in the process of building itself, it is emerging as a strong site for cultural production and consumption. Another gallery operator compared the district to other art scenes:

I don’t think that there’s just one art scene in Toronto. There’s a lot of talent in the east end. Obviously Queen West still has a great sort of Indie art scene. Up in Yorkville it’s very different but there are still some pretty wonderful galleries up there, although I don’t think the artists are there. Down here I think because there are galleries and artists. I think they are all quite different...I think that quite unlike Queen West where there’s a lot of independent and new galleries, what’s happened here is that there’s some really established dealers that are some of the anchor tenants they are a different field and they’re renowned internationally. Not to say that there’s a hierarchy, but I think that their clientele is very different than those who are visiting Queen West. I don't know, they’re different (G1).

These groupings of tenants noted that lease rates at the Distillery were lower in comparison to other arts districts which attracted them to the site initially. Most highlight a disjuncture between their initial understandings of the vision of the site put forth by the developers and the practice of this vision since the public opening. This has led to some acute tensions at the site where some tenants feel they were brought in under false pretenses: “Their [the developers] vision of the site is to capitalize on old buildings to make a lot of money. I don’t know how that will finally play out... if the vision should have been something else to be profitable then they shouldn’t have brought all the arts here” (A2, Artscape tenant).

Each of the tenants contributes to the cultural identity of the site, but how these contributions are labeled and by whom is a key aspect in understanding the internal operations. The discourse of culture is complicated in practice by: a) the relations between art galleries and the retailers; b) the festival and event season; and c) cultural producers as tokens.
Two Worlds Apart: Rifts between Tenant Types

The tenuous relationship between art galleries and retail stores on the site exemplifies the contradictions present in the named function of the site (in particular its function as an “arts and culture” and as an “entertainment” precinct). Tensions between these two tenant types are not felt ubiquitously, but where they are present, they articulate issues surrounding the overall vision of the site and unequal power relations. A recent tenant to the site who operates an art gallery and a retail store offers his perception of these relations:

there’s a certain tension that exists between the gallery group and the retail group…My sense is the gallery group…have a clientele, when they have things to offer them they invite them down. The retail side is much more interested in people, traffic, if 200 walk by their shop on a given day they’re going to do better than if 42 walk by… I think there’s a bit of a tension between those two communities. We’ve had a couple of tenant meetings where you can just feel it in the air. I sort of smile (Wayne Parrish, The Sport Gallery, personal interview).

During the interviews, several of the retailers noted their minority status at the site, suggesting that if more retail spaces were added, their needs might be better addressed. At the time of the interviews in 2007, there were 20 retail spaces at the site and 13 art galleries (Distilled 07 Guide). While these statements are directed at the balance (an aspect which will further shift once the condominiums are completed and more ground level retail is added), it is apparent that what is at stake is voice, rather than numbers. As one retail tenant suggests, the art gallery operators yield more power at the site than the retailers, and are able to direct decision making processes that are best suited to their needs:

It’s a tough go here for retail cause you have a split, almost down the middle between retail and galleries. You get gallery people who are a different breed, they tend to look down more on retail people. (The tenant
meetings] were controlled almost entirely by the gallery owners, and that’s when the whole basis of the Distillery changed last year, because the gallery owners took a lot of control off of management here (R2).

The rift between the art gallery owners and the retailers, regardless of its concreteness, emerges due to the distinct visions carried by these factions. The change at the Distillery that the tenant is referring to was a shift in the festival season, a point I will return to shortly. The nature of the categories “art gallery” and “retailer” work to further conceal divisions. For example, some of the galleries at the site are well established, drawing international audiences, while others are newly formed enterprises. At least four (current and past tenants) are members of the Art Dealers Association of Canada (ADAC), which holds status and credibility within the arts community. The hierarchy within this faction leads to ruptures within and across tenants. There is a perception that this status imparts judgement on the value of emerging galleries. One of the member galleries outlines the separation between different types of galleries on the site:

I kind of mentioned the Art Dealers Association Members. I think we probably stick together, but I think we are more on the same level or playing field….What’s nice is that…we’re all at the same level but doing different work, so we each sort of complement each other nicely and there are some clients that cross over, others that don’t. I know in my opinion it would be nice to get [additional galleries] on that level to really anchor the site as a visual arts cultural destination. Right now it’s still a bit removed ….And then there’s the whole other tier of galleries that are great, but it’s different. A different way of doing business, but yeah, it’s good that they’re here, but I don’t really go into them that often (G4).

The relationships formed amongst gallery tenants are multifarious, where connections are drawn through shared positions including membership (such as the ADAC), experience (emerging / established), and styles and genres (contemporary / modern / sculpture / photography). Similarly, there are different positions amongst the retailers, where some have long term experience in the sector and others are newly formed enterprises. These
differences amongst the tenants offer a unique space for emerging and established businesses to interact and learn from one another. Interestingly, according to the majority of the tenants, the site is not conducive to these forms of social / cultural transaction. This perception is dependent on one’s position, where for example, an owner of a new art gallery at the site (as opposed to the relocation of an already established gallery) is more likely to provide evidence of this form of mentoring. Asked why these relationships are not materializing, most tenants cite failed attempts (such as joint events, shared sales promotions) to establish connections and the independent status of the businesses (which breeds strong personalities that are more individually focused), as factors which are not conducive to these practices. Also raised is the fallout between Cityscape and its initial financial backer in 2003, which stalled the redevelopment process and threw the tenancy into an unstable position. Lastly, the cycles of new tenants coming on to the site at varying stages and others leaving makes forging these relations difficult according to some tenants. For example, the early tenants (on site prior to 2004) describe the initial years as more favourable to these forms of exchange:

I think initially everybody knew everybody down here cause there were so few of us and I think there was a strong sense of community and I think now there have been so many tenants move in [over] the last year that I don't know who’s who anymore, I recognize them but I don’t know where to place them yet. And then some of the initial tenants too have left...so recently there has just been this injection of new people onto the site so that’s really changed it a little bit. It doesn’t feel small like it used to (G1, gallery operator).

For example, some of the retailers who I interviewed discussed a desire to work with others in the sector for holiday sales. In addition, an Art Crawl was established by the developers, similar to the Arts Walk in Yorkville (and elsewhere) where galleries stay open one night of the month to encourage site visitation, and artistic exploration with the hopes that the art galleries would take over this initiative. The transfer of ownership of this event never materialized. As an art gallery operator notes, “It’s a challenge though to get people on board, because everybody is busy developing their own business” (G2).
While discrepancies are sure to arise in the social formation of a site such as the Distillery, many of the issues present in the relationships drawn between tenants reflect contradictions over the definitions of space.

*Entertaining Culture or Culturing Entertainment?*

As Horkheimer and Adorno (2001: 143) suggest, “The fusion of culture and entertainment that is taking place today leads not only to a deprivation of culture, but inevitably to an intellectualization of amusement.” Culture is robbed of its political function, replaced by the doctrine of amusement. Amusement works as a manipulative force, where it “becomes an ideal, taking the place of the higher things of which it completely deprives the masses by repeating them in a manner even more stereotyped than the slogans paid for by advertising interests” (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2001: 143-4). In other words, culture is depoliticized and amusement is hollowed of any measure of entertainment. Horkheimer and Adorno are responding to the mass production of entertainment for commercial intent (including film, television, music) which is constructed through a formulaic and standardized set of properties to distract the masses, as opposed to more localized forms of amusement. Similarly they distinguish between *mass* culture (commercially oriented) and “authentic” culture (politically / culturally oriented cultural production). While these theorizations of culture and entertainment are useful in differentiating the nature of production and the aims and intentions (whether political, cultural, economic, social) underlying particular activities, the divisions are less pronounced in practice. At present, articulations of “authentic” culture are used to derive value in a period where creativity and culture are highly valued entities in urban policy.
programming (as economic catalysts). In other words, “authentic” culture is at times commercially oriented. Similarly, localized amusement is complicated by global flows which transform local entities into global brands (consider Bilbao). In this section I focus on how the boundary between terms (culture and entertainment) is multiply articulated based on one’s cultural and economic position at the site.

Multiple articulations of culture and entertainment are raised by the tenancy. Clear divisions emerge in terms of how retailers and galleries understand the programming of festivals and events. In general, festivals and events that garner an expanded consumer base are preferred by retailers, whereas gallery operators often view these events as leading to the demise of the district through the dilution of the cultural vision. Speaking about the dual function of culture and entertainment at the Distillery, Bruce Rosensweet of Artscape ascribes the separation to diction: some theatre goers think they are attending entertainment, others think it’s a cultural event (personal interview).

In addition, cultural producers in the district often feel excluded from the programming, a condition which works to further isolate this faction of tenants. The everyday life of the site in the first couple of years was interjected with everything from rib festivals and dog fests, to modern dance performances and high-end fashion shows. Most tenants point to the messiness of Woofstock where dogs and their owners collected throughout the site, and Ribs Fest where beer drinking and sticky fingers led to product damage, to illustrate the lack of integrity and vision associated with the Distillery and the ‘out of place’ function of some of the practices that temporarily fill the space:

There were very few people who liked Woofstock. One complete, excuse the French, a complete shit show was what that was…We had dogs jumping on [products in the store], people just expected that. We ended up asking people to leave their dogs outside, and that upset a lot of people.
When that finally got cancelled, we were happy to see that go (R1, retailer).

…they did a rib festival one summer…We have an organic raw food inspired juice bar, it’s not totally raw food, but it’s primarily that. We don’t serve red meat. One day when they had the rib festival, some people were using our space…and it was disgusting and they just didn’t get it. It’s because it’s that kind of thought process, that they would have a rib festival down here where there’s art galleries, you know, they’re selling million dollar pieces of glass, and it just doesn’t quite work. The kinds of things that they should be doing here should elevate the site, not pull it down (Syd Beder, Lileo, personal interview).

The festivals and events also produce tensions between the cultural producers and the developers. There is a perception of exclusion, particularly in relation to programming emphasizing artistic production. Following a decision by Cityscape to position the Distillery as a key zone in Nuit Blanche, a festival which celebrates artistic practice in the City of Toronto, allegations were raised that the inclusion of Artscape was an afterthought: “They sent us a memo asking people ‘oh by the way if any of you want to participate in Nuit Blanche, you can participate though the deadline was last week’…Then after people went ‘what?!?’ then [the organizers of Nuit Blanche] extended the deadline for the Distillery” (T1, Artscape theatre tenant). According to another Artscape tenant, cultural producers were not invited to participate in the programming for Luminato either (T2, Artscape theatre tenant). The lack of consultation with on-site cultural producers for cultural events that focus on creativity and artistic practice such as Luminato and Nuit Blanche, is a fairly common occurrence in cultural programming.

Despite the lack of consultation, most of the Artscape tenants who I interviewed focused on the positive returns garnered from participation in arts focused events, including the collaboration and community building that ensues within the spaces.
Others however position this exclusion as a further example of the power exercised over cultural producers:

If the artistic tenants of the Distillery were not included than what the hell are they doing [in response to Nuit Blanche]? They’re trying to create their own art, these corporate people are trying to do their own thing, which fine, I think everyone should have the opportunity to try and create something, an artistic feeling or an artistic event. Go for it, that’s fantastic, you have more money to do it than I do, but…there’s things that we could do…they [Cityscape] see us all as a whole, as opposed to individual tenants. So we're treated that way, ‘oh you guys.’ That’s a problem. (T1, Artscape theatre tenant)

While the frustration in this instance is directed foremost towards event programming, the feeling of tokenism at the site extends beyond temporary festivities.

A hierarchy is replicated within the arts community itself. As an example, art carts – stalls that are rented by off-site cultural producers from Cityscape to sell their wares – that once lined the streetscape of the site for a couple of weekends in the summer months faced so much opposition that they were first moved out of sight, and then scaled back, and then entirely removed for the season (2006-2007). The art carts have since been reintroduced onto the site in concentrated areas. The temporary stalls of art created competition for gallery owners and Artscape tenants who paid consistent rent and lost revenue on some of the most popular weekends of the season. There is clearly a valuation of art that is taking place alongside these economic concerns. The stalls are described as “touristy,” the works as “street art” and the artists as “untalented” by a number of tenants. Criticism is directed at the program for threatening the vision of the site:

Anyone with an application could get an art cart. Again the work was not up to standard…it was very sort of crafty, it wasn't interesting…speaking personally, it competes with the initial vision of the site (G4, gallery operator).
It doesn’t make sense to see, in front of Sandra Ainsley, somebody having a little cart selling glass bracelets for a hundred dollars when she has better known art. I’m not sure it adds anything to the site…the people who are buying the art carts aren’t making any money, to be sure…cause I talk to them all the time (Jane Corkin, Corkin Gallery, personal interview).  

The direct competition of the Art Carts was also felt by Artscape tenants, who were forced to differentiate themselves, and their works, from what was being sold in the stalls:

The art carts that they have outside, that has become the public face of artists selling their work on the site and I’m not sure if all of the artists make their own stuff. I don’t know…I just feel like it’s not very well juried. Like they sell their work for a lot less than anyone in this building and they used to be right in front of our building so that was really direct competition for us and, I think, decreased sales for a lot of the artists on the ground floor (A1, Artscape tenant).

However, others disagree. As one artist suggests, “A clientele that walks through and buys art work whether it’s $500 or $10,000 is still a cultural buyer” (Marjolyn van der Hart, impressionist artist, personal interview). The art carts were highly favoured by the retail tenants who noted the change in the ambiance of the site with their addition, and the cross section of customers that they attracted. As a retailer suggests, the art carts program is another example of how much power is wielded by the art galleries on the site:

[The Art Carts] gives you something to look at when you’re walking around between stores. I don’t care if you’re selling, or you’re hawking, what some people would term ‘crap’….We’ve had instances with gallery owners who come out and they said ‘that’s crap, you shouldn't be allowed to show that, it’s bad art, it’s crap.’ Those gallery owners have been cited

---

16 To provide some context for how the art carts program is governed, the application process for the ‘Artisan Market’ in 2009 includes three sessions which range from eight weekends in the early summer months (May-July) for $1575.00, to four weekends in September for $525.00 (Distillery District, ‘Artisan Market,’ 2009). If the applicant is selected by management, the vendor must conform to a set of rules and regulations including set hours, approval by management for all merchandise for sale and on display, and minimal food and drink consumption while working at the stall.
for it from the Distillery management, that it’s not their right to do that (R2).

There are competing discourses at the site evident in conversations with the tenancy regarding vision, aesthetic perception, and merit. While certain events and festivals (Woofstock, Ribs Fest, and the Art Carts) received a great deal of criticism, the Jazz Festival, Nuit Blanche, and Luminato emerge fairly consistently as worthwhile happenings across the tenancy.

The contradiction of these festive practices with the vision of the site was taken up by some media outlets. Writing as a guest columnist for the National Post, Vaughan (2005) represented the Distillery as “that insta-community at the swampy bottom of the east end better known for its cocktail jazz concerts and doggy dress-up parades than its cultural vigour.” By questioning the cultural merit of the site, this article injects incongruity into the glossy representation. However, it also misleads the readership by leaving out the cultural production taking place at the site by the artisans within the Artscape buildings. In this sense, if the cultural vigour of the site is in question, why is attention placed squarely on the consumptive side (the galleries)?

Inclusivity for Public Scrutiny? Cultural Production as a Tokenistic Device

There is a continued lack of recognition that there are cultural producers at the Distillery. For example, in the interviews that I conducted with Artscape tenants, some wondered if the tenancy at large even knows that they are there, let alone the media and the public. In part, this is a product of inappropriate signage directing visitors to the Case Goods Warehouse and the Cannery:
The signage is really bad, and most people don’t know what this building is and they don’t know that it has four floors. There’s no sign that directs you to the stairs and there’s no elevator…As artists renting these spaces, no one’s promised promotion to us, but I think as the Distillery District, it would be really great to promote the fact that there are artist studio spaces here, as well as plays (A1, Artscape tenant).

Given that there are over 60 units contained within these two buildings, it is surprising that this lack of publicity / signage continues. Artscape speaks for all of its tenants in negotiations with the district. It is the representative force for any problems and / or concerns that arise. While this arrangement ensures consistency, it excludes cultural producers from the decision making processes at tenant meetings and other forums. While able to attend these meetings, the Artscape tenants are marginalized: “We don’t have a voice right. So in fact some people have brought up issues at tenant meetings and gotten shut down because you’re Artscape, you don’t even pay rent to us, so shut up” (Leif Benner, designer / goldsmith, personal interview). These unequal power relations create frustration for many of the Artscape tenants, who work to negotiate their role in on-site affairs.

Cultural producers are attracted to the site for a range of reasons. While the most prominent response to ‘why did you decide to locate in the Distillery’ is affordability (through the umbrella of Artscape) and access to a base of consumers, there are a number of other factors at play. Many of the respondents note their desire to locate in a social space:

I wanted a pretty raw space and I also really wanted something that had a community of some sort. The extent to which I would engage myself, I didn’t know, but I like having people of like interest around (A2, Artscape tenant).
In addition, the history of the site creates a particular aesthetic which is attractive for many artists: “I mean it’s a beautiful place there. I really like the building. It’s nice to just walk down there, get your coffee and go to work. It had a nice feel to it” (John Booth, Bookhou Design, personal interview). Similarly, as another artist suggests:

What I love so much, is looking out the windows at the old streets and the angles of the light, because it’s all visual for me…I look over an alleyway, and during the summer, your window’s open, you have voices coming from the street…It’s amazing. Pretty phenomenal. And people go ‘oh, you’re in the Distillery, how fantastic, it’s such a great hot spot.’ That’s not it at all. It’s much more…[like] the angles of the buildings and the visuals…that kind of thing (Marjolyn van der Hart, impressionist painter, personal interview).

Cultural producers must also negotiate the voyeuristic gaze by visitors to the site. “After a while, I just felt like I was in a nature preserve for artists rather than an actual place. Like everything was in quotations” notes one artisan (John Booth, Bookhou Design, personal interview). This way of seeing is reinforced by the layout of the spaces. The first floor of the Case Goods Warehouse forms a direct relation to the public with units encased with glass walls; the upper levels of the building include oblong shaped windows to allow individuals passing by to peer in at the stages of creation. Some tenants welcome this way of seeing, and others actively circumvent the conditions of display by covering the windows with paper or cloth in order to mediate the gaze. While many cultural producers consider their presence on the site to be tokenistic, there are trade offs associated with the position, including proximity to a high end consumer base resultant from the high end galleries / retailers / theatres / restaurants, long-term stability, space and potential creative exchange. As one artisan explains:

I’m thankful. I feel a little bit used, but well worth it. I didn’t have to sell out. I get a space for a reduced rent, and I get to do whatever the hell I want, and it turns out that people like my product and I do pretty well…I
have a healthy respect for the balance between artist integrity and capitalist money making…This to me is a good balance, being their token artist but getting prime retail space for a lot less than out there (Leif Benner, designer / goldsmith, personal interview).

Others note how the curious gaze of visitors infuses their individual spaces with energy, and fosters a direct relation with an audience:

It’s actually pretty interesting because there are times in the summer that I open up the door and there are lots of people walking through the hallway. It’s like you’re on display and you’re working on display. You’ve got Germans and Japanese tourists who want to take pictures and that’s a funny experience. They don’t buy. There’s no buying, but what I really love about it, is I see it as infusing energy in my space (Marjolyn van der Hart, impressionist artist, personal interview).

The feeling of being on display is also tied into knowledge production for some tenants.

As the following artist explains, the act of display is a form of arts education:

[I]t’s up to us to educate the public [about art]…I spent a few years at Harbourfront and it’s really hard when you are on display and they’re [the public] going to ask us stupid questions, because they don’t know. It’s a real catch 22 because out of maybe ten people, you’ll get one person who will be a client, but you have to deal with those nine people just to get that one person, so it’s difficult…At Harbourfront, I would just ignore them because they couldn’t really enter the space, they just sort of saw you from outside, whereas this one [the Distillery] they’re able to enter the space, you have to interact with them (Arounna Khounnoraj, Bookhou Design, personal interview).

Cultural producers are included at the site as workers and transformative actors, where the focus is on the consumptive aspects of creation, display, and commodity. In order for the art establishment in this space to avoid complete commodification, cultural producers must constantly refashion themselves with works that experiment, create, and actively challenge. Without this base, as Vaughan (2004) suggests “the district could quickly become little more than an upscale crafts and knick-knacks depot,” giving in to the containment of art as an aesthetic ideal rather than a political act. Given that the site
transformed almost overnight from an industrial space into a destination, the resemblance of the site to a “pre-fab art district” (Vaughan, 2004) will present a challenge to the cultural producers who are contained in a space that encourages conspicuous consumption. Cultural producers are geographically isolated, where they occupy two buildings at the southern end of the site. The separation between production (the Artscape tenants, theatre) and consumption (the art galleries, retailers, restaurants) works to reinforce feelings of tokenism. Other forms of production were present during the early stages of redevelopment. Mill Street Brewery for example opened in 2002 in one of the many tank houses. While the venture initially included the production of handcrafted beers on-site, most of the production operations have since moved off-site to a location in Scarborough. The success of the brewery demanded a more expanded set of operations and more space. The company continues to operate a store and brew pub on location, retaining the affiliation, but this venture now falls under the auspice of cultural consumption.

While “culture” emerges as a key force in the production of distinction at the Distillery, the ways in which this term is used to lend coherence, and the ways in which this term is performed by the tenancy highlights the contradictions inherent in the naming process (where does culture end and entertainment begin?). Infighting between tenant types and the festival and event season demonstrate how the different visions for the site that work to define space are contradictory. The place of artists at the site is indicative of a tactic of inclusivity to redirect the public gaze. The contradictions present within the meanings of “culture” are also present within the construction of “heritage”: both are contained and conditioned to valorize real estate.

17 As an exception, Shao Design, jewelry and design, is housed on the site at large.
Preserving History and Building Condominiums

[S]aving beautiful old buildings has immense public appeal, like apple pie and motherhood (McClelland, 2005).

The aesthetics of history are incorporated at the site as an anchor for transformation, and as a backdrop to consumption, wherein visual demarcations of history are recycled for their sensory value. As Jane Jacobs (1961: 188) argues “Old ideas can sometimes use new buildings. New ideas must use old buildings.” In relation to the Distillery, a more appropriate statement might read: high-end products and services benefit from the symbolic capital of old buildings in the contemporary period. This is not to critique the underlying premise of Jacobs statement: that there are high costs of overhead associated with new construction and that in order to support a diverse economy, old buildings can offer lower costs, lower rents, and appropriate spaces for a range of functions. Zukin (1982) has demonstrated in similar fashion, the appropriateness of old industrial spaces for arts related activities, where they provide large unordered spaces which are conducive to the project of reordering. The ability for old buildings to function as a provision for a diverse economy, as Jacobs (1961) notes, depends upon their condition: museum pieces and renovated spaces are less likely to support lower-end products and services. The intention of the Distillery was never to create a diverse economy. It is difficult in a master plan of this nature to implement economic diversity. The inclusion of Artscape was a recognition of the cultural capital (and catalytic function) associated with, and produced by, the arts; the decision to renovate and expand an historic district was a recognition of the symbolic capital associated with the structural transactions of the economy.
For many of the tenants on site, under guard to contain historical and industrial features through the injection of artifact into the veins of the walls and floors regardless of its appropriateness in the space, and to carefully excavate the interior organs (pipes, bricks, woodwork), the past is always already safely out of reach from the present. Throughout the early part of the redevelopment, there was broad acceptance of the goals of Cityscape to re-energize the district. More recently, the construction of the first condominium tower (Phase 1: Pure Spirit) and plans for the construction of two more phases of development (Phase 2: Clear Spirit & Phase 3: Gooderham and the ribbon building) at the south-east boundary of the site, has challenged the uncontested status of this relationship. While in part, the residential stage of the redevelopment is a necessary hinge to support the restorative efforts that preceded it, the extent of the expansion is less clear.18

The new construction also illustrates the valuation of history at the site, where it can be contained and priced as amenity. By enveloping the heritage resource, the towers stand to protect time. The marketing strategy for the condominiums proceeds via what Bourdieu (1991) terms a ‘neutralized language,’ a tactic used to create consensus. Recourse to a neutralized language is obligatory whenever it is a matter of establishing a practical consensus between agents or groups of agents having partially or totally different interests. This is the case, of course, first and foremost in the field of legitimate political struggle, but also in the transactions and interactions of everyday life (Bourdieu, 1991: 40).

18 The amount of resources available in Toronto to redevelop heritage properties on the scale of the Distillery is minimal. The project required residential and / or commercial expansion on some level for economic viability. As Pam McConnell, the local councilor for the area suggests, “If we were in Montreal or Quebec City, we’d have proper heritage preservation funding that would say ‘We don’t need any of that.’ But the reality is, to finance heritage infrastructure (in Toronto) we have to do it on the backs of some additional development” (cited in Vincent, 2008).
Within the marketing material, the history of the site provides a sense of spectacle where it works to prop up a discourse of distinction.

In this section, I examine the marketing material produced for Pure Spirit, Clear Spirit, and the Gooderham Condominiums before shifting attention to the role of history in the context of expansion. I argue that the assembly of “heritage” at the site functions as a legitimating tool for capitalist expansion, despite its potential to act as an anchor for knowledge production and dissemination within a wider public. This is a singularization of history for commercial gain.

*Marketing Newness out of the Refuse*

On the southern edge of the site of the Pure Spirit Condominium, a temporary wall buffers the construction. Placed on the wall are two signs, one indicating the presence of more shops adjacent to the construction, and the other collecting a number of quotes, from political activists – Noam Chomsky and Nelson Mandela – to poets and musicians – Cyndi Lauper, Billy Joel, and Louis Armstrong (Figure 4.4). One of the most visible of the quotes, separated from the others reads “Anyone who lives within their means suffers from a lack of imagination, Oscar Wilde.” The juxtaposition of the quotes at the forefront of the construction site prepares a series of signifiers that, when read according to their placement, speak to the possibility of space to be reinvented. Yet the connection between the voices appears uncharacteristic: what is the symbiosis between Walt Disney, “It’s kind of fun to do the impossible” and Noam Chomsky, “If we don’t believe in freedom of expression for people we despise, we don’t believe in it at

---

19 The temporary wall has been dismantled since the time of writing this chapter in order to complete the landscaping of Pure Spirit. The presence of the signs on the wall for roughly a year during construction efforts justifies its placement in this discussion.
Figure 4.4: A temporary wall encloses the construction of Pure Spirit with visionary appeal (personal photo).
all”? All of the quotes despite the context from which they emerged (whether a political moment and / or a cultural expression, a song, a poem, a speech) celebrate freedom to think, to create, and to believe, and are homogenized under the commodity sign. The potential that someone walking past the sign will connect with one of the quotes is high, considering the assortment. Coherence is rendered apparent via a (parallel) celebration of the site as pushing the boundaries of creativity and cultural expression. The statements work to produce a sense of inspiration that is carried into the construction of a creative dweller for the condominium units. Promotional material for the condominiums stresses originality, creativity, and pleasure. The Pure Spirit Condominium plays off of the term “pure” in its marketing strategy, with the catchphrase “pure history, pure artistry, pure culture, pure pleasure” (Promotional Brochure, Pure Spirit Lofts and Condos). Potential buyers are directed towards the uniqueness of the site:

Never has Toronto’s past promised a more exciting future. It’s all happening here in the Distillery District. The single most unique corner of the city. Electric. Eclectic. Alive. A place where brick streets will meet shimmering glass towers. Where the industrial buildings of yesterday will blend with the modern homes of tomorrow (Promotional Brochure, Pure Spirit Lofts and Condos).

In the promotional material for all three condominiums, the images feature individuals shopping, eating and being entertained, interior and exterior shots of the site, and building specs. From these visual constructions, the creative dweller is overwhelmingly young, hip, middle to upper class, and white. The promise of an ‘exciting future’ for Toronto is directed towards a particular ‘public’ who are invited to join the energy and excitement of the site. While exclusion may be positioned as a byproduct of the goals of preservation (see Duncan and Duncan, 2001), the results appear the same whether intentional or
otherwise. Negation (as a mode of exclusion) operates within the projection of unity (the future for Toronto).

The practice of neutralizing language through “visionary” appeal is taken up by Gissen (2006) in a review of the latest extension at Baltimore’s American Visionary Art Museum (AVAM) which is dedicated to the works of James Rouse, philanthropist and urban developer. Rather than taking a critical stance on Rouse’s often controversial projects (including the Rouse Company’s festival marketplace template), the museum celebrates his legacy as a visionary:

As the Visionary Village conflates a variety of urban agents and their labour into an image of expressive urbanism, the exhibition on Rouse conflates business acumen, political activism, and scientific insight in an essentialized image of individual genius. Simply by making ‘us’ think in new ways and by being different from ‘us,’ visionaries, according to the museum’s curators, ranging from one of the twentieth century’s great postcolonial political philosophers and the man who provided a space for Hooters in Baltimore, share a kind of thought process (Gissen, 2006: 257).

By critically engaging with the conflation of “thought” at both the Distillery and at AVAM, the underlying effect of these statements is clear: the visionaries valorize real estate development. This point is echoed in Gissen’s (2006: 258) observations, that if one peers out the windows of the Rouse Center, which was adapted from a nineteenth-century whiskey barrel warehouse, one can actually see material evidence of the very redevelopment of the harbor that Rouse initiated in the 1960s and that the museum continues today. Since the construction of the museum, real-estate values on the south side of the harbor have skyrocketed.

What the spaces share in common is they draw on innovators, people thinking beyond the box, to build a creative atmosphere. Inspiring consumption and neutralizing causality by deflecting attention away from exclusivity and towards the possibilities contained in the power of the quotes is intentional. The assemblage of signifiers that work to collect
possibility is carried into the marketing material for the Gooderham Condominiums where the anonymity of expression runs fervidly:

The Distillery District. Thirteen acres of brick lined streets, sunny piazzas and historic Victorian architecture. Here, lake breezes replace exhaust fumes. The unique is celebrated. The mundane is banished. The Distillery District is energetic and stylish with a reputation for cool. Who says so? USA Today, Toronto Life, National Geographic and The Globe. Galleries and performances present the artistic spectrum. Cuisine is exuberant and inventive. Shopping defies categories and is filled with possibilities. If this place were a person, they’d be creative, romantic, eclectic and thoroughly original. It’s the last building going up in Toronto’s most coveted and talked about neighbourhood (Distilled 2008 Guide, back cover).

While the ad references the “originality” of the site, it speaks to an anonymous referent. The anonymity of the ad works in a similar fashion to the collection of statements from visionary figures in that it displaces a system of differentiation. If “The Distillery District” or “Toronto” were removed as geographical identifiers, this ad could stand in for places around the world. But the generality of the message opens up the possibility that readers will connect to one aspect of the campaign, either the sense of differentiation promoted (aspects that defy and invent) and / or the personification of place (a mimicry of a classified ad). The iron gates and the security guards who work to secure the space at the northern entrance present an image of the site that negates possibility, invention, and the defiance of categories. These symbols and codes demarcate private (controlled) space signifying separation, boundedness, and surveillance. Stories recounted in the interviews with tenants regarding the illegal activities on site prior to and during the initial stages of the redevelopment include theft, drug trafficking, and prostitution circles. One gallery operator narrates the continued safety issues surrounding night time staff:

---

20 These narratives during the interviews were offered in camera. The lack of security for the site during the initial period and the widespread theft resulted in the loss of a great number of historical items.
If we have events until late at night, even twelve o’clock at night, we don’t have a bus to take. I pay for a cab to take my staff, they’re mostly girls, because I don’t want them to go through...This part of the city when we just opened was very iffy...it was like kind of a bad part of town and to a certain extent, it still is, if you just move a little bit. So it’s not a fun place for a girl walking out at twelve o’clock at night. When I put them here for an event, to run a venue, I feel my obligation is for the security of my staff to pay for a cab, and I think it shouldn’t be like this (G2).

These narratives provide a sense of materiality to the site, as a space that is imperfect and in process, by (inadvertently) drawing attention to the displacement of a prior community and to the ruptures of building (aspects that disrupt the spell of consumption). They situate the Distillery as part of a broader gentrification of the city of Toronto which is shifting the geography of poverty away from the downtown corridor. The packaging of place works via the production of distinction, regardless of whether this characteristic is present or intonated.

Marketing for the Clear Spirit condominium is directed to the exchange value of history, offering the tagline that the Distillery is “clearly getting better with age” (www.clearspiritliving.com). The metaphor of aging alcohol combines the history of the site as well as the distinctiveness present in fine spirits to sell property (see Figure 4.5).21 Furthermore, the metaphor evokes the selection of elements that are essential to the recipe and the purity needed to extract and collect value over time. Marketing for the Pure Spirit condominium also pays homage to the history of the site via the symbolism of spirits, and produces a way of seeing history: “While the Distillery District is rooted in its cobblestone streets, its future will soar high above it all in a 30-storey glass point tower

21 The utilization of terms associated with the manufacture of alcohol are repeated in advertising material and media reports associated with the site. In particular, the aging of alcohol and the distilling process emerge as the two most common metaphors. For example, Darren Hakker (2005: 15) reported on the Distillery District in the magazine inOntario using the branding slogan “Culture’s brewing” (see Figure 5). Within the story itself, this metaphor is extended: “You have to come sample the culture and history brewing here.” What does it mean to brew culture and history?: it refers to the technique of selecting and extracting elements and then mixing them together to develop a particular flavour.
atop a 5 storey podium” (www.purespiritliving.com). The tenant as voyeur will look down at the past, and form a hierarchical relation to Victorian built form. The vantage offered by the towering structure of the Pure Spirit condominium, works to instil a sense of progress to the site. History is constructed as a coherent entity to produce place differentiation. Ironically, the cobblestones which are referenced above in the advertisement were collected from sites exterior to the space undergoing demolition. According to a Toronto guidebook, “Strolling the bricked walkways (it took 340,000 bricks to pave the district’s cobblestone thoroughfares alone), it still has the feel of a Victorian village” (McCave, 2005: 84). The suggestion that the site is rooted in a feature which was a recent addition presents an interesting frame through which to read the neatness of the one dimensional image of the site: cleansed and repaired, a makeover of sorts led by market forces and the industry of selling place. Made to appear originary, the stones reflect the desire to recreate a sense of history. The statement that the space “still has the feel of a Victorian village” illustrates the disconnect with the site’s industrial past. This is not the decontextualization that Benjamin advocates, where an object is removed from its discursive position to carry on an existence that is meaningful to a present (Buck Morss, 1995).

**Heritage Matters: Containment under Condominiums**

Given that there is a need for some form of development for economic viability at the Distillery, the question shifts from the “right to build” to the “right to build what”? The addition of condominiums has spawned a number of debates. Some of the issues surround the appropriateness of massing, the relationship between modern and historic
Figure 4.5: References to the production of alcohol speak to the creation of a distinct flavour at the site. Hakker (2005) illustrates the caché attached with the distillation process through the use of terms such as “brewing.”

I journeyed back to a time when 19th century architecture ruled the skies, and roads were cobblestoned. It is the Historic Distillery District, an ancient whiskey distillery in Old Town Toronto.

The pleasant aroma of baked food seemed to permeate my soul, tempting my senses to taste a slice. I bought the whole loaf. The songs of live bands resonated off the massive red-clay-bricked buildings and flirted with my eardrums from every direction. I loved this place immediately.

Couples strolled endlessly, falling in love with the Distillery with each new step taken and corner turned. I explored the ultra-cool Sandra Ainsley Gallery, being extremely careful to not knock over any of these brilliant pieces.

The Artscape Studios was my next stop, a kind of ‘meet and greet’ between artists and the public. Then I rested my weary body with fine malt at the Mill Street Brewery. What an experience!

You have to come sample the culture and history brewing here. I go just for the ‘people watching’ but there’s always something new to do.

Call (416) 364-1177 or log on to www.thedistillerydistrict.com for maps and a complete list of events and boutiques and galleries awaiting you in 19th century Toronto. Find out more things to see in Old Town Toronto by visiting www.oldtoronto.ca.
architecture, and how the new additions will affect the scale and density of the site and the general aesthetic. These issues, while in some ways specific to the site, are important debates considering the amount of redevelopment surrounding the district’s geographic boundaries. For example, on a Toronto blog titled Urban Toronto, a forum dedicated to discussing the proposed developments culminated in over 1500 entries and close to 100,000 views within the span of two years (www.urbantoronto.ca). Participants on the forum provide links to newspaper articles, information from community meetings, create polls on the proposed construction, and add photographs, architectural renderings and updates on the development of the site. The reason behind this interest lies in the proximity of the district to nearby developments (including the West Don Lands and the Waterfront) where it becomes precedent setting, but also an articulation of the value of a series of buildings which carry an order of time.

On an aesthetic level, the responses to the condominiums by the tenancy are multifaceted. The new construction is described by some as overwhelming, where, in reference to the Pure Spirit Condominium, one Artscape tenant suggests, “I just felt like it was just harsh. Like it was just thrown in there like a spaceship landing” (Arounna Khounnoraj, Bookhou Design, personal interview). For others, the same structure is said to express the potential of the site:

You know what? If someone said to me today you can have a free property anywhere in the world, I would consider taking a penthouse in the Distillery in Pure Spirit. I would consider it…I love being part of the renaissance, I love being part of the resurgence and the energy of starting something and building it…you couldn’t have built it new, so for me I

---

22 A separate thread was started for the Gooderham Condominium in March, 2008 and reached over 120 posts. Discussions surrounding this phase of the residential development also took place on the Pure Spirit / Clear Spirit thread.
love being in that energy. I think that’s the appeal here, and I love that the old and the new sort of coexist… it will be such a cool area in five years, I know people are going to come here and go ‘how did you get that space, how did you get there?’ (Peter Smed, Oasis Wellness Centre and Spa, personal interview).23

For the most part, the tenants are optimistic about the condominiums, despite the struggle to attain financial stability during a drawn out period of construction which closed off one laneway for months and reduced parking availability (the site of the Pure Spirit condominium replaced a parking lot). At the time of the interviews in 2007, construction for the Pure Spirit condominium had begun but the other two point towers remained held up by the city planning department and then at the OMB, leaving only room for speculation.

Nearly one third describe the potential for the condominiums to lend a “community feel” to the site which is currently missing, with the rationale that more bodies in place will provide more pulse. It is believed that adding more “life” to the Distillery, via better nightlife, a reduced feeling of isolation, and a greater provision of amenities, will replace the destination atmosphere of the site and push it towards neighbourhood status. As one interviewee notes, “I guess you just long for the Distillery to become part of the city rather than a destination. I know that’s what they [Cityscape] want, to be a destination, but you want just to be a neighborhood” (John Booth, Bookhou Design, Artscape tenant, personal interview). What the tenant raises is the desire for the site to become a space for everyday life, rather than a space for spectacle. When this

23 Despite the infectious energy and excitement emerging from this tenant, following a period of eleven months, under financial pressure, his business was forced to abandon the project (a 23,000 square foot renovation of the Smoke House). His exodus was reported in Travel to Wellness (2009) “Looking at this as a learning experience, Smed admits they may have been overly optimistic about the draw of the location and the willingness of Torontonians to make the journey to the Distillery. ‘The district,’ he says, ‘is not yet a community and it is very important if not essential to locate a new spa where there is an established community – where a mix of people congregate’”. I raise this example here to illustrate the belief that many tenants share that the next stage of the development will offer stability.
desire seemed out of reach, he and his wife relocated their studio, trading location for
more space and a neighbourhood atmosphere elsewhere in the city.

While the sentiment that the three phases of development led by Cityscape will
add to the construction of “community” (which tends to express the notion of more
bodies in space) at the site is present, some tenants see the additions as pushing the
district away from its vision:

I don’t like some of the development that’s going on at the site. I’m not
sure that in twenty years it will help the site. There will be three
condos…so they will break up the site from a visual point of view, and I
think that that’s a poor decision, but it’s all money, and that’s part of it
…We can have all kinds of visions of grandeur, but the reality is dollars
and cents. I think that’s probably a little more frustrating (Victor Brown,
Perigee Restaurant, personal interview).

While for this tenant, it is monetary decisions that push the district towards its tipping
point through the addition of condominiums, for others the commercialization of heritage
rescinds the integrity of the cultural and commercial value:

Obviously we don’t want to be snobs, like art snobs. We joke that if
somebody comes in and their head goes directly up to the ceiling, we’ll be
friendly of course but we don’t really engage them. But if they come in
and they start looking at the work on the walls, we engage them a little
more so…it’s an impressive space and of course they’re going to do
that…But we’re not a historical museum, we’re a business (G4, gallery
operator).

In all of these aspects, the spectacle dominates. As Debord (2000, #37) argues,
“The world at once present and absent that the spectacle holds up to view is the world of
the commodity dominating all living experience. The world of the commodity is thus
shown for what it is, because its development is identical to people’s estrangement from
each other and from everything they produce.” Buying a “home” in one of the
condominiums completed or under construction on site relates to a regime of signs that is far more expansive than the space between a set of walls.

As part of the 2008 OMB decision which found in favour of the developers to rearrange density allowances for the construction of two condominium point towers within the Cherry Street Mixed Use Area (Clear Spirit and Gooderham), there was a Section 37 agreement passed which mandates contributions to “community benefit” and “public art” at a price-tag of $2,600,000 (OMB, 2008). The public art contribution is capped at $900,000 with the remainder of the benefits ($1,700,000) earmarked for parkland (OMB, 2008: 6). Some of this spending has taken place with the recent addition of a “Sculpture Park,” a small collection of structures and sculptures throughout the district. Two sculptures titled “Koilos” and “IT” by Michael Christian, a California based artist, now reside at the base of the Pure Spirit Condominium (Figure 4.6 and 4.7). The hulking figure of Koilos is dwarfed by the scale of the condominium, while IT stretches atop the patio in front of the Fresh and Wild grocery store with virtual expression. Section 37 agreements have proven successful in adding aesthetic interest and spurring economic regeneration, but there are still issues surrounding their relationship to (the identity and meanings of) place, and the cost of these measures to community development (including where investment occurs which is not always at the site of development, and who is included in the selection process). Percent for Art programming is active in cities across North America to promote publically accessible art works in areas of development (Hall and Robertson, 2001). The programs work by ensuring that a certain percentage of the budget for new developments is earmarked for public art. The program in Toronto (The Percent for Public Art Program) endorses that
Figure 4.6: ‘Koilos’ by Michael Christian (personal photo).
one percent of development costs are allocated for public art, either on-site or off-site (Toronto City Planning, 2007).\textsuperscript{24} Miles (1997) notes how the experience of art is mediated by two factors: how the art work is framed in a location and what venue the work was created for. Displays of public art, while able to express multiple values, are at times incorporated into renewal strategies to foster state control and the domination of capital over a population (Deutsche, 1996; Miles, 1997). This is often a product of the installation and selection process as raised by several researchers (Bailey et al, 2004; Sharp et al, 2005) which can lead to homogenization and exclusion. Local particularities

\textsuperscript{24} In 1986, the former Toronto City Council (pre-amalgamation) endorsed a program for public art in all major developments (Toronto City Planning, 2007: 30).
must be drawn upon in these legislations to avoid the potential homogenization that can arise through cultural import and to stress the potential of art to express and evoke multiple meanings. Similarly, local populations need to be involved in the selection process and the selection must be tied to place in order to thwart feelings of exclusion.

At the Distillery, the rotating outdoor sculpture park may add aesthetic interest, but it also symbolizes exchange: public art for heritage containment in the form of three point towers.  

Conclusion: The Limits of Space

Since the opening of the site in 2003, the tenancy has shared several hardships, ranging from those that are economic in nature (an inability for the site as a whole to foster consistent foot traffic, rising rents, construction surrounding the condominiums), to those that are more social in nature (internal disputes over representation, differing understandings of governance, perceived favouritism to particular tenant types, exclusivity among particular tenant types). As a result, some of the tenants brought in during the initial stages of the redevelopment were not able to weather the hardships and were forced to relocate elsewhere. Of the tenant base who entered into lease agreements at the Distillery in 2003 / 2004 (excluding the Artscape tenants), 58% remained in 2008.  

---

25 The reception to the pieces by the users of the space, while beyond the boundaries of this research, would indicate the success of this initiative, the success of the pieces themselves to connect with the audience, and the nature of the selection process (who was involved and how it unfolded).

26 This information is based on analysis of the annual Distillery Guides between 2004 and 2008. The number of spaces at the site expanded over this period of time wherein retail spaces for example, increased from 13 to 20 spaces and offices / services at the site increased from 11 to 20. Interestingly for a site that self-identifies as an ‘arts, culture and entertainment’ space, the number of gallery spaces remained consistent over this five year period at fifteen. This suggests that the art galleries and cultural producers (whose numbers remained steady over this five year period), were brought on in the initial stages to solidify the representation of the site and to attract further tenants. The number of tenants who fall under the
Within the Artscape buildings, the turnover is even greater (standing at 49% over the course of this five year period), evidenced by the consistency to which the tenant directory for the Case Goods and Cannery Buildings is crudely updated with pieces of tape covering previous tenants (Figure 4.8). Between 1996 and 2001, average annual turnover rates in the consumer services market in the GTA were calculated at 16% within shopping centres and 14.7% within commercial strips (Jones, 2003: 80-85). In comparison, retail turnover at the Distillery for the year 2008 calculated using the Distill magazine was higher than average at 20%. Given that the area is still establishing it is to be expected that this rate would be higher than average turnover rates. But when the costs of individual renovations are factored into these statistics they become even more distressing (in relation to the lack of overhead typically associated with retail trade when a tenant enters into a commercial strip or mall). One gallery operator reflected on the pattern of tenant turnover at Granville Island during its initial years:

Hopefully it all builds on itself [at the Distillery]. The funny thing that happened in the example of Granville Island in Vancouver – a lot of retailers who went into that area in 1979, 1980, 1981 invested quite significantly in lease hold improvements and things like that and the crowds didn’t come in time to save them. Invariably it was the second and third people who would come into the spaces and all the leaseholds had been done, they were beautifully done and they didn’t have that expense and at the same time the crowds were starting to build. It’s like any new venture, you could go to a mall, different economics, you can go to a mall and you know there’s going to be a crowd. You come here as we have and many others have in the last four years and it’s more of a gamble but

---

categories of retail and offices / services at the site will increase once again in the coming years following the completion of the residential stage of the redevelopment, which includes ground floor retail in the Pure Spirit, Clear Spirit, and Gooderham Condominiums, and the ribbon building, which is designated for commercial use. These numbers are based on the entry and exit of business names and do not acknowledge either name changes or changes in shared tenancy, seen most prominently in the office / services category.
in our case…it was a gamble that was worth taking because there is a certain air about the place that you have the sense that its going to work, it’s going to be successful. Even if it doesn’t, it’s a beautiful area to hang out in for four years of your life (Wayne Parrish, The Sport Gallery, personal interview).

Figure 4.8: A sign indicating the tenants housed in the Artscape buildings is updated regularly using pieces of tape (personal photo).

During the interview process I asked the tenants about their colleagues who had left the site. Most embarked on narratives regarding the inevitability of struggle, the specificity of those who left the site for personal reasons and / or economic decisions, and personality differences. One of the tenants who left was characterized by a gallery
operator as “a whiner and a complainer...I think he left for reasons that have to do more with his personality” (G3). Others fell victim to the lack of foot traffic and transaction patterns, “she had a very bad location and I don’t know what her story was but she was right at the fringe of the site” (G3). There is a process of negation that takes place in these accounts, whereby relocation is posited as specific and warranted. It is rarely approached as a central issue facing the tenancy as a whole (emphasis on fringe personalities and locations are indicative of this narrative construct).

Economic pressures at the site are rising. The special lease rates that were granted to tenants early on as a way to spur investment and combat the costs of renovation are expiring, and are being re-calculated according to market value. In 2007, the National Post ran an article titled “(Di)still Evolving” on the waning vision of the site and tenant unease. The reporter, Bielski, interviewed a co-owner of Artifex Furniture Studios, and relays his disappointment of the performance of the site:

“We made a mistake. We were sold a vision for the site which never materialized ... It’s more or less a retail failure. There’s just no one here and it appears to be getting significantly worse as time goes on, not better.” (Craig Urquhart, Artifex Furniture, cited in Bielski, 2007)

Following an attempt by Urquhart to retract the statement from the National Post, and the seizure of store property by the developers to offset unpaid rent (Bielski, 2007), Artifex vacated the premises. Matthew Rosenblatt of Cityscape was also interviewed by Bielski and responded to tenant turnover rates as follows:

“You have weaker things, in this particular instance, weaker businesses, and they become extinct because they’re not quality, people don’t want them. But it doesn’t relate to the entire entity of the community, and this is a very strong community ... If a retailer was to leave here, we can instantaneously fill it up with other strong people” (cited in Bielski, 2007).
The suggestion that this tenant is not like the other tenants works to project unity via negation (similar to the response by the tenancy raised earlier). Recall that it was Rosenblatt who described the process of redevelopment at the Distillery as a form of urban farming where the hand selection of tenants was performed to avoid instability and disease. It is likely with the expiring lease rates that the disease of discontent may spread across the organism. In 2008, Auto Grotto, an automotive memorabilia retail store was forced to leave the site due to economic pressure, and placed the following message on the company website:

We have decided to close our store…due to poor store attendance brought on essentially by the overall lack of interest in the site itself….As I have been told this is a world class art gallery location and our product line is no longer of any interest to the site’s clientele...In a few short years we watched a beautiful Toronto landmark be turned into Condo jungle under the guise of development (Auto Grotto, 2008).

Defining space necessarily works to exclude, but the construction of that definition can operate with greater levels of inclusion and exchange.

Waldie (2006) of the Globe reported on the waning vision of the site, and the level of tenants forced to relocate under economic pressure in a piece titled “Down and Out at the Distillery.” This particular article is brought up by a number of tenants who cite the behaviour demonstrated by these individuals to go to the press as destructive to the tenancy at large, and inaccurate in terms of the information disclosed. As a bittersweet turn of events, it was relayed to me on several occasions that the tenants who went public about the problems at the site, opened up in a new location on Queen West, and were not able to sustain their businesses. One retail tenant suggested that the article should be re-pitched as ‘tenants who were unable to make it at the Distillery, still can’t make it’ (R3). What this demonstrates is an attachment to place, and in some cases an
unwavering belief in the vision of the site, even during moments where its unwinding is visible.

The Distillery entered the public imaginary as a planned private sector redevelopment in 2003. Cityscape (and currently Dundee Realty) govern the site, hand selecting tenants, and controlling renovations, festival and event programming, and new construction. This form of gatekeeping ensures that the developers retain control over the organism. However, as noted this control has produced a number of contradictions at the site. The district functions via a manifestation of a number of interconnected power relations, systems, and discourses that constitute / reconstitute its balance. To return to a quote from Derrida (1978: 279), “coherence in contradiction expresses the force of a desire.” In other words, in spite of the contradictions at the site, the space is rendered coherent. The vision of the site corresponds to an assemblage of meanings, moments, and actions that remain in process. This understanding of ‘coherence in contradiction’ opens space for dialogue and exchange. Given that the site is marketed as a space that the ‘whole city can share in,’ the limits of this statement need to be revealed and the projection of unity dismantled. The emphasis on image making at the site (a one dimensional image which is cleansed and repaired) props up a play of difference (for commercial ends). When the strategies of differentiation as negation and coherence are critically deployed, they highlight the contested nature of urban space and produce a politics of place differentiation. The site forms an expression of independence from spatial homogeneity, but it is pulled back towards sameness through a desire for economic stability. The splashes of distinction are waged instead via the renovations of space and the display of content within individual units. Similarly, the site is made
flexible across tenant types as they work to re-represent the vision of the site and their place within the site and the market: retailers question the power yielded by art galleries; the festivities of the site hollow out the meaning of the descriptors of space; artists and artisans question their role as pawns in the redevelopment process. Lastly, the value of heritage is exposed as an amenity for consumption and residential development. The “heritage” of the Victorian bricked houses of industry is used to prop up the “authenticity” of experience. The infrastructure of industrial heritage also supports hundreds of new condo units designed without limitation as podium and playground.

If defining space works to communicate information and prepares a matter for action, then the terms through which the Distillery brand is articulated form a direct linkage to the social relations that constitute the site (and those that don’t constitute the site). In other words, the articulation of place identity through no-chains, art / culture / entertainment, heritage, and high-end condominiums form descriptions of space, which are then enacted in flexible ways by a set of actors. These multimodal ways of imaging the site untie the one dimensional imaging of place branding. The tensions that arise through the singularization of space confront the limits of the descriptors, where there is a disjuncture between the meaning and understanding of the site emerging from the developers. In part this results from a failure of the developers to practice the nuances and terms of their vision, an issue that arises throughout the interviews as tenants work to classify moments of incongruence and moments of consistency in order to find meaning. Without a clear understanding of the vision of the site, the tenants are unable at times to guide their practices in a complementary fashion. This disturbs the social relations between tenants, where under economic and cultural pressure, the perception that some
individuals or groups are interfering with the “vision” minimizes the potential for meaningful social interaction and collaboration.

The Distillery is a landscape of consumption which employs strategies of place differentiation to manufacture distinction. The developers orient place differentiation outward through the strategies of negation and coherence in order to maximize the experience of consumption. The Distillery is a contested landscape which is always in process. The tenancy, the developers, and the media engage in complex negotiations of identity which lead to negative formations of difference (the production of binaries between mall / non-mall, chain / non-chain, culture / entertainment, and so forth). These negotiations are multiple, projected from different sets of interests and users with varying levels of power. The tenancy works to dismantle the singular claims to space produced by the developers. But the desire by tenants to produce a semblance of consistency (recognizing the importance of this projection of unity for marketing purposes, and as a confirmation of their decisions to locate within the district), leads to the formation of a new structured centre as a disunity. I argue that this contestation is what holds the idea of the Distillery together (the untying as itself a unity for the site). This conceptualization of the site as a disunity works to deconstruct the top-down production of identity (a play of difference), while also acknowledging the layers of contestation present within urban space (struggles over space, identity, and resources as a politics of difference).

Absent from these layers which guide ways of seeing space, is the utilization of the site by the film industry throughout the 1990s and 2000s. The industry worked as a useful intermediary tenant prior to the purchase of the site by Cityscape, and it is utilized as a powerful means of place differentiation at present, where it images the site, opening
space to the possibilities inherent in visual culture. It is to this frame that I turn my attention in the next chapter. Just as the practitioners of the site attempt to make sense of the forces that secure their space, film fashions place in a series of multiple articulations that untie the unity of development.
Chapter 5:
Set Appeal: The Semiotic Invasion of Film at the Distillery District

The film industry plays an important and largely under-theorized role in processes of urban change where it shapes the physical and cultural renderings of place in material and imaginative ways. In this chapter, I examine the relationship between film and urban redevelopment at the Distillery District. I argue that the film industry functioned as an important intermediary tenant at the site following its closure as an operating industrial plant in 1990, and prior to its redevelopment as an arts, culture, and entertainment centre in the early 2000s. Film activity acted as a placeholder for post-industrial redevelopment and allowed a re-imagining of the site through the visualization of its signifieds in filmic space. By weaving together a set of interviews conducted with current tenants, planning material and media reports, and an analysis of feature films shot on location at the site, I map the inception of film production at the Distillery in the context of site planning. The pervasiveness for the site to feature as a range of places, spaces, and times in filmic space is used by the developers, the city, the media, and the tenants to produce place distinction (a singularization of meaning that is tied to celebrity and aesthetic appeal). In response to the singularization of the site in filmic space, I take up the strategy of multiplicity as an interpretive critique to reconfigure place and identity as unbounded and flexible constructs (wherein place and identity are not tied to an absolute location).

Introduction

When people find out that Chicago was filmed [at the Distillery] and other well-known films…it gives it a modern significance as well as an historic significance. It is a culture, arts, and entertainment district which you know when you step foot on it, but it also makes it known through time and more broadly (O1, cultural organization).

Between 1987 and 2008, hundreds of films, countless television shows, and numerous music videos were shot on location at the Distillery District. The majority of the films were shot on site in the period following the cessation of alcohol production in 1990 and prior to its reopening as an arts, culture, and entertainment district in 2003. At the time of the closure in 1990, the industrial zoning classification did not readily allow for redevelopment to take place, positioning the film industry as a useful intermediary tenant that permitted long-term planning and allowed for temporary capital injections.
There were several advantages to filming at the Distillery during the interim period including the aesthetics of the Victorian industrial architecture, plentiful amounts of parking, and a lack of tenants which translated into the ability to use the spaces without the need to pay for loss of business incurred during filming.¹

Post-redevelopment, the Distillery continues to serve as a film location, and the majority of the buildings are listed as film production sites on the Ontario Media Development Corporation location database (OMDC, 2008). However, following the redevelopment, a lack of parking and a loss of gritty interiors and unsigned exteriors produce conditions that are not as conducive to filming. Attraction to the district for filmic purposes is further diminished with the completion of the Pure Spirit Condominium (standing at 32 storeys) which complicates sight lines and visual framing, and further reduces above ground parking availability. In addition, the recent OMB approval for the amendment of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law 1994-0396 to construct two additional condominiums (Clear Spirit and Gooderham) will further overload the visual capacity of the district (see OMB, 2008).

The function of the property as a film location is incorporated into the formation of place identity by the developers, the media, and the tenancy (through the strategy of differentiation as multiplicity). Specifically, it is incorporated as part of the spatial imaginary of the district, where it is memorialized as a precursor to the Distillery’s contemporary cultural renderings, marked with celebrity fetishism and aesthetic appeal;

¹ During the interim period, there was a not a defined use for the district which saw an instability in tenancy. This is not to suggest that the district was void of practice. At least three full-time staff remained on site following the closure of Gooderham and Worts in 1990 for maintenance purposes. There were also real estate agents, prospective tenants, reporters, planners, film companies, and developers who utilized the district. Between 1997 and 2000, Options for Homes constructed three apartment towers in the district.
the markings of differentiation signify the *imageability* of film as a cultural form within capitalism. According to Debord (2000) the city is a site of simulations, wrought with the haunting glory of the commodity spectacle. In the realm of the everyday, pure imageability is broadcast through the streets, (re)ordering form, function, and experience through the semiotic play of signification. In the *Distilled* guide published each year for the site, there is a marked shift in the incorporation of film as part of the site’s history. In the 2004 edition of the guide, there is passing mention that the Distillery was Canada’s number one film location in the 1990s. By 2006, in a segment titled “shopping, galleries, dining & more: discover The Distillery’s multidimensional experience,” there is a paragraph outlining the numerous films, television series, commercials and music videos shot on location between 1996 and 2006 alongside the high rank celebrities that adorned the screen (a paragraph which finds its way into each subsequent guide). References to the film industry become more abundant by the 2008 edition. Under a segment titled “did you know?” the popularity of the site in over 1000 films, television series, commercials, and videos is noted. Towards the end of the guide, is a half page write-up of the film festival parties hosted on site in 2007, followed by a full page photo collage under the heading “buzz” which captures famous guests that visited the site with the following caption: “From Film Fest soirees, to music festivals, to celebrity weddings, right through to New Year’s Eve celebrations, events at The Distillery are the year’s hottest tickets.” Alongside these more contemporary displays of film imageability produced by the developers, the media drew on the image of the district as a film set throughout the 1990s noting how this practice created a re-imagination of the space in film as well as in the planning process (see for example MacLeod, 1994).
Emphasis is placed on the role of film to heighten the experience of consumption in these accounts. There is a lack of engagement with how film practice plays / played a part in the narrative of redevelopment, or how film practice unfolded on the ground (how filmmakers, casts, and crews negotiated the site, the alterations that they made, or the conditions of their labour). Rather, film practice is drawn into a strategy of place-making to produce cultural capital in the contemporary constitution of the site. Hollywood films that were shot on location are blended with narratives of the celebrities who worked ‘on-set’ to mark out the Distillery’s unique place identity in brochures, on the official website, in media and policy reports, and in conversations with the tenancy. In other words, the ability for the site to become a range of places, times, and spaces (a multiplicity), is singularized by place-makers to distinguish place. In response to this practice of singularizing the site in filmic space and singularizing the practice of film at the site (as caché), I draw on the signification of the site in film via the strategy of multiplicity as an interpretive critique to reconfigure place and identity as relational and unbounded constructs.

Place is an ‘event’ that sees “the coming together of the previously unrelated, a constellation of processes rather than a thing” (Massey, 2005: 141). Place is always in process and “internally multiple”; place identity responds to the meaning and significance of place for its users (Massey, 2005: 141). In order to advance capital accumulation, as Harvey (1996: 298) suggests, “the selling of place, using all the artifices of advertising and image construction that can be mustered has become of considerable importance.” Constructing place identity through a system of spectacular consumption (from cultural products and festivals to architectural displays) works to control and repress difference
(class, race, gender, sexuality) (Kipfer and Keil, 2002). The assemblage of these spectacular consumptive tools works to remake the urban landscape for particular tastes (middle to upper class) (Smith, 2006). What role does film practice play in smoothing capital flows and in remaking urban spaces? What role does film play in the redevelopment of the Distillery District and the reconstruction of place identity and meaning?

What remains of the period of filming is an urban imaginary built around the possibility of the space to become something other. The ‘othering’ of the district occurs on two levels. First, the local signifieds (the built environment) take on a different functional role where they are utilized as film sets. Second, the ability for the district to appear as a variety of places, spaces, and times in films from action to horror, comedy to drama, demonstrates how signifiers of place are flexible, allowing the district to become any place needed to produce a reality-effect. In other words, the use of the district as a film location highlights how place-making is not tied to absolute location (place-making is also made up of fragmentary and cross-cutting moments, ideas, values, images, and memories unfolding in material and symbolic realms). The ability for the district to become ‘other’ on these two levels – functional and visual – attends to the possibilities of place as process.

The film industry was, and continues to be, an active agent in the redevelopment of the Distillery, propelling investment and cultural interest. The capacity for the district to be represented as a range of places, spaces and times in filmic space supported the idea that the Distillery could be reinvented through redevelopment (allowing its built form to

---

2 There are of course constraints to this flexibility including the governance of the heritage resources and the visual limitations (the range of places, spaces, and times that any one location can represent even when costumed).
take on new significations of meaning). The presence of the film industry also functioned as a placeholder for post-industrial redevelopment. Lastly, given the fusion of industry and culture, the film industry was utilized by the developers to add cultural capital to the district through celebrity appeal (as a strategy of distinction). In this chapter I address how the practice of filming is incorporated into the process of industrial revaluation and the construction of a contemporary place identity along three lines: a) the entrance of the film industry on the district in the context of site planning, b) the ways in which the use of the Distillery as a film set shapes the physical and symbolic renderings of place (pre and post redevelopment), and c) the way that film imbues place with possibility. The possibility imbued in the expression of place via film responds to the strategy of differentiation as multiplicity: in this state, there is never unity, only an articulation of a system of relations which are connected yet individual. Massey (2005: 9) offers three propositions in her approach to space which can be applied to the subsequent discussion of film at the Distillery: “First, that we recognize space as the product of interrelations…Second, that we understand space as the sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity in the sense of contemporaneous plurality…Third, that we recognize space as always under construction.” This conceptualization helps to tease out the relationship between film and place as one of interrelation, of plurality of expressions and experimentations, and as always in a process of becoming. Ultimately, film operated as an important intermediary tenant during what I have described elsewhere as an in-between moment where the engines of industry were at rest, but before the cultural sirens had begun. Its presence on-site has extended beyond its tenancy, where it is now used as a place-making device to produce distinction. Before
turning to the function of film at the Distillery, I will first map several lines of thought from which these observations emerge.

**Mythologizing Place: Geographies of Film**

While a great deal of research has been conducted on the role of the arts in urban regeneration (e.g. Zukin, 1982, 1995; Ley, 1996, 2003; Smith, 1996; Bain, 2003) and the use of images and symbols to naturalize capital development (Gottdiener, 2001; Gotham, 2002), there is less attention paid to the role of the film industry within the redevelopment process. The link between film and urban redevelopment, where it is developed, is constructed primarily through a focus on Los Angeles, in particular Hollywood (Davis, 1992, 1998, 2001; Stenger, 2001a, 2001b; Scott, 2005; Curti et al, 2007), pointing to the need to expand the geographical corpus (although see Purdy, 2005). The popularity of the Distillery as a film location leading up to its redevelopment offers a unique case to diversify research on the linkage between film and urban change. In addition, film offers an important lens through which to map the power of the image, as well as the structure of the industry and the politics of production and consumption in relation to urban change.

In part, ways of seeing are affected by the lure of film: “The image is there, in front of me, for me: coalescent (its signified and its signifier melted together), analogical, total, pregnant” (Barthes, 1986: 348). These images are not re-presentations of a stable reality: “Whereas representation tries to absorb simulation by interpreting it as false representation, simulation envelops the whole edifice of representation as itself a simulacrum” (Baudrillard, 1983: 11). In other words, film does not “re-present a world that preexisted it. It presents a simulacrum” which produces reality-effects (Doel and
Clarke, 2007: 897; see Lukinbeal, 2004). In this theoretical frame, images presented in filmic space remain flexible and open, able to constitute their own reality.

Film plays an active role in the construction of filmic fashions (the shots injected with heightened meaning which are then re-produced in the everyday, including the décor of a set, the facades of buildings, the costumes of characters, the dialogue between characters) and filmic capture (the range, angles, lighting, speed, and refraction of images collected as montage that challenge sight / site perception). Other forms of classification exist to orient the representations of film within the urban as a system of unequal power relations. Adorno (1991: 93) for example, notes the disorientation of the consumer, who falls under the spell of the suppliers: “The dream industry does not so much fabricate the dreams of the customers as introduce the dreams of the suppliers among the people.” While important to situate the realms of film production and consumption as a system of power relations, the reception to film is not simply a top down approach, as can be witnessed in the use of film as a political operative. Given the relational characteristics of film, practice emerges as a necessary component in mapping the relationship between film and the Distillery. There is a growing body of works which seek to orient filmic space to spatial practice in real and imagined geographical contexts from postwar urbanism (Farish, 2005) to urban utopias (Pratt and San Juan, 2004). Images are social relations, and whether their meaning is hegemonic (Adorno, 1991; Jameson, 1991) or mobile (see Cresswell and Dixon, 2002), their presence within consumer society has reached a point of saturation which requires further analysis.

The notion of mythmaking adds insight into the transmission of film in social space. As Barthes (2001: 130) suggests, myth (a form of speech or message) is made to
appear natural and obvious, turning history into nature for the reader: “myth essentially aims at causing an immediate impression – it does not matter if one is later allowed to see through the myth, its action is assumed to be stronger than the rational explanations which may later belie it.” For example when Toronto fills in for New York in filmic space, even though there may be referents that contradict the naturalness of the image (the CN Tower showing in the background, Ontario license plates), the message is stronger than these rational explanations. This does not erase the need to unpack the myth-making process (who is constructing the message and for what ends) or how the message works to replace other potential significations (who or what is included and excluded).

Unpacking these relations offers a site for political possibility necessary for understanding social existence (Jameson, 1992b). It also offers a site for ensuring that simulations of the urban express, rather than veil, social difference (San Juan and Pratt, 2002). The political possibility that Jameson (1992b) ascribes to film is located in its utopian potential, where it effectively operates as a vehicle to problematize late capitalism. He outlines this potential through the concept of “the cognitive map” which enables “a situational representation on the part of the individual subject to that vaster and properly unrepresentable totality which is the ensemble of society’s structures as a

---

3 The IMDb includes a “goof browser” that allows patrons of the website to search for “mistakes” that exist in filmic space (http://www.imdb.com/Sections/Goofs/).

4 There is still much to disentangle in terms of the cultural politics that are represented in film (see for example San Juan and Pratt (2002) for their interrogation of the representation of gendered bodies in cyberspace films). While beyond the apparatus that is being constructed in this chapter, the reception of film representation forms an important pillar in disentangling the role of film to affect and be affected by social relations, and is an area of the geography of film which is expanding. For example, in a recent article Dodds (2006) examines audience reception to film as a marker of popular geopolitics drawing on the most recent addition to the James Bond series, Die Another Day (2002) as an example.
whole” (Jameson, 1991: 51). This concept, while able to create a sense of place produces a binary between global totality and local and contingent cultural and political contexts, and emphasizes the “universal search” for the “real” (Dixon and Zonn, 2005). Dixon and Zonn (2005: 312) rework the concept of the cognitive map in order “to outline the web of significations within which objects are embedded and…the concomitant lines of fracture and contradiction that allow for such objects to become meaningful in a host of other contexts.” Situating and negotiating these embedded contexts fosters the ability to analyze multiple intersecting significations. Recall from chapter 4 the multiple understandings of space across tenant factions and between tenants and the developers denoting the systems of signification at play in representation, governance, and identity. In other words, mythologies of place exist within the realm of lived space, as well as in filmic representations (both are produced and consumed).

While there is consensus within film geography that the reel / real binary is arbitrary and limits theoretical and empirical contributions (see Benton, 1995; Kennedy and Lukinbeal, 1997; Cresswell and Dixon, 2002; Lukinbeal, 2004; Lukinbeal and Zimmermann, 2008), it matters how this binary is “dismissed” (Dixon and Grimes, 2004). As Dixon and Grimes (2004: 267) explain, it matters “if this binary is subsumed under a ‘bad’ dialectic that implies that material and representative landscapes can be treated in common as ideological fodder, or is subsumed under a good dialectic that looks to the overdetermined character of each.” I take up the latter conceptualization, whereby the
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5 Jameson (1991) extends Lynch’s (1960, 1995) work on mental mapping, shifting from the perceptual qualities of place to the conceptual elements of place. Mental mapping relies on the behavioural movement of observers in the urban environment and does not account for development or change in the occurrence of these patterns, a point that Lynch (1995: 252) later acknowledges as a limitation: “[t]here was no sense of development in it – of how that pattern came to be, nor of how it might change in the future, as the person matured, her or his function changed, her or his experience enlarged, or the city itself was modified.” Noting the static representation of Lynch’s work, Jameson (1991) extends the notion of mental mapping to include the seminal maps of conceptual assemblages through social space.
“reel” and the “real” are both overdetermined and are “always defined by multiple operations at the same time” (Rose, 2002: 462, emphasis original). This resonates with the understanding of place as process, wherein simultaneous realities form an assemblage of meanings and effects. In order to set up the context for the relationship between film practice and urban change, in the next section I examine the Toronto film landscape within the politics of film production.

Runaway Signification: Toronto (Other)

The nature of film practice at the Distillery is particular, but it also articulates and responds to the context of film production within Toronto more broadly. The decentralization of film production in the U.S. gives rise to “runaway productions,” film activities taking place in satellite centres outside of the country (Storper & Christopherson, 1987; Elmer and Gasher, 2005; Matheson, 2005; Lukinbeal, 2006; Scott and Pope, 2007). A great deal of work is required to understand the formation of new non-U.S. centres of innovation (Coe, 2001). In Canada, major centres of film production (Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver) are utilized for their “placeless” backdrops by the U.S. film industry (Gasher, 2002; Lukinbeal, 2004; Matheson, 2005). As a result, place is utilized for its ability to become somewhere else. As Lukinbeal (2004: 316) suggests, Canadian centres “specialize in offering representational spaces that are ‘placeless’.” This specialization is owing to the ability for sights / sites to stand in for particular cities (such as New York) as well as generic cities, and to the growth in television productions in the 1990s where niche markets were established in Canada setting up the infrastructure for runaway productions (Lukinbeal, 2004: 316). Writing on the relationship between place
and placelessness, Relph (1976) defines the latter as the production of a “flatscape” a pattern of streets and buildings that do not hold meaning for those experiencing them. These are places that are directed to an elsewhere, rather than to a local, drawing their form and function via control, standardization and mimicry. While Relph’s focus at the time was on the experiential demise of urban spaces, there is arguably sufficient parallel to warrant an extension of these ideas into the expression of place and placelessness in film production.

Placelessness is not unique to the Canadian landscape of film production. In Thom Andersen’s (2003) film documentary, Los Angeles Plays Itself, the fabrication of place in film is richly displayed and revealed. Layerings of real and imagined depictions and mythologies of Los Angeles penetrate into filmic space, setting the city as a subject, landscape, and character to be shot, animated, costumed, edited, and captured. The documentary provides a critique on how film blurs the lines between the ‘real’ city and the ‘reel’ city. Not only does film affect the materiality of place, the cultural industry itself, to which Hollywood acts as a flagship enterprise, generates material and emotive effects in everyday life. For example, Davis (1992, 1998) outlines how the Hollywood

---

6 In an attempt to re-orient the placeless character of film production in Montreal, The Memories of Angels (La Memoire des Anges) (2008) draws on a sampling of clips from 120 National Film Board (NFB) films to prepare a cinematic essay on the history of Montreal in the 1950s and 1960s. With a roster of sounds that accompanied the period, the city is set as an edited version of itself, and film is positioned with dreamlike freedom to serve as archival range: as documentary, poetry, and fiction. Similarly, in the Gastown district of Vancouver, for three days in September 2008, a non-profit society (the New Urban Republic Arts Society) partnered with Cineworks Independent Filmmakers Society to curate a film series where Vancouver plays itself, a departure from its typical role where it is cast as a generic or U.S. city. The setting of the project – the top of an underused parkade turned drive-in theatre – also works to promote the cultural and consumptive uses of film in Vancouver. Projected onto the screen were the pairings of two films during each event: a feature film shot in metropolitan Vancouver and a short film to complement it (www.urbanrepublic.ca/drive).

7 The power inherent in the film industry relates to the production and reproduction of meaning on screen which bears a relationship to lived social practice. It also responds to the power of particular geographical locations and regions to dominate the field (for example Hollywood).
industry mythologizes Los Angeles, and is implicated in the city’s spatial restructuring. Hollywood (as an enterprise) gentrified the downtown through gated theme parks, entertainment complexes and housing developments, anchoring the Hollywood of the “world’s movie public” and emptying the existent Hollywood of lived experience (Davis, 1998: 392-8).

Lukinbeal (2004) distinguishes between two forms of location shooting to outline the process of becoming other in filmic space: “landscape as space”, and “landscape as place”. The former relates to non-specific settings (a movie studio, backlot), and the latter relates to site-specific settings (filming at locations determined by the narrative of the film). In the case of landscape as space, emphasis is on the forward interaction between characters. Landscape as place on the other hand, does not necessarily imply filming New York in New York, as there are a number of other places that can stand in for a location. The Distillery offers both forms of location shooting. It functions as “landscape as space” through the rental of interior space, and “landscape as place” through the use of exterior landscapes (as industrial backdrop).

As Toronto positions itself under the mantra of competitive city planning, the ability for the City to star as “anywhere” is correlative with Kipfer and Keil’s (2002: 235) discussion of the growing aestheticization and regulation of urban space as a strategy for capital accumulation: the competitive city “represents a broader project of cementing and reordering the social and moral landscape” for “global-city formation.” As Quill (1999) of the Star notes, part of the attraction for film production in Toronto is its accommodation: “With a little dressing, Toronto could be anywhere.” The cinematic spaces created via foreign productions in Canada refute the creation of a distinct
Canadian filmic identity: “it is the definition of the Canadian reality which is at stake in the struggle for control of the mediascape” (Gasher, 1995: 235). As Haysom (1994, cited in Gasher, 1995: 241), a reporter for the Vancouver Sun writes

Though this town [Vancouver] is full of movie stars, film crews and movie making, the Canadian film industry is in a desperate state. Vancouver pretends to be Seattle or generic big-city America. Meanwhile, our own cinematic culture is non-existent. Movies help us understand more about ourselves, who we are. If that’s the case, here in Hollywood North [Vancouver], we’re invisible.

The camouflage of Canadian cities and locales in film and television leads to an erasure of place distinction (Gasher, 1995, Matheson, 2005: 124-5). Once the setting of the film is established, the viewer assumes that the remainder of the film was shot in the same place. In effect, the power of the image in film is derived from the collection of a series of images which are tied together to produce a moving montage. The result is a narrative that flips the pages for the viewer as though they were reading a book (see Adorno, 1991: 93).

Toronto is an ideal film location for its diverse and character landscapes (which can be fabricated to become elsewhere / anyplace), flexible and skilled workforce, tax incentives and economic benefits. In the report Imagine a Toronto...Strategies for a Creative City (2006: 19) produced by the Creative Cities Leadership Team, the film and
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8 Matheson’s (2005) work on industrial television in Canada also complicates the reading of landscapes as placeless, by addressing the ways in which local populations actively engage with simulations of places in divergent ways.

9 The exchange rate between the CAD and US dollar also affected the film industry in Toronto. The US dollar garnered a present value in Canadian currency of 1.384 in 1997, a value which grew exponentially reaching a highpoint in 2002 (1.570) before steadily declining to reach parity in 2007 (see the Bank of Canada for more information on the rate of exchange: http://www.bank-banque-canada.ca). Coupled with the SARS epidemic in 2003 and strong competition by other Canadian (Vancouver and Winnipeg) and American cities, film production in Toronto has declined in recent years. The city is working to rebuild its reputation within the industry through an emphasis on producing home grown talent though education programs (Creative Cities Leadership Team, 2006).
television cluster is listed as a leader in the creative industry, ranking third in North America based on total production spending and contributions to the economy. Housing a workforce of around 25,000, with on-location production spending estimated at $791 million in 2007, the film and television sector in Toronto is a competitive force (TFTO, 2007). The City also hosts the annual Toronto International Film Festival, a ten day long, publicly attended event which ranks amongst the leaders of innovation in film programming. To present the picture that cities such as Toronto “lure” runaway productions dismisses the uneven power relationship involved. In this sense, while Lukinbeal (2004) is correct to point to the strong workforce and industry network in satellite centres to attract U.S. production, when a large proportion of revenue from the industry is derived from US “foreign” production, there are looming questions in regards to the diversity of this sector.10

On the Toronto Film and Television Office website, under a tab labeled “places represented,” the following question is posed: “When does Toronto not look like Toronto?” Listed across the span of several documents are the numerous major productions (feature films, TV movies, miniseries, television specials, and television series) filmed in the city between 1979 to 2007 including year of production, location sets, and places represented (TFTO, 2007). The question When does Toronto not look like Toronto? is an important one, reflective not only of the growing presence of the film

10 To put the relationship between domestic and foreign productions into perspective, the Toronto Film and Television Office (2008) released a report outlining the total production spending in Toronto for a five year period (http://www.toronto.ca/tfto/pdf/2007_stats.pdf). In 2007, 42% of feature films produced in Toronto were U.S. productions. From a production spending standpoint, this totaled $286.621 million dollars, compared to $366.130 million dollars spent on domestic productions (these statistics relate to on-location production spending and do not include post production or in studio production activity). In 2002, prior to the SARS epidemic and the near parity between the U.S. and Canadian dollars, US production spending was valued at $560.247 million, surpassing the domestic production figure which was valued at $322.923 million. This illustrates the power of U.S. productions in the local market.
industry in the city which costumes place (in a physical, material sense), but also of the representation of these places in major productions as flexible landscapes (oft times standing in for someplace-other). Weaving through the website, the question posed is eventually answered: “when it needs to look like New York, Chicago, or any other city you want.” Indeed the flexibility of the city to become other is advertised through long detailed lists that work to collapse an actual place to a virtual expression. Under the TFTO, places in Toronto are rendered flexible, awaiting their casting call. Potential filmmakers considering the city for filming can browse through an image gallery on the Toronto Film and Television Office (TFTO) website of city buildings, streets, neighbourhoods, park spaces and in the ultimate scene “before and after shots” taken from previous film sets (TFTO, 2007). The images in these galleries are abstracted of any meaning beyond their physical classification as building, street, neighbourhood. The immediacy of myth-making (Barthes, 2001), when applied to film, allows for the temporary suspension of disbelief in order to carry a message (allowing physical sites to be emptied of content in order to be filled). As Bollhöfer (2007: 168) notes, the representation of places in media are metaphorical, “determined by the plot and reduced to a single, unambiguous quality of place. Their visual descriptions are stylized and exaggerated, and often reduced to binary oppositions.” While consumers may rejoice in seeing ‘their’ place (a building, street, neighbourhood) in film, it is a masked and fragmented version of itself. Images are pieced together as montage in film to produce a particular affect; the cuts between frames mediates reality allowing moments and spaces to be experienced as continuous feeds on and off the screen (Doel and Clarke, 2007).
the next section I examine the context of film production at the Distillery and its placeless construction in filmic space.

Enter the Film Industry onto Distillery Stage

When the Distillery was recast as ‘Callahan Motors,’ a fictional car manufacturing plant in Ohio in the action-comedy *Tommy Boy* (1995), how did this representation construct the district? The scenes retain an overall sense of the space which is returned to throughout the film as an establishing shot and there are minimal modifications including the replacement of the original signage by new Callahan Motors signs. Simply stated, the forward narrative of actor Chris Farley playing a clueless heir of a multinational firm at the Distillery was irrelevant. The film *Tommy Boy* utilized the district because it could be transformed into an elsewhere.

The film industry began renting out space at the Distillery in the mid 1980s, primarily for exterior shots. *Three Men and a Baby*, shot on site in 1987, was the first film that was granted access to the interior spaces (Historica Research Limited, 1994). It is useful to provide a snapshot of film use at the site while the plant was still in operation to highlight the entryway of the film industry onto the site, and the shift in valuation of film production following the closure. Paul Allsop, former Vice President and Plant Manager of Gooderham and Worts, recounts the regulations placed on the film industry during his tenure while the site was operating:

We were very tough with the movie houses. We wanted them to put bonds down…Our electrician had to check all of their wiring before they started. They had to hire our maintenance people, all the time they were there. Any work that had to be done, maintenance wise, were done by our people. We didn't want any of the mechanics or electrics of the plant changed so
they had to hire all of these people during the shoot. So, our maintenance guys got a lot of overtime (cited in Historica Research Limited, 1994: 27).

In other words, while the plant was opened to film crews, there was a strict monitoring of activity. Filming was not a significant source of revenue at the beginning stages (and was seen by some to interfere with the daily operations of the site). In part this was due to an unawareness of the typical rates charged for film use. As Bob Morrison, former plant superintendent for Gooderham and Worts suggests:

I remember Dick [Dick Martin, superintendent of the plant before Morrison] used to charged them [film and television crews] peanuts to come here….He was charging what it cost to have one of our guys stay at night to supervise in case anything went wrong. So if they had one or two, that’s what he would charge them. So, if the guy was making $20 / hour, or for overtime say $30 / hour, that’s what he was charging them. I was talking to one of the people from the television studios and they said that this was awful cheap. If they had gone to so and so, they charge us $2,000. I told Dick that I was going to do it, to let me figure this one out. So, we made a pretty good buck while I was doing it. It was silly. Why should we allow them to come down. They [the film and television crews] were happy (cited in Historica Research Limited, 1994: 93).

What is interesting about these narratives by Allsop and Morrison is the way in which film and television activity at the site is seen as a disturbance (an activity that required monitoring) while the plant was still in operation.

In 1990, when the site shut its doors to alcohol production, the owners set out to find alternative uses for the property and while the long term goals focused on economic stability through adaptive reuse, more immediate strategies turned to the film industry. Renting out the site for filming provided an immediate source of income that was channeled into annual maintenance costs, and previous experience with the studios provided a set of connections (and a greater understanding of lease rates). According to Jim White, a long term maintenance worker, the film industry provided some needed
capital (paying for approximately 2/3 of the heating bill per year in the early 1990s), and was an attempt to boost the image of the site (cited in Historica Research Ltd, 1994).

White worked at Gooderham and Worts beginning in 1984 and knew the site intimately. He was the key person who assisted movie crews throughout the 1990s and early 2000s.\footnote{During the 1990s and early 2000s, the property was controlled by Wyndam Court Canada, a subsidiary of Allied Domecq.}

As White explains,

> We are trying to rebuild the image of the company as a place to come. It can only be more of a drawing attraction if people come to the plant and say, ‘Hey, I saw that in *Three Men and a Baby*. I know that building. I saw that on *Kung Fu*.’ It can only help the company image (cited in Historica Research Ltd, 1994: 57).

White was retained on the payroll by Cityscape as the redevelopment unfolded to help the partners navigate the site. During this time, he continued as the key contact for film crews wanting to lease space (Wallace Studios Newsletter, 2003).

Between the closure of the Distillery in 1990 and the sale of the property in 2001, the presence of the film industry filled the district with new life. It became a place holder for post-industrial redevelopment and imbued the district with new imaginaries. The voices of laborers, the sounds of machines, and the smells and sights of production faded from the industrial district. What replaced them were bright lights, trailers, and temporary alterations to create new scenes and senses of space, place, and time. When Cityscape purchased the property in 2001, the film industry continued to provide capital stability and heighten place image: “In the first six months of 2002, Cityscape signed $750,000 in movie shoots compared to $400,000 for all of 2001. Every lease includes a provision for moviemaking, part of the Cityscape quartet’s plan to add mystique (and revenue)” (Lewington, 2002b: 72). In an interview with John Berman, he remarked that
at the beginning of the redevelopment stage, the film industry lent a ‘cultural pulse,’ but its attraction has faded with the decline in film shoots (personal interview).

To provide some context of the flexibility of the district, the built form has doubled for numerous places around the world, including London in the 1890s (Dracula 2000, 2000), New York in the 1930s (Cinderella Man, 2005), and Poland in the 1940s (X-Men, 2000) alongside contemporary placements (Against the Ropes, 2004 set in Cleveland; Mimic, 1997 set in Manhattan) (Figure 5.1). The district appears boundless in scenes of chase (Bulletproof Monk, 2003) and circumscribed in scenes of crime (The Recruit, 2003). The Stone Distillery alone, a structure dating back to 1859, is used as the backdrop to a cemetery setting a tone of suspense in Don’t Say a Word (2001) and in Chicago (2002) the same building is cast as a prison. What these examples raise is the becoming other of the Distillery, a state which ultimately opens up the possibilities for the district to become something other than an industrial complex.12

The becoming other of the district is conditioned by the built form, scale, and coherence of the Victorian industrial architecture. The most popular representation of the district in film is to express the theme of entrapment. This theme leaks into many film genres from action and sci-fi, to musical and horror. For example, in the film The Recruit (2003), the district is used as an end point, an abandoned warehouse, in a chase between a CIA trainee, and his corrupt mentor, a CIA mole who has misled the young trainee to a front of illegality (Figure 5.2). As the two men chase each other outside, they are

---

12 These examples are representative of the extent to which the Distillery is reworked in film, but do not account for every occurrence of filming at the district. This would require the viewing of hundreds of films in order to position the context and placement of the district. While there is certainly opportunity to perform this level of analysis in order to map the limits of built form, this is not the objective of this chapter. Drawing on the 100 films listed on the official Distillery District website, I narrowed the focus to feature films which left approximately 40 films. I then located and viewed each of these films to analyze the representation of the district (a total of 25). I have focused here on eleven films where the exterior spaces of the district are visible, which falls under the classification of filming location as place.
Figure 5.1: Scene from *Dracula 2000* (2000) shot on location at the Distillery.

Figure 5.2: Scene from *The Recruit* (2003) shot at the Distillery. Note the building number in the background.
confronted with a trope of police officers and CIA agents in the ultimate climax of the film. In the background, the external signage of the Victorian industrial buildings is visible. In X-Men (2000), the Distillery is cast as a concentration camp in Poland in 1944, with the addition of barbed wire fencing and a thick layer of mud, rain and dark lighting (Figure 5.3). The shot sets the context of the beginning of a mutant race, where pain amounts to untapped powers forged through rage – an ultimate origin. It frames one of only a handful of shots in the film that is not confined to a futuristic aesthetic.

Figure 5.3: Scene from X-Men (2000) shot at the Distillery.

The dominance of the theme of entrapment in filmic space is of interest considering the other expressions of boundedness discussed in the prior chapters (including the historic gaze, planning regulations, private property, heritage designation, top down governance, the condominiums). For the consumer of these images, there is little reason to question where the scene is placed in a normative sense, geographically, or what functions beyond
those presented in filmic space the locations serve. This would act as a distraction from
the system of suspended disbelief that is being orchestrated. Recall here that the “edifice
of representation” is subsumed by simulacra and myth (Baudrillard, 1983: 11) and
signifiers and signifieds are reworked in filmic space to produce reality effects
(Lukinbeal, 2006).

What is a distillery when it can become a tire manufacturing plant (Tommy Boy),
a concentration camp (X-Men), or a prison (Chicago)? What does it mean when a site of
labour can become a space of pleasure or when a contemporary scene can become the
signifier of a powerful historical event? It speaks to the flexibility of place to contain
meaning (and value) based on the practices which occur within and outside it. The
Distillery is imbued with an endless lexicon of meanings which can be used to fabricate
other spaces, places, and times in film. These significations are limited only by the
imagination of the film producers, the measures in place for the protection of the heritage
resource, and the governance over the usage of the district for film purposes.

During the early 1990s, when plans and proposals for the district were surfacing,
the media contributed to the construction of an urban imaginary around film production
at the district. Reporters visiting the Distillery found more than the residue of industry:

The first thing that grabs the attention on entering the site…is the razor
wire that curls along the top of the chain-link fence. A sign reads: Long
Island Correction Facility. Inside, crumpled car wrecks, abandoned tires

---

13 See for example Clarke’s (1997) discussion on how Baudrillard works to expand the limits of the cinema
into the city (allowing the images on the screen to leak into “real” space). As Clarke (1997: 3) suggests, “If
many of us have, therefore, experienced that sudden, strange feeling whilst walking in the city that we are
walking through a set of a film, this is undeniably a part of the cinema. Cinema can no longer be restricted
to the screen upon which films are projected.”

14 Interestingly enough, while the garbage left scattered and the abandoned parts were fashioning a scene
according to the reporter in this article, when the current developers bought the site in 2001, they describe a
similar level of decay and neglect (John Berman speaking at “West Don Lands and the Lower Don River,”
Jane’s Walk, May 4, 2008).
and garbage are scattered throughout...on this day the site has been rented out for the filming of RoboCop: The Series, set in the 21st century (MacLeod, 1994).

The familiarity of the district as a film location translated into various plays of language to describe the redevelopment scheme. Freedman (1995) of the Globe, for example, reported on the decision by the OMB (which found in favour of the developers in 1995 to turn the district into an ambitious mixed use district) by adopting the language of the film industry:

[Gooderham and Worts] is about to star in Mixed Use, The Sequel, a remake of the archetypal Toronto redevelopment story, with children’s museum, market, and day care likely to be cast in supporting roles.

Salem (1994) of the Star similarly reports on the flexibility of place within the Distillery: “We have seen the future...and it is apparently located within the confines of the old Gooderham and Worts distillery in downtown Toronto.” Through a process of alteration, inversion, and replacement drawing on the diverse array of film sets that have repositioned the space, place, and time of the district, this statement would be better suited to a fill in the blank exercise: “we have seen the blank and it is apparently located within the confines of the old Gooderham and Worts distillery.” The use of the district as a film location promotes a system of meaning which is open to possibility (as multiplicity). In the third chapter, I drew on the referential representation of the district (as a form of visualization or image perception) in the press to a Dickens novel, a Parisian street, and New York in the 1870s. These systems of relation work to identify the district for capital (where naming conditions a sense of unity and identity via a process of negation and coherence).
The area surrounding the Distillery has been earmarked for the expansion of the new economy sector since the 1990s. When land use restrictions were relaxed in “The Kings” (King-Spadina and King-Parliament) in 1996, it shifted the future of the area from heavy industrial use towards light industrial and commercial activities including the film, media, design, and technology sectors (TUDS, 2002a: 1). By 1996, the Distillery, a special identity area within the King-Parliament district, was already an active location for the film industry. Between 1996 and 2001, the zoning changes to “The Kings” catalyzed the expansion of over 500 new jobs in the radio, film and television sector (TUDS, 2002a: 9). In addition to the flexible zoning provisions for “The Kings” which encourage expansion of the new media sector, the TFTO encouraged the development of the King-Parliament area as a commercial concentration of film production (TFTO, 2008). In close proximity to King-Parliament are the Port Lands, an area which was historically populated by heavy industry which is now undergoing redevelopment under the direction of Waterfront Toronto. Pinewood Toronto Studios, a public-private development was recently constructed within the Port Lands and stands as Canada’s largest comprehensive film centre. The proximity of the Distillery to these two film areas produces spill over effects. As one retail tenant notes, “To a lesser extent, we cater to the trade and what I mean by trade is not so much architects and designers, but film companies or a television commercial shoot. They’ll need product style, so they’ll borrow furniture from us” (R1).

The expression of place in filmic space responds to the strategy of differentiation as multiplicity. Multiplicity for Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 10) operates through a

---

15 The Distillery won City Council approval for an ambitious mixed-use redevelopment plan in 1994 (which was followed by a seventeen day OMB hearing brought on by Heritage Canada and three private citizen groups which was settled in favour of the developers in 1995).
process of deterritorialization / reterritorialization which is best understood through the example of the wasp and the orchid:

The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of a wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp is nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid’s reproductive apparatus. But it reterritorializes the orchid by transporting its pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome….a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp. Each of these becomings brings about the deterritorialization of one term and the reterritorialization of the other; the two becomings interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization even further.

The wasp finds nourishment in the orchid, and the orchid finds reproduction through the wasp, creating a process of symbiosis where both wasp and orchid develop and take shape in relation to one another. This interrelation is present in the ‘real’ and ‘reel’ spaces of the Distillery, wherein film is nourished by place, and place is reproduced via film (a becoming-film of place and a becoming-place of film). As another example of multiplicity, in chapter 3, I outlined Foucault’s notion of the book as a relational entity, a point which is further demonstrated by Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987: 11) suggestion that “the book is not an image of the world. It forms a rhizome with the world, there is an aparallel evolution of the book and the world.” This concept of multiplicity (as rhizome) is particularly useful in examining the representation of place within filmic space as an aparallel evolution of space and filmic space. Specifically, it draws attention to the possibility of place to become an elsewhere through the relations formed between elements (harkening back to Massey’s (1994) sense of place as ‘open’). This non-hierarchical relation is outlined by Barber (2002: 16-17):

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, cities became transformed and even brought into existence through the impetus and movement of film images, viewed collectively in the form of exhortative
newsreels and feature films within crowded cinema spaces; at the same
time, cities reached a point of crisis, and even were abandoned or
destroyed, through the impact of film images on urban populations.

In other words, assemblages in film construct “new spatio-temporal orders wherein the
‘fragmented images’ are brought together ‘according to a new law’” thereby disrupting
the dominant claim(s) of space (Buck Morss, 1995: 268). Film assemblages disrupt
singular claims to space by highlighting simultaneous realities through the use of
montage. Doel and Clarke (2007: 890) similarly draw on the term “montage” to express
“the process of selecting, editing, and piecing together separate sections of imagery for a
calculated affect, and the technique of producing a new composite whole from fragments
of imagery.” Returning to the example of the book as a representational frame which
produces a rhizome with the world, film brings together elements within a
representational frame (as montage) while forming multiple relations with the world (as
multiplicity).

While representations of place in filmic space offer a site of possibility, how these
images are consumed by a set of actors can work to singularize this potential opening. In
the case of the Distillery, singularization is produced under the strategy of distinction,
whereby a set of social actors commodify the use of the district as a film location for
place-making (multiplicity is thus singularized for the purpose of place marketing). For
the remainder of the paper, I turn to the ways in which the tenants at the Distillery
respond to the film industry (through its physical re-orderings and its symbolic meanings),
and then shift to how the status associated with the film industry is stretched and
remodeled to form a distinctive place identity.
Drawing on Film as a Strategy of Distinction

After the stage set is dismantled and the cast and crew empties out, the activity of filming remains couched in the palimpsestual quality of place. It remains an active part of place through the physical remainders of the film industry, and through the cultural and symbolic capital associated with film which forms part of the urban imaginary. Crang and Travlou (2009: 87) describe the layerings of place on the island of Kefalonia, the stage for the Captain Corelli’s Mandolin book and film, as a series of present absences: “There are ruins from the earthquake haunting the present landscape with architectural traces of a past forever lost and then, there are the ruins of the filmic space representing a reinvented past that returns to the present landscape to haunt it with memories in absentia.” These ruins of place (as a layering) cut across time and space, collecting the material and the symbolic aspects of landscape. Beyond the potential for place to become its fiction as raised in the example of Kefalonia, films also work to recode place in multiple ways via the associations, memories, ideas, and images that accompany visitors onto the site (that affect ways of seeing). While this later point is beyond the scope of this research, it speaks to the multiple assemblages of place in film and film in place.

Where film assembles new orders, consumers create new trajectories out of these orders through their signifying systems (see de Certeau, 1984: xvii). During the interview process a number of tenants digressed into anecdotes about the use of the district as a film location, citing everything from personal encounters with celebrities to the cinematography of a scene shot in their space. The function of the district as a film location is important to the majority of tenants on a number of levels: it acts as a
conversation starter for their businesses, it is a way for them to connect with the district’s past, and it expresses the cultural importance of the space. In this section, I focus on the physical remainders of the film industry through the residue of paint at the Distillery before turning to how the production of film is drawn into a strategy of differentiation to add cultural and symbolic capital.

Under the protection of the Ontario Heritage Act from 1976, the film industry was not able to physically alter the built environment of the Distillery for any purpose. Accordingly, the physical remainders from film typically fall on the side of coats of paint to some of the interior spaces. Given that these additions are more subtle, it is difficult for the most part to decipher whether the intricacies of the spaces are remainders of the alcohol production period, or whether they were made during film production. The reassembling of the pieces are puzzles for many of the tenants, raising questions concerning the legitimacy of the physical heritage. For example, when asked how the film industry shapes the district, one tenant pointed to the coats of paint left behind:

We sandblasted the heck out of everything that had paint on it because it was years of film use, so there’d be like an eighth of an inch of paint on everything and I just wanted it to look like it did more when it was being used as a distillery (Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery, personal interview).

Understandings of the heritage designation produce an artificial separation between functions. By placing emphasis on the “originary” use of the district as a distillery, its usage as a film set is defined as something removable. This also works to bracket everything leading up to the closure of the industrial operations in 1990 as holding heritage value and everything following the closure as not holding heritage value, despite the purpose / intention behind any additions or modifications, or the dates at which these
changes took place. Other tenants draw on the complications that result from the use of particular spaces by the film industry. A gallery operator describes the limitations she faced during the renovation of her space and shifts attention to the way in which filming devalued the heritage resource:

The walls had been painted for film sets…at some points they had been sandblasted for film sets. Because this room has been used on so many occasions, I could not sandblast the walls…they had already been degrading to a certain point. That’s fine so we painted. We did sandblast the joists and the ceilings…so you can see the timber again because they were painted. I don’t know if that would have been for industrial purposes or if it dates to when they were doing movies in here. It’s really hard to know (G1).

In this case, the physical changes orchestrated by the film industry are positioned as degenerative. Returning to Benjamin’s (1977: 226) notion of origin, rather than turning towards beginnings, it is necessary to view the past as a “process of becoming and disappearing.” The division between functions and their value (industrial production and film production) is socially constructed and must be viewed through the simultaneity of openings and collapse / closure. A coat of paint added during an industrial period does not necessarily constitute “heritage.”

Similar to the developers, some of the earliest tenants of the Distillery recount their first visits to the district vis-à-vis the film industry:

I discovered it…because my mom was buying a car from the car dealership right there [adjacent to the district], so I was there waiting for my mom, and I said ‘what is that place’?…They were filming on the street, and I thought it would be so nice to have a studio there (Shao-Pin Chu, Shao Design, personal interview)

At times the rearrangements of place for filming presented ruptures in place memory:

I first got a tour of the property before anything else had happened…We looked at a lot of spaces and decided this would be the space we would
open in... the next day we came back and they had transformed it entirely into a film set. So it didn’t look at all how I wanted to remember it (G1, gallery operator).

The modifications to place by the film industry pre-redevelopment worked to add cultural appeal to the buildings through an illumination of the possibilities inherent in the district and through an expression of culture. How the film industry is re-membered in the current iteration of the district as an ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ district by the developers, the media, and the tenants adds another layer to the function of the industry. Despite the placeless depiction of the Distillery in feature films, tenants draw upon these references to incite an inference of place value:

From time to time we play movies that were shot at the Distillery [in the store]. It’s a conversation. In the retail business you’ve got to start conversations. We were down here when they shot some of the movies too. It just adds to the heritage. We actually got to hang around with a few celebrities, so that’s not bad (Michael Ber, Sound Design, personal interview).

Beyond the practice of tenants drawing on films produced at the district in conversation with consumers, there is also a tendency for tenants to incite anecdotes of the films as events:

_Cinderella Man_ was shot in Toronto...I don’t know if you saw the film but where Russell Crowe plays a boxer from the 1930s named James Bradick. He’s trying to get work one morning and those are the gates where that scene was shot [pointing to the wrought iron gates at the north entrance]...It’s nice to have little anecdotes like that so when you engage people in conversation when they walk through your shop they’ll say ‘This is such a great site’ and you can say ‘yeah, _Chicago_ was filmed here.’ So it adds to the uniqueness of the site or the caché somehow (Wayne Parrish, Sport Gallery, personal interview).

In this example, _Cinderella Man_ (Figure 5.4) and _Chicago_ become significant spatial references to orient the value of the district. While the film industry for the majority of
tenants adds cultural value and symbolic meaning to the space through narrativization (or storytelling), for other tenants, the representation of the district in film operates as a vehicle for the *transmission* of place (identity). These transmissions of place work as a marketing strategy for consumptive purposes.

Figure 5.4: A scene from the film *Cinderella Man* (2005) highlighting the wrought iron gates of the Distillery.

The issue that remains however, is that unless the audience watching the film is intimately familiar with the district, most of these referential qualities are lost in the forward narrative. At times, the district is not even credited as a film location (within the film credits and on popular media databases), further disorienting the viewer. For the tenants who work at the district however, the representation of the district in film adds to the public accessibility of an important resource:

I think that film is really important to have here. I know there’s a lot of tenants who complain about it because it takes parking from the retail. I
know the filming has been reduced significantly and I think it’s really too bad. It’s a responsibility to the site itself. It’s such a jewel that to sit there and shut it down and say ‘no, no, we can’t share that because of the parking issue,’ you know it’s really short sighted...I just find that it’s logistic issues. There’s something really kind of cool about going to see a film and seeing where you work, you know the place, the brickwork and you see it’s a really unique kind of place (Marjolyn van der Hart, impressionist artist, personal interview).

While the tenant above begins the discussion by directing attention to the importance of “sharing” the district where film acts as a vehicle for public transmission, the latter part of this response attends to how the appeal of the district is created through the expression of film (where film acts as a mediator of value). On this latter point, the value of the district (as a unique space) is mediated via the film industry, wherein its presence on the screen defines its character. These transmissions of place orient the district on a terrain of global capitalism. They also attend to the “multiplicity of overlapping contexts” (Rose 2002: 462) and the differential practices that work to constitute the process of place and place identity.

Given the private ownership of the land, and the placement of the district outside of the city centre, the use of the Distillery as a film set was not always part of the public consciousness. The film industry, as one tenant notes, drew attention to the distinctiveness of the district: “it just speaks to what kind of a flavor is here, you know, and how unique this site is” (David Brown, fine artist, personal interview). Along this line, a small number of tenants noted that the film industry has very little to do with the present iteration of the district. For the majority of the tenants that I interviewed, however, the industry lends caché. Most of the filming moved indoors following the public reopening of the district in 2003, or is concentrated in courtyards and laneways. As one tenant notes,
They do film next door quite a bit [The Fermenting Cellar] and it’s a great space for that, it’s raw…it’s a pretty incredible rental space, 8000 square feet. Right now they’re dressing it up crazy for tomorrow night. Sometimes they just use it as is, and they film in there, do photo shoots. We’ve had fashion shoots in our gallery. People like the old effects (Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery, personal interview).

While filming has declined considerably at the district, less intensive forms of image construction persist. According to one retail tenant, the occupation and specificity of the spaces on site do not readily lend themselves to film purposes (R1). The district is highly photographed for individual consumption, where it is used as a backdrop in numerous weddings, photo shoots, corporate booths, music videos, and advertisements.16

While these practices constitute more temporary acts of utilizing the district, they remain as part of its visual cadre.17 The Fermenting Cellar is used frequently for example by private corporations for product launches (Lexus, Absolute Vodka, Daimler Chrysler), and for private parties (Microsoft, IKEA, General Electric).18 Drawing on the district to propel the image value of a private corporation is an extension of the prior function of the district as a film set, directing attention (and value) to particular visual codes and image perceptions.

16 The district differentiates between private photography shoots (such as wedding photos) and commercial photography shoots (such as advertisements). The fee for private shoots is currently listed as $183.75 dollars, while the commercial shoots are listed as $2,100.00 dollars (Distillery District, Distillery Site Photography, 2008).

17 The district is recognizable in fragmented form as the backdrop in numerous fashion shoots and product launches. Most recently, Tilley (a line of “adventure” clothing and accessories) drew on the district as the backdrop to the fashion line to convey the image of a timeless classic. On the Tilley website (www.tilley.com) the catch phrase of the clothing line reads “Goes with anywhere.” The “anyplace” of the Distillery in film, in this sense, is similar to the placement of the Distillery in advertisements as “anywhere.” It is a becoming other.

18 On the website for The Fermenting Cellar (www.fermentingcellar.ca/fermenting_cellar.swf) many of these corporations are listed as patrons of the space complete with testimonials of the utilization of the space for their events.
While the tenants draw upon and re-member the film industry to foster cultural and economic appeal (and advantage), the film industry is drawn upon as a wider strategy for differentiation as part of the process of naming space by the developers. The official website for the Distillery lists many of the films, television shows, and music videos (along with the actors) shot at the district over the past 15 years, under a section titled “Hollywood North” (Distillery District, 2006). The aesthetic of built form, celebrity sightings, and creative production works to attract cultural and economic capital. The industry is named on the website to raise the profile of the space, and to condition the meaning of the district as a space of desire. As Donald (1999: 63-8) suggests, the representation of places in film “render certain states of mind and styles of imagining” – ways of seeing – that are “simultaneously sensory and symbolic.” Reciting run-ins with celebrity and the flexibility of space to record anything from action scenes to musicals, framing the district via the film industry coalesces with the construction of distinction (as a play of difference which trades in aesthetics).

During one of my site visits to the Distillery in May, 2008, I walked into the condo sales office to collect information on the third proposed condominium (The Gooderham Condominium). I was passed a clipboard for registration, handed a ‘gift bag’ and led alongside two young couples to a three dimensional model incorporating the proposed and completed additions (Pure Spirit, Clear Spirit, and Gooderham). Included in the gift bag alongside pricing options, mortgage rates, and general marketing materials, were three newspaper articles. One of the articles, and the one that I want to focus on here, was a printout from the Star (Wong, 2008) on the construction of Pinewood Toronto Studios in the Port Lands. By drawing on the studios in their marketing
campaign for the Gooderham Condominium, the developers are working to connect the
district to neighbouring sites of film production, and to re-member the function of the
district itself as ‘Hollywood North.’ Similarly, the history of the district as a film
location is utilized in the Pure Spirit Condominium brochure where the value associated
with film production is connected to other forms of festivity: “Beyond being THE
LOCATION for numerous films, the Distillery District provides a venue for a
distraction to the kaleidoscope of annual events” (Pure Spirit Lofts and Condos Brochure: 7, emphasis
original).

Conclusion: Aestheticizing Place via Cultural Screen

What is the value of the imaginative
possibilities that are ushered into the urban
landscape by the film industry? How can these possibilities help us to re-imagine built
form and place? How does the role of film in the process of urban redevelopment
contribute to understandings of urban change and the role of visual culture in everyday
life? In this chapter, I privilege the local via an examination of one film location within
Toronto. This focus provides a double facing: first, it allows an engagement with the
production of simulacrum in film; and second, it allows an examination of how the
repetitious use of the Distillery in film affects the function of the space (in physical and
cultural ways), and leads to a re-imagining of place (identity). The developers, the media,
and the tenants draw on the value of the use of the district as a film set as part of a
broader strategy for place-making (to construct distinction as a play of difference). Film
also serves as an important reminder at the district of the possibilities for built form to
become something other (on a functional and visual level) than what is captured at any
present moment. The possibilities for the site to become something ‘other’ (as multiplicity) destabilize narrative constructs that position place as a singular entity (a politics of place difference).

The repetition and use of the distinctive industrial aesthetic at the Distillery in film forms an important element in the narrative of redevelopment. The industrial zoning of the site following the cessation of alcohol production, did not readily lend itself to immediate transformation. The consistent, yet temporary, use of the district as a film location added capital injections and created a place imagery that could be packaged and disseminated, thereby allowing the planning process to unfold with greater flexibility. Similarly, the relaxed zoning in the King-Parliament area in 1996 placed further emphasis on the attractiveness of this area in Toronto for filming. The film industry teeters between the industrial and the cultural, an in-between tenant, and yet an important one in framing the possibilities of place.

The role of film in urban redevelopment has broader implications for social policy and must be examined at greater depth within scholarly research. The Distillery is an exclusive private sector redevelopment east of the downtown corridor which has minimal relation to neighbouring lands. The redevelopment contributes to the process of remaking urban spaces for middle and upper class tastes (Smith, 1996, 2006) where lands for affordable housing and low rent land uses in the inner city are further disadvantaged.

---

19 In an interview with John Berman of Cityscape, I posed the following question: what relationship does the Distillery foster with the communities surrounding the site? His response was that there were no adjacent communities to the district and therefore no direct communication. When asked to clarify, he noted that the comment referred to the physical distance between the district and the communities that surround it. St. Lawrence lies directly west of the site separated by Parliament Street and a park. North on Parliament Street is St. James Town and further north, Regent Park. East and north-east of the Distillery is the site of the West Don Lands and south of the railway tracks is the East Bayfront area. The lack of relation or communication developed with any of these communities reflects the destination status of the site (rather than its status as a neighbourhood).
The practices and behaviours which characterized the district during its operation as a distillery are replaced by the spectacle of urban consumption. Film is incorporated into spectacular modes of consumption to circulate images of celebrity and aesthetic appeal (renderings of place that distract from the exclusivity of the site). How film crews negotiated the site, their labour practices, and the role of film in the redevelopment process are also left out of these images.

Images of places in film are ghostly in character due to their ability to enter into and out of space and time without absolute clarity of form. At times, it is difficult to identify the spatial or temporal markers, leading to a cycle of signification where the viewer becomes implicit in the desire to name (wherein the Distillery becomes New York or Chicago). There are however sites which actively seek out film use for place promotion (see Hudson and Ritchie, 2006). Additional (ghostly) accounts of representational places in film, and the role of film in the context of redevelopment, will proffer further insights into, and debates on, the relations between film and urban change.

In order to advance understandings of these relations, there is a need for comparative research on urban change which pays special attention to contextual circumstances (see Ley, 1996; Lees, 2000). This contextual framework is particularly important considering the structure of the film industry and its uneven development across space. In the case of the Distillery, the use of the district as a film location drew out new imaginaries of the historic value of the district given the ability for its signifiers (built form) to be brought into alternative projections of space, place, and time.

Following the redevelopment, the district is not as conducive to filming as it was during its ‘vacant’ state. However, this does not lessen the importance of filming in the
narrative of place, both in terms of the way that filming operated as a placeholder for postindustrial redevelopment, and in the way that this activity is incorporated into a contemporary place identity to promote distinction. The developers and the tenancy draw on the use of the site as a film set to promote place distinction (the status of the celebrity, caché of film). Film can work to increase visitor motivation through the depiction of identifiable places (see Crang and Travlou, 2009). The Distillery, however, remains largely unidentifiable in its filmic appearances. Rather, it is malleable (where it stands in for a plethora of places, spaces, and times) and anonymous (lacking credit). The value of the film industry in branding strategies at the Distillery lies in the ability for place-makers to usher in new spatial imaginaries to construct a unique sense of place. The relationship between film and place illustrates how place-making is not tied to absolute location (place as process). Rather place identity is as much symbolic as it is material (made up of collections and fusions of meanings, moments, reflections, affect, memories, and built form); singular claims to space are broken down through the depiction of simultaneous realities of place as montage.
Chapter 6:
Conclusion: Differentiating Sameness: Distilling the Logic of Urban Redevelopment

Some modes of reflection, analysis, and argument aim not at building a systematic theory, but at clarifying the meaning of concepts and issues, describing and explaining social relations, and articulating and defending ideals and principles. Reflective discourse…makes arguments, but these are not intended as definitive demonstrations. They are addressed to others and await their response (Young, 1990: 5).

This thesis extends theorizations on urban redevelopment through an engagement with the strategies used to differentiate space. In particular, I examined the strategies used to market the Distillery District as a unique and distinct place, and the effects of this valuation on art (the tokenistic inclusion of creative practices / cultural producers), history (the erasure of labour and context in the production of heritage narratives) and space (the privatization of urban space and exclusivity). The four strategies of differentiation – negation, coherence, residue, and multiplicity – reflect four techniques of power. Each strategy contains the potential for both a play and a politics of difference. Place identity at the site is currently constructed through a play of difference (a surface rendering based primarily on aesthetics). By examining the politics (the production of narrative constructs, modes of inclusion / exclusion) behind this form of place-making, I have illustrated how alternative formations of place identity can be activated. My central argument was two-fold. First, I argued that the top-down manufacture of place identity at the Distillery fractures the experience of space for various user groups (tenants, visitors, residents). In an attempt to construct place distinction, what emerges is a sense of sameness which is oriented outward at the expense of nurturing situated / contested modes of place identity. Second, I argued that it is only by developing an understanding of how place differentiation is operationalized (produced, consumed, resisted, co-opted)
that alternative formations of place identity are realized, and the nature of socio-spatial disconnectedness can be overcome.

To understand the present evocation of urban festivity in North America (festival marketplaces, cultural districts, themed environments) it is necessary to place this phenomenon in conversation with the discourses and practices which enabled it. These discourses and practices are a product of the strategy to singularize space in the global market (led by policy directives and the private and public sectors) to attract tourists, middle to upper class residents and consumers, and creative businesses. The costs of this manufacture of site-identity and meaning are grave, producing landscapes of sameness. Also present at these sites is a manufactured (and often contradictory) sense of place and / or time. Obsolete industrial structures, owing to the relative decline of manufacturing employment as a result of deindustrialization, are emerging as ideal host environments for this form of spatial re-branding (see Hutton, 2009). The arts community, given its ability to remake space and smooth capital flows, is a core element alongside festive activity and creative workers.

The redevelopment of these sites offers a highly marketable aesthetic, promotes historic interest, and cultivates cultural attraction through urban festivity. It is in the redevelopment of these spaces – specifically their branding and the inclusion and exclusion of particular characteristics – where the production of sameness emerges. Under the desire to carve out generative difference emerged the Distillery District, a space of industrial manufacturing recast as an ‘arts, culture, and entertainment’ district. This shifted a potential public good into a commercially driven product. The private ownership model of the site differentiates the space from other waterfront
redevelopments and festival marketplaces which are typically organized as public-private partnerships, public endeavors, or private endeavors with heavy subsidization. The private ownership of a heritage site produces a tension between economic viability and preservation. It also minimizes the level of consultation for residents in the planning process and the level of accountability (access and representation). Heritage programming needs to ensure that appropriate site animation / interpretation emerges alongside economic development.

Drawing on the present constitution of the Distillery, four major themes guided this research: a) the shifting representations of industry, history, and art; b) the celebration, commodification, and regulation of place differentiation; c) the incorporation / inclusion of history; and d) the incorporation / inclusion of the arts community. The present construction shifted the site from a space of industrial production to a high-end consumptive enclave (which includes cultural production to legitimize redevelopment) just east of the downtown corridor. While the vision of the district articulated by the developers is oriented around the themes of the inclusion of the arts community and adaptive reuse in an attempt to manufacture distinction, each of these aspects is robbed of their complexity, smoothed into non-threatening narratives, and served up as aesthetic delight in practice. The goal to singularize space in relation to these two themes works to orient an experience of consumption, but the Distillery brand forms an impediment to the dissemination of local and regional histories, the potential for meaningful creative exchange, and long-term stability.
Each of the chapters herein worked to position multiple ways of seeing the site through the lenses of history, planning, practice, and montage. In chapter 2, I examined ways of seeing history through cartographic depictions that catalogue the physical construction of built form and the context for its inclusion. I operationalized the strategy of residue as an interpretive critique to complicate the lack of engagement or animation of the past within the district on the ground (a commodification of history which focuses on tokenistic displays of the past). In chapter 3, I oriented ways of seeing the district along the parameters of urban planning, where the top down governance of space works to condition differentiation in place identity and representation through the strategies of negation and coherence using legal and institutional frameworks. I oriented these vantages via an emphasis on heritage and culture, two elements which form part of the dominant discourse of the district forged by the developers, media, stakeholders, and circulated within policy materials. I demonstrated how the role of the private sector in the redevelopment of a nationally designated heritage site works to commodify the very elements worth preserving, and structures space as an exclusive enclave for the middle to upper class. In chapter 4, I continued to map the strategies of negation and coherence by examining how flexibility in meaning and practice is produced by the tenants in response to the discursive web of naming space in the contemporary reordering of the site. My focus here was on individuality, cultural expression / repression, and heritage and condominium planning. While some of these lenses are present in earlier chapters, they stand here as vessels that are pulled and filled to re-frame the conditions of naming and creativity in practice. By highlighting the multimodal ways of imaging the site emerging
from the tenancy, the one dimensional image of place constructed by the developers –
where place is sanitized and singularized – is dismantled. Finally, in chapter 5, I
privileged the visual as a marker of the possibilities that exist between built form and
space through the medium of film. The lens of the camera offers a provocative caption of
the site, where it enables the buildings to move through space, place, and time in the
fashion of montage. The film industry was an important intermediary tenant at the site
allowing the planning framework to unfold over an extended period of time. While the
representation of the district in filmic space destabilizes the construction of place identity
as tied to absolute location (working to unpin singular claims to space), the multiplicity
inherent within the repetition and use of the district in film (a form of deterritorialization)
is reterritorialized by the developers, the tenants, and the media to construct distinction.

While the literature on urban redevelopment emphases the desire for places to
carve out generative difference for interurban competition, how place differentiation
operates in discourse and practice is under-theorized in the literature. The four strategies
that make up the typology respond to the complexity of systems of classification in place-
making. The production of place is always necessarily based on a process of selection.
Understanding the nature and effects of these selections (whether they are appropriate to
a particular site) means attending to the work that they do: Who has the power to
classify? How does the organization of place structure social relations? What types of
narratives, objects, processes, memories are on offer and how does this affect notions of
belonging and identity? What potential exists for producing a politics of place
difference?
In the remainder of this concluding chapter, I examine two central elements that arise (as an effect of and / or a basis for) the strategies and tactics of place differentiation in this project: the construction of a unique place identity and the revaluation of industrial forms / lands.

_Festiivity in Force: Building a Non-Place?_

One of my earliest framing questions in relation to the Distillery was “what is the site and what does it do”? Added to this were two additional questions “according to whom” and “in what context”? It became apparent during the research stage that these questions were highly correlative with the issues confronting the site at present. Though I never raised this line of questioning directly in the interviews, articulations of the meaning and identity of the Distillery returned endlessly to this taxonomy. The limitations of the present classification are raised by a number of tenants as summated in the following quote also used in chapter 4: “I think it’s just that tension of what is this place? Right now it’s kind of like a non-place. They should just figure it out and let us know [in reference to the developers]” (G4, gallery operator). Interestingly, for this tenant, a non-place is cast against the construction of place identity and meaning served according to the vision put forth by the developers. In other words, the difficulty surrounding ‘what is this place?’ for this tenant is a failure on the part of the developers to formulate a clear and consistent vision. The status of the district as a non-place raises a complex set of questions that respond to spaces of capitalist transformation and everyday life more generally: under what conditions or circumstances does a place become a non-place? Does the current climate of building space in the urban necessitate
the markers of identification / certainty / simple recognition that Hannigan (2002) ascribes to fantasy cities? Where does resistance emerge within the complex web of naming, designing, and producing meaning and identity?

Relph (1976) distinguishes between place and placelessness to mark out the demise of urban spaces under processes which create imitation and homogenization (wherein placeless environs cease to produce meaning for those experiencing them). In chapter 5, I took up these ideas in relation to the representation of place by the film industry, wherein the anyplace of Toronto and the Distillery served as useful visual arcades for runaway productions. The anyplace which attracted the film industry to the district also serves as a reminder of the possibilities of built form and function to signify a diversity of spaces, places, and times. Here, I want to connect these ideas to the present moment of spatial indifference at the district: the inability to derive what should be a meaningful engagement with a space which carries a rich set of histories, a strong visual aesthetic, a non-chain environment, and a full range of cultural production and consumption. In an attempt to construct place differentiation, what arises at the Distillery is a singularization of space (as brand) which attempts to flatten all manners of disjuncture for outward expression and interurban competition. Within this flattening process, descriptors of space are hollowed of their meaning, left as empty vessels which are at times filled with contradictory matter. In saying this, I am not trying to reinforce a binary between place and non-place where the former is positive and the latter is negative. Rather, I am making the point that in an attempt to produce a particular form of meaning (articulated by the developers, key stakeholders, and city authorities), there is a return to

1 Also relevant to this discussion is the work of Augé (1995) and Moran (2005) on the non-place and quotidian space.
a system of sameness in operation at the site. The issue at hand is not the production of placelessness itself, but rather what placelessness does.

The top-down governance of space at the district (a product of market driven forces and competitiveness which is seen in the majority of cultural districts and festival marketplaces) leads to a passive as opposed to an active mode of participation (or becoming). To take the example of the tenancy, rather than being directly engaged with place making, the tenants respond to place as product (albeit in creative and transgressive ways at times). In relation to this process of flattening, the tenancy must continue to articulate the terms of their participation at the site across factions. Individual instances of this form of resistance in day-to-day exchanges, such as the redirection of the festival and event season by a group of art gallery operators in chapter 4, emerge as useful tactics of active participation. While tenant meetings are cited as inappropriate occasions for meaningful interaction, other instances of communication must be created to allow the tenancy to help guide the process of building. For example, tenant directed meetings, collaboration amongst tenants for events and activities, and the creation of an organized association of tenants would serve to produce more active forms of participation. This will in turn create greater stability within the tenancy, and will offer creative strategies for the developers to ensure that place differentiation is waged in accordance with the practitioners of space rather than against them. For the tenants themselves, this form of participation may work to dissolve frustrations over particular elements in the vision and practice of the site and make occupancy of this space a collective process of expression.

In *Postmodern Geographies*, Soja (1989) arrives at the question “what is this place?” in relation to Los Angeles, the epicentre of postmodern urbanism. As he suggests,
Even knowing where to focus, to find a starting point, is not easy, for, perhaps more than any other place, Los Angeles is everywhere. It is global in the fullest sense of the word. Nowhere is this more evident than in its cultural projection and ideological reach, its almost ubiquitous screening of itself as a rectangular dream machine for the world. Los Angeles broadcasts its self-imagery so widely that probably more people have seen this place – or at least fragments of it – than any other on the planet...Everywhere seems also to be in Los Angeles (Soja, 1989: 222-3).

Writing in the late 1980s the ‘everywhere’ and ‘everything’ described by Soja is sped up in the contemporary climate of fast policy transfers ranging from entrepreneurial styles of governance to creative city scripts. Cities across North America responded to the effects of deindustrialization through local economic development models that privileged image promotion (Harvey, 1989). Festival marketplaces, themed environments, cultural precincts promote place and practice interurban competitive advantage through image transfers. The effect, according to Harvey (2000: 168), is an un-escapable production of utopia as a market driven, consumption-based dispatch:

The multiple degenerate utopias that now surround us – the shopping malls and the bourgeois commercialized utopias of the suburbs being paradigmatic – do as much to signal the end of history as the collapse of the Berlin Wall ever did. They instantiate rather than critique the idea that ‘there is no alternative,’ save those given by the conjoining of technological fantasies, commodity culture, and endless capital accumulation.

Images are an important element in the production of space where authority is granted to particular arrangements. The lack of critical response to the upscale redevelopment of the Distillery is perplexing. The power of the image in contemporary society is clearly at play here: the rights of the developers to ensure economic viability in return for the rescue of a site of industrial heritage from ruin, supersede the rights to space. The surveillance tactics and forms of socio-spatial exclusion are contained within, and emerge from, an aestheticization of space; the site is sanitized and purified under the power of the
image as a ‘distinct’ space in the city. In chapters 4 and 5, I highlight how the image can be reappropriated as a political strategy. For example, the image of the site in filmic space dismantles singular claims to place through the identification of individual systems of relations that are non-hierarchical. Similarly, the one dimensional image of the site (cleansed and purified of contestation for market exchange) is dismantled through multimodal ways of seeing raised by the tenancy. Understanding place identity as a fragmentary construct works to produce a unity of a different order (where the untying of coherence produces a frame that holds things together).

In order to engage with the spatial manifestation of the policies and politics that took effect (and are taking effect) since the 1970s, it is essential to respond with critical engagement. If systems of classification contain power – defining who belongs and who doesn’t, what is included, and what is marginalized – than it is classification itself that must be democratized to allow for more participatory forms of place-making that are open to contestation and dialogue. To return to a quote from Bourdieu (1984: 479), the struggles of the social world are based on power “over the classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of the representations of the groups and therefore of their mobilization and demobilization.” The typology that I offer in this thesis works towards deconstructing and reconstructing classification schemes in the order of place-making (in discourse and in practice) to provide different access points (in representation and voice). Within each system of classification, there contains the potential for enabling different formations of place, identity, representation, and governance (to reinsert a politics into the play of difference characterizing the contemporary urban landscape).
In this project, I have worked to advance understandings of how private sector productions of space operate within competitive market structures through the desire to differentiate. A reliance on the private sector in cultural initiatives, through partnership or as sole leader, raises questions concerning for whom are these spaces being transformed, and for what ends? There are a number of implications to these arrangements of space including uneven capital investment / development, exclusion, reduced community participation, singularization / sanitization of history, and the privatization of space (and the retrenchment of the public sector).

The Re-Valuation of Industrial Monuments

The process of deindustrialization has left ruins of buildings, once occupied by the rhythms of production, to await their fate. Dickinson (2001: 34) describes four possible fates bestowed upon old industrial structures in the contemporary era: “1) Demolition and disappearance; 2) recycling into new (primary commercial) uses; 3) transformation into historical monuments; or 4) persistence in the landscape as conventional ruins.” The Distillery emerged as a site worth preserving (falling into the second fate most prominently, and the third fate due to its heritage designation); its preservation responds to the value of historic form for capitalist exchange. Without a visitor’s centre to amble into to gather the pieces, and a price tag set for the walking tours, much of the collection of history is left to the imagination of the consumer, who must negotiate the remains of industry through the distraction of the culture industry. The heritage designation, architectural coherence and status, and geographic location of the site minutes from a still-thriving downtown corridor, ensured that it was not a forgotten
space. But what is remembered and how? The memory of history is waged on the glory of the past, whitewashed of conflict, and safely guarded by development.

While the built form tells a story of industrial progress and company wealth, it also narrates the ways in which structures of the past were valued across time. Even when the buildings were first constructed they held value beyond their utility as warehouse, tank house, boiler room, and rack house. When they were constructed, they were intended for viewing: the orientation of the Stone Distillery prepared a visual sightline along the historic harbour. In other words, the structures espoused the progress of Gooderham and Worts. The buildings remain today due to a particular way of seeing the value in these artefacts, which began with the owners of the site when it was still operating as an industrial machine. Similarly, the sale of the site was contingent upon finding a buyer that would take up this way of seeing to ensure not only the survival of the complex, but also its monumentality to the industrial age.

Both the planning framework from 1994 and the redevelopment process beginning in 2001 were forced to confront the economic viability of the site given the extensive amount of renovations required, and included provisions for the addition of new construction to supplement capital expenditures. Alongside economic viability emerged the notion of the ‘right to build.’ For example, at the beginning stages of the redevelopment, Cityscape was applauded for their transformation of an industrial wasteland into a pristine site of urban festivity. The applause fell quieter upon the announcement that Cityscape wished to rearrange the density allowance for new construction, passed in the original planning framework. A diminishing public purse reduces the ability to protect the structures of the past in the City; greater reliance on the
private sector to redevelop large tracts of underutilized lands translates into diminishing control over the final product and the commercialization of a potential public good. This raises issues surrounding public versus private space, inclusive versus exclusive building, and the rights and access to histories versus the presentation of a commercialized past.

There is a strong relation between historic structures and the arts and culture sector. Old industrial spaces emerge as prime real estate for the arts, deriving their appeal from their open spaces, lowered rents, lighting, and general aesthetics (see Zukin, 1982; Bain, 2003). Liberty Village, Yorkville, and Queen Street carry a more extensive history as arts communities in the City of Toronto emerging between the 1960s and 1990s when cultural producers took over warehouse spaces, old manufacturing buildings, and deteriorating historic residences. More recently, Wychwood Barns, a redevelopment of the St. Clair car barns by Artscape, 401 Richmond Street redeveloped by Urban Space Property Group in the 1990s, and the Distillery District have cemented the relations between the arts and culture sector and (industrial, commercial, and residential) heritage built form in the City. While some of these areas were able to retain the arts communities under the pressures of gentrification, others have fallen victim to the familiar story of arts displacement and have instead refashioned themselves upon the memory of artistic presence (Mathews, 2008). The Distillery entered into a long-term lease agreement with Artscape in an attempt to mitigate displacement, but the power relations on site clearly position Artscape tenants as unequal (tokenistic) members. This raises questions concerning the place of cultural producers in planned cultural districts where they serve to humanize or anchor the emergent area, but are offered little in terms of exposure, voice, or participation. While many are content with the nature of this relationship, where trade-
offs include proximity to a strong consumer base and lower rents, there is much to question in this regard. If the industrial buildings of the past are viable spaces for cultural producers, retention must be derived not only from the appearance of long-term planning via top-down lease agreements which work as a rotating fund, but through full participation and inclusion in all arenas. As these spaces are commercialized and commodified, they cease to provide meaning for the individuals experiencing them.

**Imbuing Place with Everyday Expression: Future Threads**

There is much to be gleaned from an examination of the redevelopment of the Distillery District, and a focused analysis of how place differentiation is produced at the site (how it is constructed, how it operates, and what alternatives exist). The narratives offered in this project respond to the current climate of redevelopment, where they articulate the contradictions inherent in the process of building space. Outlining a set of processes (redevelopment, place identity, production of differentiation and distinction, social control, and social relations) as they are materializing offers a great deal of insight into the mechanisms and strategies driving capital transformation. For a site that constantly unraveled and reorganized whenever I sought to map its contours, seen most evidently in the fallout of the financial partners, the closure and opening of businesses, and the construction of the condominiums, this is a work in progress.

The Oasis Spa left the site in 2008, following an extensive renovation of 23,000 square feet of the Smoke House at a price-tag of $5 million dollars. Sandra Ainsley recently closed her 7000 square foot gallery (Sandra Ainsley Gallery) at the site in the Cooperage Building after 8 years, and Artcore / Fabrice Marcolini Gallery, another long
term tenant at the site closed with little warning in June, 2009, a twitter feed for the gallery updating customers reads “After 6 consecutive successful seasons at the Distillery, we are ready to pioneer a new district with a new model for our artists & clients” (Artcore, 2009). The new district that Artcore will pioneer is undisclosed and the twitter feed has remained inactive since the announcement of the closure. Adding to this list, Fluid Living (retail) left the site in 2008, and Perigee restaurant left in 2009. While some degree of tenant turnover is expected in any new venture, the rate of volatility amongst these long term established anchor businesses following high levels of capital investment is more perplexing.

Caulfield (2005: 94-5) emphasizes the benefits of revisiting the site in ten years time. This period of wait will present a different context of municipal planning and policy and a different arrangement of space. A decade’s time will also see the completion of the three condominiums filled with new residents offering a potential shift in the atmosphere of the site. Will the tenancy have reached a greater level of stability with less turnover rates? How will the composition of the tenancy change (will the focus remain on cultural consumption)? How will the West Don Lands and the Waterfront work to counter the physical isolation of the district? Will the site find a different level of connectivity to the downtown corridor? These questions proffer a great number of future research threads.
Appendix A: Interviews Conducted by Category

Total Number of Interviews: 40

Artists: 10
Art Galleries: 9
Theatre: 4
Restaurants: 2
Retail: 6
Developers: 2
Organizations: 1
Key Stakeholders: 6
(Stakeholders include interviewees from the housing, culture, and heritage sectors)

Coding System:
Confidential Interviews are coded with a letter and number combination as follows:
A1…A2… Artists
T1…T2…Theatre Groups
G1…G2… Art Galleries
F1…F2…Restaurants
R1…R2…Retail
D1…D2…Developers
S1…S2…Stakeholders

Non-Confidential Interview Participants

Galleries
Fay Athari, Arta Gallery
Scott Hannay, Brush Gallery
Jane Corkin, Corkin Gallery
Joanne Thompson, Thompson Landry Gallery
Wayne Parrish, The Sport Gallery

Retail
Syd Beder, Lileo
Michael Ber, Sound Designs
Peter Smed, Oasis Spa

Restaurants/ Cafés
David Castellan, SOMA Chocolatemaker
Victor Brown, Perigee

Theatre Tenants (Artscape)
Vikki Anderson, DVxT Theatre
Chris Tolley, Expect Theatre
**Artists/Cultural Producers**
Marjolyn vanderHart
David Brown
Robert Akroyd, Akroyd Furniture
Shao Pin
Leif Benner
Arounna Khounnoraj, Bookhou Design
John Booth, Bookhou Design

**Developers**
John Berman, Cityscape
Bruce Rosensweet, Artscape

**Key Stakeholders**
Cynthia Wilkey, West Don Lands Committee
Michael Labbé, Options for Homes
Margie Zeidler, Urban Space Property Group
Julie Beddoes, Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association
Lestor Brown, Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association
Appendix B: Field Notes Documenting Ways of Seeing


As I walk through the wrought iron gates at the northern entrance of the Distillery District, the cobblestones immediately cast awkwardness in my steps. Transported from a demolition site in the U.S., the presence of the stones is a nice visual touch. It is almost five years since the official re-opening of the site following its closure as an alcohol production facility in 1990, and nearly all of the forty red brick Victorian industrial buildings are filled with the sights and sounds of modern consumption. To an untrained eye, it would seem as though these structures were simply supplanted just east of the city centre to beckon the allure of history as a backdrop to consumption. I have read the plaques affixed to buildings and old industrial objects before, but today they seem to just blend into the site. These notices of history are foreshadowed by the colourful notices put up by the Distillery management warning patrons to be careful in the historic zone.

During my visits to the district over the past four years, the only dangers I can remember seeing or hearing about was a flood that occurred when a pipe burst during the initial stages of building the thirty two storey Pure Spirit Condominium on the northeast portion of the site, and a hole in a skylight at Sandra Ainsley’s Gallery—a space filled with blown glass sculptures from renowned international artists—produced when an object (a hammer) fell in during the restoration of a nearby historic cupola. Though I missed this latter event on its happening, I witnessed the shock the following day when a small group, myself included, gathered inside the gallery under the hole to learn of yesterday’s occurrence. None of the art pieces, clad with price-tags ranging upwards of half a million dollars, were damaged in the incident.

The site is quiet today. It always is during the winter season. I prefer the rhythm of the site when it is empty of the gloss and flash of the summer festivals and events. It allows me to connect differently with the space. On previous visits in this season, I have sat and watched bodies leave one building and scurry to the next, thinking about how the arcades that Benjamin writes about worked as protectors for consumption in difficult weather. I have sat inside SOMA’s chocolate shop, drinking a Mayan Hot Chocolate, preoccupied with the heaviness of the doors that block out the gusts of wind and snow from the warm interior, thinking about how cold these spaces must have been in the nineteenth century when labourers could turn to little for warmth.

Today my mind is occupied with something entirely different. Even when the district is at rest from the flow of foot traffic, there is something altogether contrived about the space. Perhaps it is the way the Distillery emerged in the urban landscape and the urban imaginary in one foul sweep: the chain linked fences were dismantled, the gates were opened, and statements such as “pre-fab” emerged to reflect its rapid transformation. Perhaps it is the private ownership of a property geared to high-end consumption and based on the commodification of history and culture. Perhaps it is the ways in which it is not unlike other places that I have visited and read about such as Faneuil Hall in Boston or Granville Island in Vancouver. This makes the markers of differentiation appear as surface renderings. There is much to praise at the site, but also much to question. The property is no longer the Gooderham and Worts distillery, once housing a workforce of 200, and known worldwide at its prime for its delightful whiskies, though the original signage still occupying the space complicates the matter. On everyone’s minds, mine included, is what is this place?
Reflections: Segway Tour of the Distillery District, September 20, 2007

My first “official” tour of the Distillery District took place in the fall of 2007 while riding atop a Segway, a machine that came to perfectly represent the teetering atmosphere of the site as theme park and relic. “Ride the future…today” is the catch line on the Distillery District website promoting the meeting of present and future offered in the ninety-minute experience (www.thedistillerydistrict.com). The roster of tours offered at the site by Segway Ontario recently expanded to include a three hour photo tour of the district at a price-tag of $150 where participants will learn how to capture images as “postcard pictures,” and an option labeled “Corporate Events and Teambuilding” where companies can join the likes of McDonalds, Bell Canada, and Telus Mobility for their own corporate outing (www.thedistillerydistrict.com).

The half-hour training session focusing on forward – backward rotations through a series of pylons, was fairly procedural until I drove my Segway into the side of the Molasses Storage Building in order to avoid two tourists on foot. As the wheels turned against the brick exterior with great dedication, my instructor calmly wheeled towards me with the reminder that if I lean backwards the machine will respond, separating the nexus of body / machine from the wall. The event went largely unnoticed with forgiving smiles from the other participants. Soon enough we were moving snakelike through one of the buildings to examine an old engine, marking the beginnings of the tour.

The guide enticed us with catchy historical details and punchy statements about the discourses surrounding the commodity of alcohol, the material construction (and historic and contemporary function) of the buildings, the entrepreneurial spirit of the Gooderham family, culminating in a narrative about the contemporary refashioning of the site under Cityscape. Bite size stories that are ingested without the feeling of gluttony – that Al Capone smuggled alcohol from Gooderham and Worts during prohibition, the numerous films shot at the site during the 1990s, the Stone Building fire in 1859, that the harbour historically was positioned at the south end of the parking lot – saving room for an afternoon or evening of pedestrian consumption.

We managed as a group to squirrel away some extra time at the end which we spent riding the Segways in the parking lot at full speed (about 20 km/h). On the way back to the office to return our machines, we paused on Trinity Street so that two of the participants (a couple) could capture the moment on film for their Christmas Card. As we rode through the cobblestone lanes the displacement of the experience from my visual imaginary was acute. I looked around expecting to experience the state of suspended disbelief engineered in theme parks through the caricature of a giant mouse and the genre of plastic and felt friends that accompany him. There were none of these signifiers present. Rather than simply crashing into the walls of the site in expectation of movement, it is paramount to recognize their composition within a maze of signification in order to pass through the ruptures and smooth spaces more meaningfully.

### Restaurants
- 1832 Pizza and Pasta Bar
- Balzac’s Coffee
- The Boiler House
- Brick Street Bakery
- Distillery Chill
- Grand Piano Pastries
- Perigee Restaurant
- Pure Spirits Oyster Bar & Grill
- SOMA Chocolate

### Offices/Services
- Architect Circle
- Bright Light Communications
- Cityscape Development Corp.
- Corktown Interior Design
- Distillery Administrative Offices
- The Distillery Visitor Centre
- Drive Digital Pictures
- The George Partnership
- Glue
- Groove Games
- Rossignol & Associates Design

### Retail
- Artifex Furniture Studio
- Corktown Designs – Jewelry Gallery
- Elizabeth Munro Design
- Fluid Living
- FOS
- Found Objects
- Lileo
- The Martini Club Boutique
- Mill Street Brewery
- Mona’s Dog Boutique
- Piko
- Red Heron Essentials
- Sound Designs

### Galleries (Cont’d)
- Real Time Digital Centre for the Art
- Robert Birch Gallery
- Sandra Ainsley Gallery
- Shao Design

### Performance Theatres
- The Young Centre for the Performing Arts
  (Soulpepper Theatre / George Brown College)
- under construction

### Artscape
- Working Studios/Shops
  - Akemi Nishera KOZO Paper Studio
  - Akroyd Furniture
  - Emily Hamill
  - Fishbowl Studio
  - Hag Atelier
  - Josette Luyczx, Artwear Designer
  - Leif Benner
  - Marie Payne, Dyer, Weaver ruckus
  - Steward & Company
  - Terry Antoniwiz

### Performance Theatres
- Dancemakers Centre for Creation (Studio A and Studio B)
- Tapestry / Nightwood New Work Studio

### Artist Studios
- Macy Awad
- Paula Braswell
- Emily Cartwright
- Case Goods Studio 401
- Rene Cea, Studio 4
- June Clark
- Sheila Cullen
- Janet Dey
- Susi Dorrell, Studio 4
- Gemma Duarte, Studio 4
- Emily Eng / Sandi Ralph
- Marianne Fowler
- Helena Frei
- Fred Gaysek
- Melanie Gordon
- Sandy Groebner
- Janet Jones

### Gallerie (Cont’d)
- Lisa Klapstock
  *new*

### Arts Organizations
- Artscape SPACE Centre
- Caliban Arts Theatre
- Naomi Campbell
- The Dance Current / The Canadian Dance Assembly
- The CanDance Network
- CAPIC
- Dance Ontario
- Dancemakers Office
- DanceWorks
- DVxT Theatre Company
- fFIDA (fringe Festival of Independent Dance Artists)
- Go7
- Inner City Angels
- Mammalian Diving Reflex
- Mariposa in the Schools
- Moving Pictures Festival
- Native Earth Performing Arts
- Necessary Angel Theatre Company
- Nightswimming
- Nightwood Theatre Office
- Prologue to the Performing Arts
- Queen of Puddings Music Theatre
- Sinfonia Toronto
- Tapestry New Opera Works
# C.1 Tenant Directory, 2009* (Distilled, 2009)

## Restaurants
- Archeo
- Balzac’s Coffee
- The Boiler House
- Brick Street Bakery
- Café Uno
- Mill Street Brewpub
- Pure Spirits Oyster Bar & Grill
- SOMA Chocolate
- The Sweet Escape Patisserie
- Tappo Restaurant and Wine Bar

## Offices/Services
- Cityscape Development Corp.
- Corktown Interior Design
- Dance District
- Deaf Culture Centre
- Distillery Administrative Offices
- Distillery Post
- The George Partnership
- Groove Games
- HUMANCONTACT Inc.
- Job / Blue Barracuda
- Kingstar Direct
- Martini Club International
- McLellan Group Integrated Communications
- Partners Film Company
- Pikto
- Smith Roberts Creative Communications
- Sport Media Group
- Spraggett Stevens Inc.
- TD Canada Trust
- Yellow House Events
- York Search Group Inc.
- Xonkor Holdings

## Retail
- A Taste of Quebec
- Artemide
- Bergo Designs
- Berloni Cucine e Bagno
- Carpe Diem
- Condominium Sales Centre
- Corktown Designs Jewelry
- distill
- DOM Toronto

## Retail Cont’d
- Elizabeth Munro Design
- Euoko
- Fawn Ceramics
- Fresh & Wild Market
- Höstens
- Lileo
- Loophia
- Mill Street Brewery
- Pikto
- Segway of Ontario
- Shao Design
- SOMA Chocolate & Gelato
- Sound Designs
- Spectacle
- Vintage Gardener

## Galleries
- Arta Gallery
- Axtore
- Corkin Gallery
- Deaf Culture Centre
- Engine Gallery
- Gibsone Jessop Gallery
- Jacob Grinberg Photography
- Julia M Gallery
- Meta Gallery
- Clark and Faria
- Pikto
- Thompson Landry Gallery

## Performance Theatres
- Young Centre for the Performing Arts
- (Soulpepper Theatre / George Brown College)
- Dancemakers Centre for Creation Studio A
- Tapestry New Opera Works / Nightwood Theatre Studio

## Educational
- Distillery District Early Learning Centre
- George Brown College Voice Intermediate School

## Artscape
- Working Studios/Shops
- Akroyd Furniture
- Dan Brouwer
- Emily Hamill
- Hag Atelier
- Holly Wheatcraft
- Leif Benner
- Lilith
- Millicent Vee
- Susan Card / Dish Gallery and Studio
- Tank jewelry + beads
- Tanya Kirouac
- tenacious

## Performance Theatres
- Dancemakers
- Le Laboratoire D’Art Inc.
- Nightwood Theatre
- Tapestry New Opera Works

## Artist Studios
- Robert Akroyd / Akroyd Furniture
- Cheryl Albuquerque
- Alison Baldock
- Ryan Barrett
- David Brown
- Blayne Collins
- Justine Dart
- Janet Dey
- Sussi Dorrell
- Emily Eng
- Emily Filler
- Marianne Fowler
- Fred Gaysek
- Melanie Gordon Photography
- John Hyslop & Chris Tsirbas
- Massoumeh Jian
- Rachelle Kearns
- Ed Kotanen
- Susan Leopold
- Elisha Leventis
- Mascia Manunza
- Carol Matson
- Celia Neubauer
- Agata Ostrowska
- Sasha Rogers
- Yevgenia Savosta
- Ann Shier
- Ted Smith
- MJ Steenberg
- Magda Trzaski
- Marjolyn Van der hart
- Wendy Walgate
Galleries
Dish Gallery and Studio
Proof Studio Gallery
RedEye Studio Gallery

Arts Organizations
Aluna Theatre
Art of Jazz
Canadian Dance Assembly
CanDance Network
CAPIC

Arts Organizations Cont’d
Dance Ontario Association
Dancemakers
DanceWorks
DVxT Theatre
Expect Theatre
Inner City Angels
Le Laboratoire D’Art Inc
Modern Times Stage
Company
Native Earth Performing Arts
Necessary Angel Theatre
Company
Nightswimming
Nightwood Theatre
Planet in Focus: International Environmental Film & Video Festival
Pleiades Theatre Inc.
Prologue to the Performing Arts
Company
Queen of Puddings
Rimé Canada
Shakespeare Link Canada
Tapestry New Opera Works
The Dance Current
Theatre Museum Canada
Volcano

*Names which appear more than one time in the directory (under multiple classifications) are retained from the guides in both years
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