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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The transition from industrial to post-industrial economies has left many cities’ port and industrial areas, like the Port Lands, derelict and underutilized. This research investigates how creative clusters can be used as a strategy for regenerating these urban areas. It investigates and evaluates how elements of built environments, creative activities, and plans can help foster the conditions to develop and sustain creative clusters. Toronto’s Port Lands potential for a creative cluster was compared to King-Spadina and the Distillery District. The research question asked is:

What changes can be made to the Toronto Port Lands to support a creative cluster?

Guided by this question, this research used an evaluative criteria framework of necessary conditions and success factors to assess the three aforementioned case studies. The criteria and sub-criteria were primarily drawn from John Montgomery (2003; 2004) and supplemented by Bahar Durmaz (2015) and Matthew Wansborough and Andrea Mageean (2000). The evaluative criteria were used to assess the respective areas’ built environments (see Table Exec-1), plans (see Table Exec-2), and creative activities (see Table Exec-3) to provide a better understanding of the characteristics that exist and those that may need improvement.

The methods that were used to conduct the qualitative case study research were built environment analysis, document review analysis, and semi-structured interviews. Methods for evaluating the built environment were adapted from Ewing and Clemente’s (2013), Scoring Sheet Measuring Urban Design Qualities since it related to relevant criteria that contribute to making a “good” creative cluster. The same criteria were then modified to assess how effectively the plans encourage these qualities. Montgomery’s (2004), Cultural Quarters as
### Table Exec-1: Built Environment Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILT FORM AND URBAN DESIGN</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diversity</strong></td>
<td>Mix of compatible uses and activities stimulate one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixture of uses</td>
<td>Types; ages; sizes; and conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixture of buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adaptability</strong></td>
<td>Are former/current warehouses and light industrial buildings being reused?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of old warehouses and light industrial buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Life</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Are streets edges where private and public realms meet well-defined? Are storefronts transparent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active edges</td>
<td>Is there a fine horizontal grain of narrow commercial units at ground level? Is there activity in front of storefronts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Scale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>Provide an average estimate of building height. Assess building details, orientation of buildings, and depth of setback on tall buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual interest</td>
<td>Pieces of street furniture and other street items, such as small planters, pavement texture, street trees, presence of parked cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEANING</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public and semi-public spaces</strong></td>
<td>Are there spaces for public events and gatherings? Identify accessible courtyards, plazas, parks, and gardens Are there semi public spaces (public squares, street vendors, shop frontages, patios)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Heritage preservation</strong></td>
<td>Is architectural heritage preserved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Buildings with identifiers (signs)</strong></td>
<td>Assess quality of commercial signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presence of outdoor dining</strong></td>
<td>Are there venues which provide outdoor dining space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Distinct sense of place</strong></td>
<td>Do physical elements such as buildings, banners and public art reference local traditions/history and a create distinctive sense of place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building form and composition</strong></td>
<td>Do new developments respond to existing patterns of development and building forms in terms of architectural style and detailing, massing, setbacks, arterials, colour palettes and textures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comfort and impression</strong></td>
<td>Does the space make a good first impression? Is it aesthetically pleasing? Does it appear as if the area is well maintained (is the litter in the public areas; are buildings in good condition; does the built forms use high quality materials)? Are there places to sit in public?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table Exec-2: Plan Evaluation Criteria Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLEAR PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear physical plan</td>
<td>Structure: Assess clear organization/layout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Style: How is it written?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content: What is written and how well is it written?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan follows design guidelines</td>
<td>Design guidelines are indicated in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILT FORM AND URBAN DESIGN</strong></td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Mixture of uses Assess range of permitted land uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixture of buildings</td>
<td>Assess range of permitted building uses (i.e. residential/commercial/institutional mix).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Adaptive reuse Assess policy relating to the restoration and or adaptive reuse of old or heritage buildings (warehouses and light industrial buildings).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Life</td>
<td>Transparency Assess policy on streets edges. Evaluate policies that guide areas where private and public realms meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Life</td>
<td>Active edges Assess policy related to activity at street level. Does policy encourage ground level uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Scale</td>
<td>Height and scale Assess policies regarding building height and scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual interest Assess street furniture, lighting, signage, street trees and open space requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEANING</strong></td>
<td>Public and semi-public spaces</td>
<td>Assess policy quality on the accessible courtyards, plazas, parks, and gardens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage preservation</td>
<td>Assess policy on heritage preservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings with identifiers (signs)</td>
<td>Assess policy on commercial signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of outdoor dining</td>
<td>Assess policy that encourages the use of outdoor space for outdoor dining.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct sense of place</td>
<td>Assess policy quality on physical elements such as buildings, banners, and public art. Does it promote local traditions and create distinctive sense of place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building form and composition</td>
<td>Does policy encourage new buildings to respond to existing pattern of development and building form (setbacks, massing, colour palettes and textures, architectural style and detailing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Exec-3: Creative Activity Evaluation Criteria Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CREATIVE ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venues, festivals and events</strong></td>
<td>What kind of cultural venues exist in the area? What kind of festivals and events take place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workspaces</strong></td>
<td>Are there workspaces for artists and low-cost cultural producers available? Are there managed workspaces for office and studio users? Is there a focus on small-firm economic development in the creative sectors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day and evening uses</strong></td>
<td>Is there a daytime and evening economy (such as: cafe culture, pubs, clubs, etc)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative production and consumption businesses?</strong></td>
<td>Identify creative production businesses (making objects, goods, products, and providing services) and creative consumption businesses (people going to shows, visiting venues and galleries).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts development</strong></td>
<td>Are there any identifiable arts development initiatives? Identify any arts and media businesses, organizations, and vocational training and education facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art in the environment</strong></td>
<td>Is there public art on display? Are there art exhibitions or performances in public space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration Part 2 was used as a guide for collecting information on creative activities and assessing their quality.

The Distillery District’s and King-Spadina’s built environments, plans, and creative activities do a very good job of displaying the majority of conditions that lead to developing and sustaining a creative cluster. Both case studies’ diverse, pedestrian friendly and distinct built environments offered a variety of opportunities for creative production and consumption. They did an excellent job of preserving and adaptively reusing the heritage industrial buildings to house a range of retail and service businesses, creative workspaces, galleries, and entertainment venues. The King-Parliament Secondary Plan, which puts forward policy that guides the planning and development of the Distillery District, was evaluated as the best plan. It did an exemplary job of providing built form, design guidelines, and creative activity related policies that closely aligned with the criteria of “good” creative clusters.

In comparison to the Distillery District and King-Spadina, this research showed that the Port Lands demonstrated few of the necessary conditions and success factors of a “good” creative cluster. The Port Lands built environment was void of many of the characteristic criteria. The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan also shared of many of the same deficiencies. In terms of creative activity, although the case study contained several major firms in the film sector, it lacked smaller firms and actors that provided opportunities to produce and consume creative goods and services. The Port Lands was observed to lack creative workspaces, galleries, arts development initiatives and organizations.
This report concludes by putting forward three recommendations to guide current and future planning and development initiatives that may make the Port Lands more supportive of a creative cluster. The following is a summary of the recommendations that were ascertained by site visits, existing literature, and interviews with informants.

**Recommendation #1: Promote a high quality built environment that is diverse, to human scale and designed to support vibrant street life.**

Future planning and development in the Port Lands should adopt policies that support a diverse built form that contains a mix of land uses, building types, and unit sizes so that businesses can evolve as the surrounding neighbourhood transforms. It is also important to have a diverse mix of ground level uses that not only stimulate one another but also animate the public realm at all hours of the day. The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* should be modified to include a series of general built form policies, similar to the *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* and *King-Spadina Secondary Plan* that outline the built form’s relationship with the public realm.

**Recommendation #2: Adapt former industrial buildings for creative purposes with the intention of attracting a greater diversity of creative production and consumption businesses, arts development agencies and organizations.**

Use Section 37 obligations of the Municipal Planning Act to secure below market workspaces in exchange for height/density bonuses. This may encourage arts development organizations, similar to Artscape, to adapt industrial and warehouse buildings to provide affordable work and retail spaces for the creative sector.

**Recommendation #3: It is important that plans and policies support creating visually distinct areas by identifying, preserving, and building on existing qualities that make an area unique.**

Local planners, designers, historians, architects, sociologists, and demographers to create a customized and site specific guideline similar to the Distillery District’s *Landscape History,*
Inventory and Guidelines of the Heritage Masterplan. This document should help articulate the cultural landscape characteristics that contribute to Port Land’s special atmosphere. It should also provide urban design guidelines to help maintain, integrate, and enhance old and new elements into the future development plan.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

In 1912, the Toronto Harbor Commission’s *Toronto Waterfront Development Plan* created a new industrial hub in the Port Lands to serve the city’s growing industrial sector (Toronto Harbor Commission, 1912). However, in the last hundred years Toronto has slowly transitioned from an industrial to post-industrial economy. The majority of manufacturing and industrial uses have been pushed out leading to gradual deindustrialization in the Port Lands. Remnant industrial buildings and port activities continue to exist, however, the majority of the area is underutilized or vacant. Studies have shown a number of sites in the area are contaminated due to previous industrial uses (City of Toronto, 2013, p.47).

The redevelopment of the Port Lands is significant because it is potentially the largest redevelopment opportunity in Toronto. The 356 hectares (880 acres) area is located south east of Toronto’s downtown, south of Lake Shore Boulevard and in between the Inner Harbour and Leslie Street. The redevelopment of the vast waterfront area presents an opportunity to transform the once former industrial area into a thriving mixed use community consisting of residential, commercial, and recreational uses. This redevelopment has the potential to spur economic development, create new jobs, and become a thriving centre of activity on the waterfront.

A number of cities around the world have experienced redevelopment of similar brownfields to complete communities that include a mix of commercial, recreational, and residential uses (Mommaas, 2004; Andres and Gresillon, 2013). Municipal governments have integrated creative and cultural policies into these urban renewal and redevelopment plans. Creative clusters have been turned to as an effective policy mechanism to stimulate the urban
regeneration in declining industrial and waterfront areas (Montgomery, 2003; Evans, 2005). There is extensive academic literature that demonstrates these strategies encourage and enhance sustainable local and regional economic development (Cooke and Lazzeretti, 2008). It has also been shown that the quality of place matters for attracting creative and cultural industries and workers (Bradford, 2004; Florida, 2012; Martins, 2015).

Research has shown that there are socio-spatial elements related to built environments and culture that positively contribute to the development of creative clusters (Wansborough and Mageean, 2000; Montgomery, 2003; Durmaz, 2015). Florida (2012) and Durmaz (2015) suggest it is important to understand the conditions and factors that contribute to successful creative neighbourhoods at a micro scale. This research investigated and evaluated how specific elements of built environments, plans, and creative activities help foster the conditions to develop and sustain creative clusters. Toronto’s Port Lands potential for a creative cluster was compared to King-Spadina and the Distillery District. The research question asked is: **What changes can be made to the Toronto Port Lands to support a creative cluster?**

Following the introduction, Chapter 3 (Methodology) outlines the research methods used to answer the posed research question. Chapter 4 (Built Environment Analysis), Chapter 5 (Plan Analysis), and Chapter 6 (Creative Activity Analysis) provide the analysis chapters for this report. The report will conclude with, Chapter 7 (Conclusion) where a succinct review of the findings and list of recommendations will be presented.

### 1.1 What is a creative cluster?

Michael Porter (2000) defines a cluster as, “A geographically proximate group of interconnected companies and associated institutions in a particular field, linked by
commonalities and complementarities” (Porter, p.16). Geographic proximity, cultural and institutional leads to power incentives and improved access, relationships, and information (Porter, p.32). Porter (2000) writes that clusters include a variety of stakeholders, including: companies, suppliers, service providers, firms in related industries, and institutional and government actors (Porter, p.15). Clusters generate “buzz” that attract visitors that sustain local businesses. An economic benefit of clusters is that their innovations spur economic growth by creating spill-overs that allow other stakeholders to benefit. Countries around the world have used clusters as catalysts for supporting industrial transformation processes and developing regional competitive advantages (European Creative Industries Alliance, 2013).

The reviewed academic and policy documents have not clearly and consistently made a differentiation between “creative industries” and “cultural industries”. The reviewed literature has identified a debate related to the definition and concepts relating to creative and cultural industries (Drake, 2003; Evans, 2009; The European Cluster Observatory, 2011; European Creative Industries Alliance, 2013). Specifically, it confirmed Drake’s (2003) observation that there is a lack of clarity whether the terms “creative industries” and “cultural industries” are interchangeable and whether the two terms delineate between sectors or activities. For the purposes of this report, the term creative industries will follow the Government of Ontario’s Ministry of Tourism and Culture (2010) definition that includes all activities directly involved and support the development and production of creative products and services, including: video production, music recording, theatre, digital media, visual arts, performing arts, cultural institutions, design (industrial, graphic, fashion, etc.), advertising, software development, information technology, and electronics (The Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2010, p. 3). When these firms come together to form industrial or institutional geographic concentrations or
agglomerations, they are known as creative clusters. Using this definition provides a clear and consistent term throughout this report and one that is recognized within Ontario, Canada. Figure 1 provides a visual of the various industries included within a creative cluster. It provides a visual representation of the core, content, wider, and supporting creative industries that may contribute to forming a creative cluster.

**Figure 1-1:** Visual representation of the core, content, wider, and supporting creative industries.


1.2 **What role does quality of place play?**

Research has shown that quality of place plays a significant role in creating an environment that is conducive to clustering of cultural and creative industries. Florida (2012)
believes that factors relating to quality of place, not just economic factors, are also relevant. He writes, “Place itself, I began to realize, was the key factor. So much so, that I coined a term-quality of place...to cover the unique set of characteristics that define a place and make it attractive” (Florida, 2012, p.1). He defines quality of place as a combination of the built environment, natural environment, vibrant street life, aesthetic, historical, cultural, diverse, authentic and integrates the arts, music, cafe culture, a variety of outdoor activities (Florida, 2012).

Florida (2002), Drake (2003), and Smit (2011) argue that quality places foster inspiration, creativity and innovation. They help attract creative firms and people while cultivating the creative spirit of local residents. Place based factors provide economic advantages by creating distinctiveness between localities and stimulation for artists and designers (Drake, 2003). Bradford (2004) notes that business surveys show that quality places play a significant role in businesses’ investment decisions. He cites that it matters more than locating near airports or taxation levels (Bradford, p.6).

1.3 Components of the Built Environment in the Context of Creative Clusters

Jane Jacobs (1961) study of Greenwich Village’s creative cluster established important precedent on the value of diverse built environments. Her discussion on planning mixed use areas is fundamental to developing complete and inclusive communities. Planning areas that include a variety of buildings, mix of compatible uses, and types and sizes of buildings are important to creating opportunities for a variety of businesses and activities. These places are used for a variety of day and evening uses and integrate live, work, and play uses. From a social planning perspective, mixed uses also provide social benefits to creative clusters by enabling socio-economic mix (Wood and Dovey, 2015). They provide a range of housing types,
commercial uses and employment opportunities that allow for wide range of incomes, education, religions, ethnic backgrounds, and age groups to live together. Furthermore, diverse built environments enhance safety and community vibrancy by providing a mix of different land use options that can accommodate changing and evolving communities (Von Hausen, p.74). When creative clusters are integrated within mixed use neighbourhoods, they have been shown to promote the regeneration of derelict industrial and port areas (Andres and Gresillon, 2013).

Vibrant urban streets contribute to thriving cultural areas and their overall quality of place (Jacobs,1961; and Montgomery, 2003). Streets are areas where creative workers may spontaneously meet face to face and exchange information, ideas, and collaborate. They are also areas where cultural festivals, events, artistic expressions and performances may take place as well. Therefore, it is important that the lower floors of buildings and the public realm are designed well so they provide optimal conditions making it comfortable and inviting for a variety of activities like walking, conversations, window-shopping, entertaining and people watching. To do so, Montgomery (2003) writes that streets must be active and transparent. A diverse horizontal grain of active uses such as restaurants, schools, retail stores, mixed use buildings are vital in promoting transparency while keeping edges lively (Gehl and Svarre, 2013).

New industry entrepreneurs and workers in creative industries are drawn to working in former warehouse, industrial, and heritage buildings (Hutton, 2006). Hutton (2006) has shown the retention and adaptive reuse of old and heritage industrial buildings supports creative production and consumption. These structures’ authenticity has an affinity to evoke inspiration and creativity in workers because they exert a sense of memory, nostalgia and connection to the historical use (Montgomery, 2003; Hutton, 2006; Lloyd, 2004). Firms and workers are also attracted to the potential internal configuration which provide working environments that are
suitable for creative activities (Hutton, 2006; Martins, 2015). Features such as durable construction, spacious rooms, high ceilings, large windows for natural lighting are advantageous to a variety of design and entertainment related purposes. Typically heritage structures are adaptively reused for workspaces for creative and cultural firms such as advertising, graphic design, internet design and services, fashion, music companies, artist studios and galleries, and performance venues.

In addition to the traditional office or studio space, Martins (2015) describes three types of ancillary work place types that are differentiated on the type of work practise: the workafe, the break-out space, and the meeting place (Martins, p. 133). These practices encourage a type of café culture that promote face to face networking and the sharing of ideas and information. Workafes are typically inside coffee shops or restaurants. They typically mimic office environments, providing space that allow for work to be individually or in groups (Martin, 2015). The break-out space includes spaces for more informal interactions during and after work. These semi-public and public spaces are associated with eating or drinking like outdoor dining areas, squares, parks or streets. The meeting place offers an alternative and distinct environment that provides quality architectural and decorative atmosphere but are also quiet and private (Martin, 2015). These venues are associated with different day and evening uses such as hotels, publics, bars, cafes or member clubs. Martin (2015) points out that these ancillary workplaces contribute to making areas good working neighbourhoods for creative workers.

Public, semi-public and private spaces also are areas that bring together buildings and communities. Spaces such as parks, roof decks, squares, parking lots, patios, and streets provide opportunities for people to interact and socialize. Gehl and Svarre (2013) points out that good public places strengthen a city’s social sustainability. They are places where individuals
regardless of economic status, religious or ethnic background can gather and meet. Public spaces provide space for a spectrum of activities, demonstrations, and cultural events. They are used for meetings where people exchange personal, cultural and political views.

The following is a short description of the three case studies that will be examined in this report. The Port Lands Industrial District, Distillery District and King-Spadina will be examined to better understand the characteristics and conditions they display.

1.4 Case Study Description

1.4.1 The Port Lands (Toronto, Canada) was planned and developed as part of the Toronto Harbor Commission’s Toronto Waterfront Development Plan (1912). The *Toronto Official Plan* designates the Port Lands as a “Regeneration Area”. The area contains a mix of underutilized industrial, commercial and vacant lands. Located on Toronto’s waterfront, it is minutes from the City’s downtown. The Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) is a high level planning framework looking to reimagine, regenerate, and redevelop the area. Several of the recently published PLAI documents express a creative district and cultural uses as potential land use options.

![Figure 1-2: Map of the Port Lands.](https://mapquest.com)

*Source: MapQuest (2015).*
The industrial heritage characteristics of the Port Lands draw similarities to the Distillery District and King-Spadina.

1.4.2 King-Spadina (Toronto, Canada). Beginning in the early 1900’s, King-Spadina was a significant industrial and manufacturing hub that specialized in clothing and printing. During the Second World War, new factories were built that focused on wartime production producing planes and arms (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014). It was not until the 1960’s and 1970’s deindustrialization began and companies moved to less expensive suburban cities. By the late 1990’s, the vast majority of King-Spadina’s industry base disappeared. In 1996 the City of Toronto introduced the King-Spadina Secondary Plan to help revitalize the area by liberalizing planning and zoning requirements, permitting a mix of residential, institutional, and commercial uses (CMHC, n.d.). Traditional land use regulations were eliminated and the area was designated as a, “Regeneration Area”. This plan worked better than expected (CMHC, n.d.). Over time, the former factories, warehouses and railway buildings have been repurposed and or redeveloped into offices, lofts, studios, galleries, entertainment venues, and various cultural uses. A significant amount of infill mixed-use condominium buildings have been developed bringing

Figure 1-3: Map of King-Spadina.

Source: MapQuest (2015).
over 7,500 residents into the area (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014, p. 55). The area has a diverse local economy, providing jobs in the knowledge and creative economy. There are over 1,200 businesses in the area that employ over 45,000 people (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014, p. 55). The area contains Toronto’s Fashion or Garment District as well the Entertainment District.

1.4.3 The Distillery District (Toronto, Canada) is a historic 13 acre former industrial district, managed by Gooderham & Worts as early as 1832. Gooderham & Worts grew to become the largest distillery in the British Commonwealth and the country’s largest corporate taxpayer (Otto, 1998; Artscape, 2015). The site which contains 47 Victorian industrial buildings, was subject to extensive historical study and reports. It is identified as a National Historic Site by the Government of Canada. In 1996, The City of Toronto officially designated the Distillery District as a “Mixed Use Area” to encourage investment, housing, and commercial spaces for new creative businesses. These policies are reflected in the King-Parliament Secondary Plan. The Plan eliminated existing traditional zoning and planning restrictions and encouraged modern mixed use development (CMHC, n.d.). In 2001, Cityscape Developments, Artscape and the City of Toronto came together to regenerate the site into a creative hub focusing on arts and entertainment.

![Figure 1-4: Map of the Distillery District.](source: MapQuest (2015)).
The Distillery District is an exemplary case study of how arts, culture, and place making can be used as a catalyst to drive change and transformation in a derelict industrial area. It is home to approximately 300 artists, a number of 50,000 square feet of below market designer and maker retail space, arts education facilities, galleries, condominiums and offices (Artscape, 2015). The public spaces within the district are used for day and evening cultural and artistic displays and performances.

1.5 Secondary Plans

Secondary Plans are part of a City’s planning and development policy framework that stimulate and guide growth and change for defined geographic areas (City of Toronto, 2010, p.5-9). They provide detailed direction on land use, natural heritage, employment, and infrastructure. According to the City of Toronto’s (2010, p.5-10) Toronto Official Plan, Secondary Plans are prepared for areas that demonstrate one or more of the following attributes:

- Large areas of vacant or underutilized land which would benefit from comprehensive planning to enable suitable development or redevelopment;
- Areas targeted for major public or private investment
- Areas where development is occurring, or proposed, at a scale, intensity or character which necessitates reconsideration or reconfiguration of local streets, block plans, public works, open space or other public services or facilities; and
- Other growth areas identified in provisions of this Plan, such as Centres, selected Avenues identified by Committees of Council and Regeneration Areas.

In the context of creative clusters, Secondary Plans are a valuable planning tool to analyze because they introduce community level policies that directly influence the conditions that lead to “good” creative clusters. Secondary Plans envision the type and form of physical development by providing land use policies that guide development, redevelopment, intensification and or infill (City of Toronto, 2010, p.5-10). They put forward a comprehensive vision for an area’s
built form (massing, density, built form, and public realm) as well as related urban design objectives, guidelines and parameters. Secondary Plans also indicate needed infrastructure and environmental related investments, including: transportation services, environmental services, community and social facilities, cultural, entertainment, and tourism facilities, pedestrian systems, parks and recreation services (City of Toronto, 2010, p.5-10).

In 1996, the City of Toronto loosened its planning and zoning requirements by introducing the King-Parliament Secondary Plan and King-Spadina Secondary Plan. The aim of these plans was to deregulate land use policies in these areas by allowing for a mix of land uses and encouraging investment (CMHC, n.d.). The City of Toronto hoped that these plans would stimulate the local area’s economy, enhance public spaces, retain the existing heritage character and built form, and encourage adaptive reuse. According to the CMHC (n.d.), King-Parliament and King-Spadina areas are considered to be exemplary case studies of successful urban revitalization (CMHC, K-4).
CHAPTER 2 - METHODS

Research Methods

A three part methodology was used to collect information and data. They are:

- Built environment analysis;
- Document review analysis;
- Semi-structured interviews.

These methods helped investigate the posed research question of comparing the Toronto Port Land’s potential for a creative cluster with Toronto’s Distillery District and King-Spadina area and what changes need to be made to the Toronto Port Lands to support a creative cluster. The aforementioned methods are suitable to answer the research question because they provide an understanding and logical relationship of the built form and activities which fosters the creation of successful creative clusters.

2.1 Built Environment Evaluation Method

The author developed an evaluative criteria framework matrix by drawing upon a number of peer reviewed articles and professional sources about creative clusters, urban design, and place making. Montgomery’s (2003; 2004) work served as the main source that informed the three main criteria and respective sub-criteria that were used to structure the evaluative criteria matrix used by this report. Wansborough and Mageean’s (2000) and Durmaz (2015) characteristics of creative clusters supplemented the criteria. The evaluative criteria framework puts forward the conditions and success factors that lead to “good” creative clusters. Works by Comedia (1991a; 1991b), Gehl (1996), Gehl (2010), Gehl & Svarre (2013), Jacobs (1961), Kostof (1992), and Lynch (1959;1981) were read and contributed to the author’s theoretical understanding of the topic. The reviewed literature contributed to understanding how the criteria
relate to quality of place and how the built environments, plans creative, activities should be evaluated.

The evaluation of the selected creative clusters was completed using observational analysis. Table 2-1 summarizes the evaluative criteria used to assess the built environments. The method for evaluating these criteria largely draws from Reid Ewing and Otto Clemente’s (2013), “Scoring Sheet Measuring Urban Design Qualities” and Project for Public Places. These sources discuss how the cases studies should be analyzed and how the findings should be interpreted. A ranking scheme was used to judge whether the cases studies display “poor”, “limited”, “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” examples of the criteria (see Table 2-2). This evaluation criteria rating score was adopted from Lundberg (2014). Qualitative research does not allow one to make inferences about which case study “scores” better. Therefore, only general conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the study areas’ built environment was derived.

Table 2-1: Summary of Built Environment Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUB-CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILT FORM AND URBAN DESIGN</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING</td>
<td>Public and semi-public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings with identifiers (signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of outdoor dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building form and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfort and impression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2-2: Ranking Scheme Evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Poor" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Limited" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Good" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Very Good" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Excellent" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photography was used to document key observations. For instance, it was helpful to document the presence or absence of specific activities and built form features identified in the evaluative criteria. Images were taken of: pedestrian environments, building types, heritage buildings and items, building facades, street signage, public art, and patios. The author referred to these pictures when writing the Chapter 4. The pictures helped supplement the author’s field notes and observations, providing important site specific and contextual information that may not have been fully explained in the field notes. It was ensured that all faces were blurred for ethical reasons. Google Streetview was used to complete the built environment evaluation for the case studies that needed to be revisited.

The evaluative criteria contains three broad components as discussed below:

2.1.1 Built Form and Urban Design

Built form and urban design are important aspects of what makes a “good” creative cluster. Each case study’s built form was carefully examined using the evaluative criteria (as noted in Table Exec-1). Jacobs (1961) writes that diversity is an important aspect of urban design. Therefore, built environments should include a mixture of building types, sizes, and ages as well as mixture of uses. These buildings should provide space for a mix of uses and activities that stimulate one another. Old warehouses and light industrial buildings were also identified as key pieces of creative clusters. Typically, they are adapted for new creative uses such as offices, studios, galleries, and entertainment venues. According to Montgomery, good cultural quarters are judged by their street life and human scale. Ewing and Clemente’s (2013) scoring form was a guide for observing these qualities. Interviews with key informants supplemented information gained for this section. Section 2.3 provides more information on this method.
2.1.2 Meaning

The combination of history and experience contributes to users’ meaning of urban spaces. Montgomery (2003) writes that like any quality, public and creative spaces need to include meeting and gathering places, a sense of history and progress, and design and style. Imageability is a term which best describes this function (Montgomery, 2003). Ewing and Clemente (2013) define imageability as, “The quality of a place that makes it distinct, recognizable, and memorable. A place has high imageability when specific physical elements and their arrangement capture attention, evoke feelings and create a lasting impression” (Ewing and Clemente, p. 5). Ewing, Reid, and Clemente’s (2013) scoring form guided the observational analysis of this set of criteria. This involved assessing the public and semi-public spaces, heritage preservation, buildings with nonrectangular shapes, buildings with identifiers (signs), and outdoor dining. Additionally, Natland (2003)’s criteria helped evaluate how physical elements, patterns of development and architectural style, and an area’s aesthetics contribute to a creative cluster’s sense of meaning. Interviews with key informants supplemented analysis of the case studies’ built environments meaning. Section 2.3 provides more information on the method relating to key informant interviews.

Google Streetview, aerial photos, site photos, and detailed field notes were used to supplement site analysis. These resources helped the author save time and resources by not having to travel to the study areas multiple times. According to Lee and Talen (2014), Google Streetview is a suitable tool to make inferences about the built form. However, it poses limitations to analyzing criteria related to activities and meaning and identity which are more effectively done in person.
2.2 Document Review Method

2.2.1 Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines

The plan evaluation criteria were used to guide the document review (see Table 2-3). Relevant Secondary Plans, Urban Design Guidelines, and online websites and documents were examined. The plan evaluation criteria were used to assess how effectively the plans encourage qualities that foster “good” creative clusters. There is a considerable amount of literature and established methods on plan evaluation. Baer (1997), Hoch (2002), and Brody (2003) were reviewed but not explicitly followed. Lundberg’s (2014) “Clear physical plan” criteria were found to be most suitable for the purpose of this plan analysis.

Table 2-3: Summary of the Plan Evaluation Criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUB-CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR PHYSICAL PLAN</td>
<td>Structure: logical order, concise paragraphs, and sentences, clear headings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style: avoids jargon. Simple and direct. Avoid repetition. Figures and tables are used to aid understanding. It is audience appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content: spelling and grammar. Objective/Purpose/Subject is clear. Relevant points have been listed (table of contents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILT FORM AND</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DESIGN</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING</td>
<td>Public and semi-public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings with identifiers (signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of outdoor dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building form and composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The “Clear Physical Plan” criteria were taken from Lundberg (2014). The other criteria and sub-criteria were adapted from Montgomery (2013; 2014), Durmaz (2015) and Wansborough and Mageean (2000).
Lundberg’s (2014) “clear physical plan” criteria was used to evaluate the style, structure, and style of the studied plans. The latter three criteria and sub-criteria were adapted from the built environment analysis. The complete evaluative criteria matrix can be found in Table Exec-2. The plans that were evaluated were:

- Distillery District: *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* and supplemented by *Landscape History, Inventory and Guidelines of the Heritage Masterplan*
- King-Spadina Area: *King-Spadina Secondary Plan* and supplemented by *King-Spadina Area Design Guidelines*.
- Port Lands Industrial District: *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan*

Information gained from interviews with key informants relating to the studied plans assisted in better evaluating the attributes of the built environment. Furthermore, this information supplemented findings acquired from the site visits.

Similar to the built environment analysis, a ranking scheme was used to assess if the case studies display “poor”, “limited”, “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” examples of the criteria. Only general conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the study areas’ plans were derived.

### 2.2.2 Creative Activity

Cultural production and cultural activity are key requirements for “good” cultural quarters (Montgomery, 2003). Since cultural industries are a subsector of creative industries (see creative cluster definition above), this research makes the assumption that “good” creative clusters also require creative production and creative activity. Montgomery’s (2004), “Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration Part 2” was adapted and used as a guide for collecting information on creative activity criteria and assessing their quality. The criteria used to assess creative activity, include: the venues, festivals and events, workspaces, daytime and
evening economies, creative production and consumption businesses, arts development initiatives, and the presence of public art. These criteria were evaluated by using document review. Interviews with key informants also supplemented the activity section for the analyzed case studies. The complete evaluative criteria matrix can be found in Table Exec-3.

**Table 2-4**: Summary of the Creative Activity Evaluation Criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUB-CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Venues, festivals, and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workspaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day and evening uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative production and consumption businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts development initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art in the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* The “Creative Activity” criteria were adapted Montgomery (2013; 2014) and Wansborough and Mageean (2000).

### 2.3 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with stakeholders who have an understanding of either the planning rationale, community and business activities, and meaning of the case study areas. The stakeholders include: planners and project managers. Stakeholders were chosen based on their professional experience and insight with the study areas. Identified individuals were also contacted via email and phone. The email script (see Appendix A) was used as the main body of the email.

A list of preconceived questions were used to help guide the semi-structured interview process (see Appendix D). The interviewees were asked questions about the case studies that were based on the theoretical principles discussed in the literature review. Furthermore, the author asked questions that thought to be within the interviewees’ professional expertise and
experience. Urban planners and project managers were asked planning specific questions regarding the effectiveness of the plans and policies and how creative uses were incorporated into land use and urban design plans. They were also helpful in providing contextual information, history about the study areas, and history about the plans. The following is a sample of interview questions:

- Why has the plan been effective in guiding the development and design of the study area?
- When planning/designing cultural areas, how do you envision the future land uses and activities? Do you plan for arts initiatives and day and evening uses?
- How are cultural uses integrated into this particular area’s plans? Is a specific strategy needed to support this? How do you attract creative production and consumption businesses?
- How does the built environment convey a sense of meaning and identity for the area? Are there particular heritage buildings, landscape features, or building identifiers that make it suitable for cultural uses?
- What do you think are the important lessons from this area that should be shared with other neighbourhoods?

For a list of the complete interview questions refer to Appendix D.

In all, four semi structured interviews were conducted with key informants. Prior to the start of the interviews, a number of administrative duties related to ethics were completed. The previously discussed details of the letter of information were reviewed and discussed in person with each interviewee. Additionally, each participant signed a consent form.

The semi-structured interviews were not digitally recorded but detailed interview notes were taken by the author. The interview notes were rewritten and organized using Microsoft Word. The intention of these interviews was to help inform and complete both the built environment and plan analysis. They were particularly useful in acquiring information that could not be attained through observational or plan analysis. The semi-structured interviews gathered
information about creative cluster concepts, policy and or the case studies in order to answer the research question.

It was not possible to interview all the primary public and private sector stakeholders who worked on the projects due to time and availability. Therefore, one planner or project manager affiliated the study area was interviewed to develop a holistic viewpoint. By obtaining information from multiple sources, this research avoids weaknesses response bias, reflexivity and inaccuracy (Yin, 2014).

2.4 Generalizability of Results

Yin (2014) defines analytic generalization as conclusions or lessons from a specific case or experiment that can be applied to other situations. The evaluative criteria achieves analytic generalizability which may be applicable to analyze different creative clusters. The evaluative criteria helped identify key lessons from the Distillery District and King-Spadina that were applicable to the Port Lands. The recommendations for the Port Lands may act as a guide to improving planning policy in order to create the conditions conducive to creating a creative cluster. Planners, decision makers and developers involved with creative clusters in other cities can also refer to these evaluative criteria and robust methods to help identify, enhance, and or better develop their existing and planned built environments and creative activities.

This research developed a sophisticated and comprehensive methodology to study the selected case studies. It looked to achieve an understanding of the existing and planned built environment as well as the creative activities. The following three chapters explore and analyze these components.
CHAPTER 3 – BUILT ENVIRONMENT ANALYSIS

This chapter consists of a description and analysis of the Distillery District’s, King-Spadina’s, and Port Lands’ built environments. The evaluative criteria framework (see Table Exec-1) was used to evaluate whether necessary conditions and success factors of “good” creative clusters exist. A ranked score is provided as per the ranking scheme (see Table 2-2). Chapter 6 provides a comparison of the built environments and plans within respective case studies to see whether the built environments accurately reflect the plan.

3.1 Built Form and Urban Design

Diversity: Mixture of Uses and Buildings

The term diversity refers to the physical composition of the built environment. Diversity and its connection to creative clusters was discussed in Chapter 1. The Distillery District and King-Spadina exemplified diverse built environments. Both study areas contained a mixture of uses ranging from creative industry workspaces to a number of complementary service and retail commercial uses that brought activity during all hours of the day. The key difference between the two was that King-Spadina contained more office space. A conflict of uses existed in both study areas: the Distillery District and King-Spadina. The first attempted to balance the tourist/visitor based uses with residential needs, while the second tried to balance entertainment related uses and residential uses. The Port Lands
significantly differed from the other two study areas. It primarily consisted of industrial and some commercial uses. Furthermore, there were no residential uses and a significant amount of temporary use/vacant land.

The Distillery District’s mixture of buildings primarily consisted of old and heritage buildings with some new mixed use commercial-residential developments. The shapes and sizes of the buildings varied making them suitable for a variety of different businesses and activities. The buildings’ interiors and exteriors were in excellent condition. They were well maintained and appeared to use high quality building materials. In contrast, the range in building type, size, and condition within King-Spadina was excellent. New and existing mixed use developments had narrow commercial storefronts on the ground floors and residential above. There was a cluster of old warehouse buildings converted for nightclub uses. The Port Lands range of building types was limited. The majority of buildings were large industrial and warehouse style buildings. There were few

Figure 3-2: Diversity of building types in the Distillery District.


Figure 3-3: Single use industrial building in the Port Lands.

traditional office buildings. Many of the buildings were large and appeared to provide single units for one type of use.

**Table 3-1: Diversity Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Distillery District" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="King-Spadina" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Port Lands" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adaptability**

Urban revitalization plans are turning to adaptive reuse in an effort to promote sustainability and preserve built environments that have cultural and historical importance (Bullen and Love, 2011; Von Hausen, 2013). This is accomplished by creatively reusing existing buildings and transforming them into residential, commercial, and/or institutional uses.

The presence of old and heritage warehouses and/or industrial buildings were observed. Both the Distillery District and King-Spadina were evaluated as having excellent adaptability because they had a significant amount of former warehouse and industrial buildings that had been converted to different uses (see Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-5). The Distillery District buildings had been reused for commercial uses, such as galleries, pubs, restaurants, cafes, shops, studios, and some

**Figure 3-4:** A building in the Distillery District adaptively reused for a pub.  
*Source: Misiak (2014).*

**Figure 3-5:** Adaptively reused building King-Spadina.  
*Source: Misiak (2015).*
offices. King-Spadina had seen many buildings adapted for restaurants, office and creative uses. However, in recent years the area had an influx in the redevelopment of these sites to mixed use commercial-residential buildings. In comparison to the other two case studies, the Port Land’s had potential for adaptive reuse in the North West area of the study area. However, few buildings were reused. The Port Lands was evaluated as having limited adaptability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Street Life: Transparency and Active Streets*

Ewing and Clemente (2013) define transparency as, “The degree to which people can see or perceive what lies beyond the edge of a street or other public space, and more specifically, the degree to which people can see or perceive human activity beyond the edge of a street or other public space” (Ewing and Clemente, p. 11). For streets to be transparent, they also need to have a horizontal grain of active frontages (Gehl, 2010). Active edges have narrow units and many doors. Intensifying the number of commercial units at the ground floor of buildings creates a vibrant street life. Active frontages enhance the pedestrian experience and city attractiveness by inviting people to walk slower, increase the number of stops, and walk into shops more frequently (Gehl, 2010).
The size of the Distillery District’s street and laneway facing windows differed, providing varying degrees of transparency. Trinity Street was observed as the street with the greatest amount of transparency. Not all of the adjacent buildings’ windows were floor to ceiling. Interior laneway windows were scattered along building facades and were medium size providing fair visibility into and out of the building. King-Spadina’s main streets’ ground floor residential and commercial spaces generally provided excellent transparency. The majority of the recent developed buildings had floor to ceiling windows making window shopping and people watching possible. The existing buildings in the Port Lands provided poor transparency into the buildings. The Port Lands contained a discontinuous network of sidewalks.

The buildings within both the Distillery District and King-Spadina area varied in the number of units and types of businesses. Both areas were evaluated as having a fine urban grain as well as a high frequency of human presence and public activity throughout. Both the Distillery District and King-Spadina had a diverse mix of ground level commercial activities that stimulated one another. They include: lounges, shops, cafes, display spaces, and walk-up...
services. Many people were observed walking in and out of the different commercial businesses along the laneways and sidewalks. Active frontages within the Port Lands did not exist.

Table 3-3: Street Life Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Human Scale*

Ewing and Clemente (2013) define human scale as, “Size, texture, and articulation of physical elements that match the size and proportions of humans and, equally important, correspond to the speed at which humans walk” (Ewing and Clemente, p. 9). They continue by stating that physical elements such as building details, pavement texture, street trees, presence of parked cars, orientation of buildings, depth of setback on tall buildings, street furniture, and spacing of windows and doors contribute to an urban place’s human scale (Ewing and Clemente, 2013). Human scale is an important element that contributes to an urban area’s comfort and walkability.

The Distillery District was primarily a pedestrian oriented place. The pedestrian only laneways and streets contained characteristics that exemplified good human scale which made the area comfortable for walking and cycling. The District had a high proportion of street-

Figure 3-8: Street furniture, pedestrian level lighting, and street decorations in the Distillery District.

level widows per block with the majority of the buildings ranging between one and four storeys. There were new high rise mixed use buildings located at the perimeter of the district that made an effective use of podiums to maintain a sense of scale. Physical elements such as cobblestone pavement, street trees, seasonal decorations, banners, public art, and street furniture were evaluated as being excellent (see Figure 3-8).

King-Spadina integrated elements of human scale into its built form and public realm. The western half of the area did a very good job of making pedestrians feel comfortable. The area had a high proportion of street-level widows per block with older buildings ranging between one and six storeys. Many of the recent “tall buildings” developed in the eastern half of the area, greatly exceeded the four to six storey range that is considered an appropriate human scale (Ewing and Clemente, 2013, p. 9). Furthermore the amount of public spaces and architectural features such as awnings, pillars, street trees, lamp posts, mail boxes, bicycle racks and parked cars was be evaluated as being very good throughout the King-Spadina area (see Figure 3-9).

The quality of human scale in the Port Lands was poor. The built form and public realm did not correspond to the size and proportion of humans. Although many buildings ranged from one to two storeys, they were setback from the street or sidewalk. There were also little to no public realm amenities such as street furniture, planters, or bicycle racks.
Table 3-4: Human Scale Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Meaning

Public and Semi-Public Spaces

The Distillery District was an excellent example of a public place that supported strong activities. Figure 14 illustrates the series of connected lanes and streets that made up the area’s public spaces. The end of Trinity Street was an open space similar to a square, where public events like art shows, meetings, and seasonal events took place. Furthermore, the Distillery’s public spaces contained a number of separated patios and outdoor dining areas for neighbouring restaurants, bars, and lounges.

Figure 3-10: Map of Distillery District showing destinations and laneways.

King-Spadina had a good mixture of public and semi-public spaces. St. Andrew’s Playground, Clarence Square, and Victoria Square provided open and recreational space. In addition to public parks, there were a number of privately owned accessible public spaces (known as POPs) adjacent to both the old buildings and the new developments throughout the King-Spadina area. There were small enclosed courtyards and lane ways between some of the old industrial buildings on King Street that resemble public spaces in the Distillery. Separated patio spaces were also common along streets that had wide sidewalks or significant setbacks.

The Port Lands had public spaces that were potentially suitable for public events, gatherings, social and or outdoor recreational activities, including Clarke/Cherry Beach Park, McCleary Park, Martin Goodman Trail (MGT), the Cherry Beach Sports Fields, Tommy Thompson Park, the Leslie Spit and the Outer Harbour Marina. However, it significantly lacked publically accessible private spaces and patio spaces. The private outdoor spaces, such as roof decks and patios owned by night clubs and pool bars, were not visible or directly accessible from the street.

**Figure 3-11:** Clarence Square in King-Spadina.

![Clarence Square in King-Spadina](source: Misiak (2015)).

**Figure 3-12:** Semi-public space similar to the Distillery District in King-Spadina.

![Semi-public space similar to the Distillery District in King-Spadina](source: Misiak (2015)).
Heritage Preservation

According to Von Hausen (2013), heritage is an important element of successful places because, “These elements also help define the social, cultural, and spiritual-symbolic underpinnings of what makes the place special and/or unique” (Von Hausen, p.73). The Distillery District was an excellent example of heritage built form and characteristics preservation. The site contained more than 40 heritage industrial buildings. The interior and exteriors of heritage buildings did not appear to be modernized or significantly altered from their original design. The historic courts, lanes, and open spaces were maintained as they were initially planned. Elements like chutes, bridges, and overhead pipes as well as various crafts and handiwork relating to the district’s industrial past were preserved throughout (see Figure 3-13).

Table 3-5: Public and Semi-Public Spaces Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-13: Preserved industrial chutes and bridges as well as Government of Canada Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada Plaque.

King-Spadina was a very good example of heritage preservation. According to the *King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District Study* there are 38 designated properties, 68 listed properties, 5 properties intended for designation and 6 properties with municipal heritage easements (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014, p. 87). There were a significant amount of former industrial and manufacturing buildings built between 1880 and 1940 that added cultural heritage value to the area. Many of these buildings’ architectural styles appeared to be consistent with Edwardian Classical, Renaissance Revival (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014, p.100). There were also commercial buildings that borrowed Classical, Neo-Gothic, and Art Moderne styles (Taylor Hazell Architects, 2014, p.100). Victoria Memorial Park and Clarence Square were two public spaces with heritage attributes that remained preserved. The former industrial and warehouse buildings in the district provided a basis for distinct character to the area. A significant amount of older mixed use and industrial buildings in the area had been replaced by modern infill developments.

There were a limited number of buildings and structures within the Port Lands which were listed on the City of Toronto’s...
Inventory of Heritage Properties and one that was designated under the Ontario Heritage Act (City of Toronto, 2013, p.20). Although there were few listed and designated buildings and structures, they added to the heritage value of the Port Lands. These buildings served as reminders of the Port Lands’ industrial past.

**Table 3-6: Heritage Preservation Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Buildings With Identifiers (Signs)**

Ewing and Clemente (2013) state, “Signage is a major source of complexity in urban and suburban areas. If well done, signs can add visual interest, make public spaces more inviting, and help create a sense of place” (Ewing and Clemente, p.15).

While it was typical for most commercial businesses to have signage identifying their business, the quality greatly varied across the three case studies. It appeared that the Distillery District had maintained a number of its historic signs. New signs were

**Figure 3-16: Example of signage in the Distillery District.**

*Source: Misiak (2014).*
Figure 3-17: Poor commercial signage in the Port Lands.


subtly differentiated by the typography, colour, and material, however, they still respected the heritage character of the area (see Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-16). In King-Spadina, buildings with signs were predominantly along major commercial streets like King Street and Front Street. Unlike the Distillery District, sign designs were more eclectic. Unfortunately, the majority of the business signs in the Port Lands were poorly designed and did not contribute to the identity of the area (see Figure 3-17). For example, many signs used generic typography and were printed on canvas or plastic.

Table 3-7: Buildings With Identifiers (Signs) Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presence of Outdoor Dining

The Distillery District and King-Spadina areas were excellent examples of areas that support outdoor dining. Both areas contained several separated patio spaces along laneways or streets. In King-Spadina, King Street was one street that had a number of outdoor dining and patio spaces that supported high amounts of sociability and active street life. The Keating Channel Pub and Grill was the only venue in the Port Lands that provided outdoor dining space that was visible from the street. The outdoor dining space was significantly setback from the street.

Table 3-8: Presence of Outdoor Dining Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinct Sense of Place

Distinct sense of place refers to physical elements such as buildings, street furniture, banners and public art which reference local history and traditions to create a distinctive sense of place. The Distillery District was an excellent example of a distinct sense of place because it maintained a unique and historic identity by way of protecting the heritage built form and referencing the local area’s industrial past. The exteriors and interiors of buildings were preserved and adaptively reused in a manner that allowed visitors to see the buildings’ original design and use. The lamp posts, traditionally designed businesses signs and old/heritage objects like mill stones, old cars, barrels and wagons were placed throughout the district referencing the area’s industrial past. The public art throughout the area communicated a sense of culture and creativity.

King-Spadina’s old, heritage, and modern mixed use buildings created a distinct sense of place that combined elements of its industrial past and contemporary design. Public art referenced the area’s past as a major centre of the garment trade. The historic theatres and banners in the eastern half reminded users of the area’s past and current hub for theatrical arts and entertainment. King-Spadina was evaluated as having a very good distinct sense of place.

Figure 3-18: Historic wagon and barrels referencing local traditions and historic past in the Distillery District. 

The Port Land’s built environment conveyed a limited sense of distinct place because there were few buildings and structures. There were also no banners or public art that referenced the area’s past or local traditions. There were remnants of its port and industrial past scattered in the area which provided an odd, unusual and distinct identity.

**Table 3-9**: Distinct Sense of Place Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Building Form and Composition*

Building forms and composition refers to whether new developments conform to the existing built environment’s architectural styles, detailing, massing, setbacks, arterials, colour palettes and textures. New developments within the Distillery District more consistently followed existing patterns of development and building forms than in King-Spadina. In both areas the architectural style, detailing, colour palettes and textures of the majority of the new developments did not match the existing old and heritage buildings. The concrete and glass exteriors were a significant juxtaposition to the existing brick buildings. The newly developed mixed use buildings in the Distillery District towered over the original buildings. The height and massing of the eastern half of King-Spadina’s recently developed tall buildings were not consistent with the area’s existing industrial buildings. The western half’s old and heritage buildings appeared to serve as a model for development, not only in terms of height, but also the design at street level, and continuation of the street wall. Recent developments in the Port Lands’ continued to follow industrial pattern and building forms that lacked architectural style, and detailing. They were not orientated with the street or pedestrian friendly. The lack of development in the Port Lands made it difficult to assess existing patterns of development.
Table 3-10: Building Form and Composition Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comfort and Impression

An area’s aesthetics and maintenance greatly contribute to its users’ impression and overall identity. Project for Public Spaces states, “Whether a space is comfortable and presents itself well...is key to its success. Comfort includes safety, cleanliness, and the availability of places to sit...” (Project for Public Spaces, 2015). The most successful area in terms of comfort and impression was the Distillery District. The space’s built form and public realm made an excellent first impression. Although the district was primary made up of buildings that were over a hundred years old, the brick structures were in excellent condition. The area’s laneways, streets and gathering areas were well maintained and decorated giving an impression that it was cared for. Workers were observed cleaning up trash and

Figure 3-19: Workers in the Distillery District.


Figure 3-20: Street cleaner in King-Spadina.

Source: Misiak (2015)
performing maintenance on the built form and public amenities. There were plenty of conveniently placed chairs and benches throughout the District. In King-Spadina, the new mixed use developments gave the impression of quality construction using high quality materials and professional design which enhanced the visual aesthetics of the public realm. The street trees, window displays, signage, and cleanliness of the streets made walking in the area aesthetically pleasing. Overall, the area was evaluated as conveying very good comfort and impression. In contrast, the Port Lands built form and public realm was poorly designed and maintained. The lack of street life and lack of lighting did not give a sense of safety or security. This, in combination with the deteriorating building facades, unkempt landscape, and significant amount of litter in public and private areas caused the Port Lands to have poor quality of comfort and impression.

**Table 3-11: Comfort and Impression Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CHAPTER 4 - PLAN ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Plan Analysis Chapter is to assess how effectively the plans support the necessary conditions and characteristics of creative clusters. This chapter consists of a discussion and analysis of the *King-Parliament Secondary Plan*, *King-Spadina Secondary Plan* and *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan*. These Plans will serve as the primary documents analyzed. Existing urban design guidelines supplemented and informed criteria relating to the design of the built environment and public realm. Following, a ranked score will be provided as per the ranking scheme (see Table 2-2).

The criteria used to evaluate the case studies’ plans are summarized in Table Exec-2. The definitions of these criteria are provided in Chapter 3 and will not be explained again to avoid repetition. Each of the Secondary Plans were examined for policies that contribute to the promotion of these criteria. A comparison of the built environments and plans within respective case studies will be examined in Chapter 6 to see whether the built environments accurately reflect the plan.

4.1 Clear Physical Plan

*King-Parliament Secondary Plan*

The *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* is a community plan that covers six different neighbourhoods, including: Jarvis Parliament, Corktown, West Don Lands, Gooderham & Worts Special Identity Area (The Distillery District), Triangle Lands, and Queen Street. The subheadings clearly identify the purpose of the section and the areas they apply to, they include: Urban Structure and Built Form; Heritage and Community Improvements; Pedestrian Environment, Transportation and Parking; Community Services and Facilities; and Environment.
This Plan is long in comparison to the other reviewed Secondary Plans: 17 of 34 pages of the Plan apply specifically to the Distillery District. A table of contents outlining the major sections, subsections, figures, and appendices with corresponding page numbers would help readers navigate through the document. However, despite its length, the Plan follows a logical order and is easy to follow. The language used is clear, concise, and does not use complicated terminology or sentence structure.

Section 15 “The Site and Area Specific Policies”, is specific to the Distillery District. Maps illustrating the site boundaries and three different mixed use areas are provided on the first two pages of this section. The key policy objective is, “to ensure the retention and conservation of the Gooderham & Worts Special Identity Area in accordance with accepted heritage conservation practise” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.14). The Plan’s subsequent objectives encourage:

- Comprehensive redevelopment in accordance with the “Site and Area Specific Policy”;
- A broad mix of land uses to ensure the area becomes: a focal point of activity for residents and tourists, includes a balance of uses, is animated throughout the day, and provides a satisfactory living environment;
- High level of public use and public accessibility;
- Heritage of the Distillery District be accessible to the general public.

Appendix 3 Design Guidelines exclusively applies to the planning and development of the Gooderham & Worts Special Identity District. Unlike most design guidelines, any redevelopment of the Distillery District must be in accordance with the principles stated in Appendix 3. According to subsection 5 of the “Site and Area Specific Policy”, this was secured through an agreement between the property owner and the City. These policies were credited as being an effective guide to the redevelopment of the Distillery District. One major critique of Appendix 3 is that it does not include illustrative photographs and or drawings. Although the
policies use simple language, these would aid in visualizing the design guideline’s intended outcomes.

*King-Spadina Secondary Plan*

The *King-Spadina Secondary Plan* is well structured and follows a logical order. The Plan lists a series of “major objectives” from the outset which, make it easy to understand the overall purpose of the plan. The *King-Spadina Secondary Plan*’s purpose is succinctly summarized under the heading “major objectives”. This section puts forward a clear but broad vision for the area that: attracts investment, preserves and reuses heritage and important buildings, provides compatible uses that evolve with the neighbourhood, and commercial activities that support and service residents and businesses.

The Plan uses major section headings and subheadings. Each section and subsection is numbered. The Plan avoids the use of jargon and uses simple and direct sentences. The Plan does not adequately use graphics, such as pictures, drawings, or tables. Only two maps are used illustrating the Urban Structures Plan and Areas of Special Identity. These figures do an effective job of displaying the location of key built environment features, such as the area boundary, potential and existing gateways, potential view terminus, midblock connections, significant streets and open spaces, landscape edges, special identity areas.

Unlike the *King-Parliament Secondary Plan*’s Appendix 3 Design Guidelines, property owners are not required to follow the *Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area*. The document is not enforced through legislation or agreements. It is only a tool that planners and developers can use to guide the preferred design options built form and public realm. This
Central Waterfront Secondary Plan

The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan includes the Port Lands. A clear statement of purpose is stated at the beginning of the plan under the “Core Principles” section of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan. This section states that the plan provides a framework and principles for renewal activities on the Waterfront that will be valid for a span of 30 years (City of Toronto, 2007). Four core principles are listed as: removing barriers and making connections, building a network of spectacular waterfront parks and public spaces, promoting a clean and green environment, and creating dynamic and diverse new communities (City of Toronto, 2007, p.1). These core principles are expanded on in later sections. The Plan does an effective job of defining each of core principles and its significance to the Waterfront. It also does an admirable job of proposing area-specific actions “Big Moves” and policies that can be implemented. These are to be completed through a precinct implementation strategy. A precinct implementation strategy is a process that develops a comprehensive and orderly development strategy for a specific area (City of Toronto, 2007). This process may include: urban design, heritage and environmental performance standards, soil clean up, and community improvement (City of Toronto, 2007, p.15).

Overall, the policies are written in a style that is easy for the general public to understand. Sentences are written clearly, concisely and avoid the use of complex language. However, the poor formatting and organization of the document takes away from its legibility. The Plan does not make an effective use of headings and subheadings to differentiate between core principles,
objectives, and policies. Nor, does the Plan make an effective use of figures and tables. A locator map would be useful in helping readers, not familiar with the Waterfront, identify key areas, such as the Port Lands, West Don Lands, Queens Quay, Harbourfront Centre, and East Bayfront. The plan is 32 pages in length and may benefit in providing a table of contents to help navigation of the document.

Table 4-1: Clear Physical Plan Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Distillery District" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="King-Spadina" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="The Port Lands" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Built Form and Urban Design

Diversity: Mixture of Uses and Mixture of Buildings

The Secondary Plans for both the Distillery District and King-Spadina call for a mixture of land uses. In all, the Plan puts forward a vision to transform the Distillery District into a complete community. The Plan states, “A broad mix of land uses in the Gooderham & Worts Special Identity Area including residential, retail, institutional, office, restaurant, cultural or arts related uses, community service and facility uses and light industrial uses are encouraged...” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p. 14). The King-Parliament Secondary Plan divides the Distillery District into three “Mixed Use Areas” each of which have their own land use characteristics. In contrast, the King-Spadina Secondary Plan broadly calls for a mixture of uses. The Plan’s major objectives 2.2 states that, “The King-Spadina Area will provide for a mixture of compatible land uses with the flexibility to evolve as the neighbourhood matures” (City of Toronto,1996b, p.1). The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan envisions the Port Lands as a place that will be suitable for living and working. Unlike the other Secondary Plans, land uses are not specified for the
The Plan identifies future precinct planning as the means to defining the range of uses (City of Toronto, 2007, p.11).

The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan is the only plan that refers to a mixture of buildings. It states, “Businesses will be presented with building and location choices that satisfy all sizes and types of businesses from start-ups to mature international business operations” (City of Toronto, 2007, p.9).

Table 4-2: Diversity Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Adaptability

All three Secondary Plans have policy objectives that support the adaptive reuse old or heritage buildings. The King-Parliament Secondary Plan’s policies on adaptability are evaluated as excellent. Collectively, the policies emphasize the significance of rehabilitating, reusing and respecting historic buildings in the district. The Plan also provides direction as to the uses that should be considered for the historic buildings, including: a museum, spirit centre, performing arts centre, industrial heritage education centre, and a conservation skills training centre.

Although not as direct, the King-Spadina Secondary Plan does a very good job at encouraging adaptive reuse of its heritage buildings. The King-Spadina Plan states that the historic industrial buildings in the area should be reused and act as a model for new developments (City of Toronto, 1996b, p.2). The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan states that listed heritage properties will be protected and improved (City of Toronto, 2007, p.13). The Plan recommends that these properties be used for creative uses (City of Toronto, 2007, p.13).
Street Life: Active Edges and Transparency

King-Parliament Secondary Plan and King-Spadina Secondary Plan have very clear policies that promote active edges and transparency. They encourage the built form and street conditions that may contribute to these two criteria. The two plans have nearly identical built form principle policies on public spaces that outline forming and animating edges, surveillance opportunities, and enhancing the lower levels of buildings. Furthermore, both plans enhance and maintain the public realm by require future planning and development to, “enhance the public nature of streets, open spaces, and pedestrian routes,” and to, “provide public uses which are directly accessible from grade level” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.2; City of Toronto, 1996b p. 3). The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan does not have policies that relate to active edges or transparency.

Table 4-3: Adaptability Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Adaptability Ranking" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Adaptability Ranking" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Adaptability Ranking" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street Life: Active Edges and Transparency

King-Parliament Secondary Plan and King-Spadina Secondary Plan have very clear policies that promote active edges and transparency. They encourage the built form and street conditions that may contribute to these two criteria. The two plans have nearly identical built form principle policies on public spaces that outline forming and animating edges, surveillance opportunities, and enhancing the lower levels of buildings. Furthermore, both plans enhance and maintain the public realm by require future planning and development to, “enhance the public nature of streets, open spaces, and pedestrian routes,” and to, “provide public uses which are directly accessible from grade level” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.2; City of Toronto, 1996b p. 3). The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan does not have policies that relate to active edges or transparency.

Table 4-4: Street Life Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Street Life Ranking" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Street Life Ranking" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Street Life Ranking" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human Scale

With respect to new development in the Distillery District, Section 15, policy 4.2.2 of the King-Parliament Secondary Plan states that building heights should be “...sensitive to and respect the unique heritage and pedestrian quality of such lane” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.16)
The recommended maximum building height is 137m (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.16). The plan encourages maintaining its network of public accessible open spaces in order to preserve the pedestrian oriented nature of the district. Items such as, lighting, signage and public art, are also mentioned in sustaining human scale.

The *King-Spadina Secondary Plan* states that the height and scale of new developments should be compatible with the existing built form and heritage buildings. However, the height and scale across the area is not consistent. The *Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area* state that buildings heights in the East Precinct exceed the permitted zoning and should not be used as precedents for development. The West Precinct contains low to mid rise buildings that are approximately uniform in height and scale. Additionally, the Guidelines strongly support planning and designing area streetscapes and built forms that provide a comfortable environment for the pedestrian. The Guidelines suggest elements related to human scale, such as height, mass, setbacks, step-backs, building quality and visual interest, can be integrated to provide a more pleasant pedestrian experience.

The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* states that precinct plans will specifically define scale. However, it suggests that, “They should generally be developed at medium scale, with some lower elements and higher buildings at appropriate locations” (City of Toronto, 2007, p.10). It also states that, “Development of the Central Waterfront will maintain Toronto’s successful tradition of city building at a compact scale combining the best of urban living, amenities, and built form” (City of Toronto, 2007, p.11).

**Table 4-5:** Human Scale Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Meaning

Public and Semi-Public Spaces

The King-Parliament Secondary Plan’s Site and Area Specific Policies outline a thorough series of policies that maintain and enhance publicly accessible open spaces within the Distillery District. The Plan specifies that the pedestrian oriented character of the district will be kept by maintaining its publically open space system, including its: network of streets, lands, courtyards, and linkages. Policy 6.2 states that, “A linear publicly accessible open space system will be established in the Parks and Open Space Areas, the design of which will include a bicycle path and will enhance the historical interpretation of the Area” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.18). It also promotes public accessibility within the area by encouraging the creation of programs for public use. This Secondary Plan is evaluated as providing excellent quality policy on public spaces.

The King-Spadina Secondary Plan does a satisfactory job of laying out open space policies. The Plan identifies significant streets and open spaces. It also specifies that new buildings should be organized in such a way that they enhance the quality and character of streets and open spaces. The Plan states that this will be accomplished by a policy framework consisting of zoning, design guidelines and streetscape improvement programs (City of Toronto, 1996b, p.1). Furthermore, the Plan communicates new developments’ contributions to public space improvements. The Plan states that, “new developments will provide high quality open spaces for the use of residents, visitors, and area workers” (City of Toronto, 1996b, p.3)

The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan is evaluated as containing excellent policies on public space because of its direct, expansive, and detailed series of relevant objectives and policies. One of the Plan’s core objectives is to build, “...a network of spectacular waterfront parks and public spaces” (City of Toronto, 2007, p.1). The Plan envisions the public spaces as
providing areas for, “outdoor cafes, areas of respite, play areas, public art, gatherings and celebrations” (City of Toronto, 2007, p.4). The waterfront’s maritime characteristics are central to the public space policy of the area. The plan calls for the waterfront to be used for boating opportunities and facilities.

### Table 4-6: Public and Semi-Public Space Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heritage Preservation**

All three Secondary Plans identify heritage preservation as major policy objectives. The *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* identifies the Distillery District as provincially and nationally significant and a unique industrial heritage area (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.14). The Plan repeatedly states that heritage built form and characteristics, such as its historic buildings, courts, lanes, open spaces, crafts and handiwork, should be conserved and maintained. The Plan looks to not only ensure the preservation of historic building’s exteriors but also interiors (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.15). Appendix 4 lists the “Specified Heritage Interiors” in the Distillery District. Although it does not go into as much detail, one of the *King-Spadina Secondary Plan’s* main policy objectives is to also preserve heritage buildings. The Plan clearly states that the heritage buildings are “essential elements” of the character of the area (City of Toronto, 1996b, p.3).

Similar to the aforementioned Secondary Plans, the *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* focuses on preserving the waterfront’s industrial heritage. The Plan does an excellent job at identifying the key cultural and natural heritage features. It states that places such as the Ship
Channel, cement silos, and dockwall, should be maintained in new development plans. Furthermore, future plans should also preserve the “unique waterfront heritage” as an amenity and create a series of unique public places that reflect the area’s history and character (City of Toronto, 2007, p.6/7).

**Table 4-7: Heritage Preservation Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buildings with Identifiers (Signs) and Outdoor Dining**

The *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* is the only Secondary Plan that contains policies that relate to signs. The policy does an excellent job of conveying the necessity for existing historical signage to be maintained and new signs to be designed in manner that respect the heritage character of the Distillery District (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.25). The Plan recommends that *Landscape History, Inventory and Guidelines of the Heritage Masterplan* be used to guide the retention and reuse of old signs and design of new signs. The design guidelines outline the message, typography, colour, material, size and location of various new sign types. In comparison the *Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area* do limited job. They only provide a very broad statement that signs should add diversity and interest to the streetscape.

**Table 4-8: Buildings with Identifiers (Signs) Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Secondary Plans also lack specific policies for outdoor dining. The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* is the only plan to vaguely mention that outdoor cafes should be located within the waterfront’s public spaces. The *Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area* states that building should provide a step back to allow room for “outdoor spill-out activity” (City of Toronto, 2006, p.18). A picture of an enclosed area with tables and chairs is shown.

**Table 4-9: Outdoor Dining Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Distinct Sense of Place*

The *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* does an excellent job of encouraging distinct sense of place and local tradition by creating authenticity. The series of policies maintain and enhance a historic industrial identity by way of protecting the heritage built form and cultural attributes. The Plan does a good job at achieving this because it contains policies that cover heritage preservation, and landscape and design elements in the area. The *King-Parliament Secondary Plan* states, “The landscaping design, lighting design, signage design and public art provided for the Gooderham & Worts Special Identity Area will reinforce the heritage character and assist in the historical interpretation of the Area” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.15). Furthermore, the Plan recommends that the *Landscape History, Inventory and Guidelines* should be consulted to assist with the planning and development of various landscape features, including: open space and vegetation, paving materials and surfaces, lighting, and signage.
Although not as detailed, the King-Spadina Secondary Plan does a very good job of creating a distinct sense of place by preserving physical characteristics associated with its historic manufacturing and industrial past. The Plan’s heritage and built form policies support creating a place that is authentic. The Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area identifies opportunities to improve Special Character Streets and tertiary streets’ public realms by adding banners and enhancing paving and lighting. The Guidelines also state that public art plays a role in remembering the city’s history and culture. It identifies potential sites on private and public lands where public art can be installed.

The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan outlines policies that preserve its unique maritime and industrial heritage to create “special places” to live and work along the waterfront (City of Toronto, 2007). The Plan does an excellent job of outlining policies that retain, improve and integrate heritage structures as well as promoting maritime activities. The Plan states that waterfront streets will be designed to become “places” with distinct identities (City of Toronto, 2007, p.3). Furthermore, distinct sense of place will also be encouraged along the public water’s edge promenade by integrating parks and public spaces that include for public art.

Table 4-10: Distinct Sense of Place Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Form and Composition

The King-Parliament Secondary Plan and King-Spadina Secondary Plan have identical policies that strongly express that new developments should fit in with the existing pattern of
development. The policy states, “New buildings will achieve a compatible relationship with their built form context through consideration of such matters as building height, massing, scale, setbacks, stepbacks, roof line and profile and architectural character and expression” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.2/3; City of Toronto, 1996b, p.3). Both plans also contain a statement with a stipulation directing new developments to achieve a compatible relationship with surrounding heritage buildings.

**Table 4-11: Building Form and Composition Ranking.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>The Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Distillery District" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="King-Spadina" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Port Lands" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5 – CREATIVE ACTIVITY ANALYSIS

This chapter consists of a description and analysis of the Distillery District’s, King-Spadina’s, and Port Lands’ creative activity. The evaluative criteria framework (see Table Exec-3) was used to identify whether the conditions and success factors related to “good” creative clusters are present. A ranked score is provided as per the ranking scheme (see Table 2-2).

Venues, Festivals, and Events

The Distillery District and King-Spadina are home to a number of cultural venues, festivals, and events which offer a variety of gatherings, viewings, screenings and performances. These festivals and events happen consistently throughout the year. A notable event that the Distillery District hosts is the annual Christmas Market. This event consists of day and evening entertainment, food and retail vendors, and stores and galleries displaying and selling art. King-Spadina has a number of Toronto’s premiere theatres and performing arts centres. The TIFF Bell Lightbox is one of the main venues for the Toronto International Film Festival. TIFF is considered the second largest international movie festival, attracting actors, directors and tourists from across the world. In contrast, the Port Lands is the weakest performing case study in terms of venues, festivals and events. Unlike the previous two areas, it is limited to a couple live music venues, nightclubs and vast parking lots that are converted to performances spaces for seasonal events like Cirque du Soleil and Cavalia.
Table 5-1: Summary and rank of venues, festivals and events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre Company, Young Centre for the Performing Arts, Boiler House Loft, Fermenting</td>
<td>Yukuks,</td>
<td>Venues: Polson Pier, Sound Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cellar.</td>
<td><strong>Festivals and events:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatrical Fridays (at the Stirling Room), Christmas Market, SING! Vocal Arts</td>
<td>Much Music Video Awards (MMVAs), Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF), Nuit Blanche, Luminato</td>
<td><strong>Festivals and Events:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festival, arts and crafts workshops, Emerging Young Artists exhibition, The Distillery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cavalia (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday Market, Canada’s National Ballet School Creative Challenge,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cirque Du Soleil (seasonal), Luminato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workspaces

A common perception that creative and cultural industry businesses prefer workspaces located in converted warehouses and former industrial buildings (Hutton, 2006; Martins, 2015). The Distillery District’s 15 Case Goods Lane building is managed by Artscape, who provides below market rate work and retail space to small artistic producers. A twenty year lease at below market rates to Artscape was achieved through Section 37 obligations of the Municipal Planning Act (Artscape, n.d.).

Figure 5-1: Artscape workspace at 15 Case Goods Lane.

Source: Misiak (2014)
King-Spadina also has former industrial and warehouse buildings that were converted for various creative industry purposes. 401 Richmond Street is a notable example of a restored industrial heritage building that is home to over 140 artists, cultural producers, galleries, festivals and shops. There is concern that land values will push the creative and cultural sector out of King-Spadina, which would force artists to find more affordable workplaces.

In the Port Lands, VSVSVS provides work space for seven artists in a former warehouse building. Additionally, film production companies have adapted former industrial buildings for movie set production and studio purposes. Recent Port Lands Acceleration Initiative planning documents show Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto plan to integrate a film studio district in the land use and planning framework for the area (City of Toronto, 2014). Waterfront Toronto has identified opportunities for the expansion of employment uses intended for creative industries (City of Toronto, 2014).

Table 5-2: Summary and rank of creative industry workspaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workspaces</td>
<td>Case Goods Warehouse and Cannery Building are buildings that are managed by ArtScape. There are 63 work and retail studios, offices, rehearsal and performances spaces. These units are rented at below market rates. The tenants are small firms in the cultural sector.</td>
<td>401 Richmond St is a restored industrial heritage building that is home to over 140 artists, cultural producers, galleries, festivals and shops.</td>
<td>VSVSVS provides warehouse space for artists. Former industrial buildings have been converted for film sector uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank

|  | [Rank] | [Rank] | [Rank] |
Day and Evening Uses

Distillery District and King-Spadina both have strong day and evening economies. The development strategy for both Distillery District and King-Spadina achieve this by encouraging the importance of creating mixed use neighbourhoods. Although the King-Parliament Secondary Plan broadly mentions day and evening uses and the King-Spadina Secondary Plan does not, both areas contain creative sector workspaces and a number of complementary service and retail commercial uses during all hours of the day. The key difference in the Distillery District’s day and evening uses is how it caters to independent and non-main stream businesses, such as: boutique jewellery and fashion, art galleries, and non-chain restaurants and cafes. King-Spadina has more of a mix of independent and chain businesses. In contrast to both these case studies, even though the Port Lands has policy that encourages “morning-to-evening vitality” there are only a few night clubs, and one pub in the study area.

Table 5-3: Summary and rank of day and evening uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day and evening uses</td>
<td><strong>King-Parliament Secondary Plan policy:</strong> “The Area is animated throughout as broad a time period of each day as possible” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.15)</td>
<td><strong>Bars, Restaurants, and Coffee Shops:</strong> Cibo Wine Bar, Spice Route, SpiritHouse Toronto, Gusto 101, Starbucks, Zoe’s Bakery Cafe, Aroma Expresso Bar, Le Neuf Cafe, Fynn’s of Temple Bar, Firkin on King, <strong>Clubs:</strong> The Hoxton, Tryst, Brassaii, Union Nightclub, <strong>Retail:</strong> King’s Display Rack and Mannequins, King Textiles, Gotstyle, Indochino, Livestock, Theatrix Costume House, Bridals on Spadina.</td>
<td><strong>Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy:</strong> “A balance of places to live and work will contribute to the morning-to-evening vitality of new waterfront communities” (City of Toronto, 2003,p.11). <strong>Clubs:</strong> Cabana Pool Bar, Polson Pier, Sound Academy <strong>Bars, Restaurants, and Coffee Shops:</strong> Keating Channel Pub &amp; Grill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td><strong>Bars, Restaurants and Coffee Shops:</strong> Archeo, Balzac’s Coffee, Brick Street Bakery, Cluny Bistro, El Catrin, Mill Street Brew Pub, Pure Spirits Oyster House, Sweet Escape Patisserie. <strong>Retail:</strong> Bergo Designs, Blackbird Vintage, Corktown Jewellery Designs, Gotstyle Distillery, Mint Boutique.</td>
<td><strong>Bars, Restaurants, and Coffee Shops:</strong> Cibo Wine Bar, Spice Route, SpiritHouse Toronto, Gusto 101, Starbucks, Zoe’s Bakery Cafe, Aroma Expresso Bar, Le Neuf Cafe, Fynn’s of Temple Bar, Firkin on King, <strong>Clubs:</strong> The Hoxton, Tryst, Brassaii, Union Nightclub, <strong>Retail:</strong> King’s Display Rack and Mannequins, King Textiles, Gotstyle, Indochino, Livestock, Theatrix Costume House, Bridals on Spadina.</td>
<td><strong>Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy:</strong> “A balance of places to live and work will contribute to the morning-to-evening vitality of new waterfront communities” (City of Toronto, 2003,p.11). <strong>Clubs:</strong> Cabana Pool Bar, Polson Pier, Sound Academy <strong>Bars, Restaurants, and Coffee Shops:</strong> Keating Channel Pub &amp; Grill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>![Rank Icon]</td>
<td>![Rank Icon]</td>
<td>![Rank Icon]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creative Production and Consumption Businesses

Creative clusters are areas where a significant amount of creative activities take place and provide a foundation for future uses including creative consumption and production. All three case studies rank well within these criteria. The policy objectives with respect to establishing creative uses set out in the respective Secondary Plans have had successful outcomes.

The Distillery District has a number of art studios, galleries, and performance theatres that allow for both the production and consumption of culture. King-Spadina is the most important area for cultural employment in Toronto. In 2011, 20% of all employment was in culture-related areas (Silver, 2011, p.29). The area is part of the Entertainment District which has a significant clustering of entertainment and digital media businesses. A few of the entertainment, digital media, cultural organizations and businesses that have their offices located here include: Mirvish Productions, Canadian Filmmakers Distribution Centre, CARFAC Ontario, and Loop Media. Furthermore, the area is also known as the “Fashion District”. Custom fashion designers, supply stores, and boutique shops are also found.

In contrast to these aforementioned areas, the Port Lands has focused on creative production versus consumption. The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan has a number of key policy statements that envision the Port Lands as a cultural and creative hub. It envisions a “convergence district” of film and new media activities to attract businesses to support these uses in the Port Lands. It makes specific reference to entertainment industries, such as: music, film, television production, communications, software development, biotechnology, and publishing sectors (City of Toronto, 2003, p.12). The outcomes of these policies have been successful. Since 2008, Pinewood Studios, Canada’s largest film and television studio complex, has anchored the Port Land’s film sector. Several movie and digital media related companies are found in the area.
Table 5-4: Summary of some of the creative production and consumption businesses criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative production and consumption</td>
<td><strong>King-Parliament Secondary Plan policy:</strong> 2.3) “King-Parliament’s role as a major employment area within the City will promoted and enhanced by encouraging the retention and expansion of commercial and light industrial activities, particularly in the business services, film, media, design and technology sectors.” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.1)</td>
<td><strong>King-Spadina Secondary Plan policy:</strong> 2.3) “The King-Spadina Area is an important employment area. Accordingly, the retention and promotion of commercial and light industrial uses including media, design and fashion businesses within the area is a priority.” (City of Toronto, 1996b, p.1).</td>
<td><strong>Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy:</strong> The Secondary Plan calls for the creation of an area that will be, “conducive to the creation of an international Centre for Creativity and Innovation for knowledge-based industries, film and new media activities” (City of Toronto, 2003, p.9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleries:</td>
<td>PROOF Studio Gallery, Dish Gallery + Studio, Julie M. Gallery, Thompson Landry Cooperage Gallery, Thompson Landry Gallery, Arta Gallery, Corkin Gallery, Eskimo Art Gallery.</td>
<td>Galleries: Wynick/Tuck Gallery, Abbozzo Gallery, Alice Burton, Art of Karuna/Kalyna Pidwerbesy, David Mirvish Gallery</td>
<td>In Spring 2015, Daniels Corp announced that they will be developing the “City of the Arts” a short distance away from the Port Lands. This will consist of 150,000 sq. ft. Creative Industries Hub that will house a cluster of arts organizations (including: Artscape). Cultural consumption is limited to seasonal events (Cirque du Soleil and Cavalia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rank | |
|------|---|----|---|
**Arts Development**

As far as arts development, The Distillery District and King-Spadina ranked as excellent. The Distillery focuses mostly on micro and small arts development companies. It also has a number of non-for-profit arts and education organizations. King-Spadina is home to a number of major arts development agency and company offices. Many of these are national agencies and organizations that represent different sectors in the creative and cultural industry.

**Table 5-5**: Summary and rank of arts development education institutions/facilities and organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts development</td>
<td>Education: Distillery District Early Learning Centre, Voice Integrative School, Soulpepper Theatre Company</td>
<td>Education: The Second City Training Centre, School of Editing Calphalon Culinary Center Liaison Culinary College</td>
<td>There are no identifiable arts development initiatives or arts development agencies and companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Art in the Environment

McCarthy (2006) argues that integrating public art that has a historical association with the area is a valuable means of linking image and identity (McCarthy, p.260). It is also credited for contributing to distinctive sense of place, quality of place, and cultural regeneration (McCarthy, 2006, p.260). The City of Toronto has a policy framework and series of objectives for integrating art in the environment. Section 3.1.2 of Toronto’s Official Plan recognizes public art as a way of making streets and open spaces more attractive and interesting. Section 3.1.4 identifies public art as a way of integrating neighbourhood’s history and culture into the built environments.

The King-Parliament Secondary Plan states that, “...public art provided for the Gooderham-Worts Special Identity Area will reinforce the heritage character and assist in the historical interpretation for the area” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.15). The Distillery District does an excellent job of demonstrating this policy objective by placing several items, such as, wagons, millstones, and old cars, throughout the area. Visitors to the district interact with these modern art installations by viewing, touching, climbing and photographing them. Local stores and galleries often display art in store front entrances and windows.

The King-Spadina Secondary Plan does not contain policies for public art. However, the Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina Area identify areas where there are opportunities to integrate public art into the streetscape, open space, and built forms. The City’s policy for

Figure 5-2: Garment/fashion themed public art in King-Spadina.

Source: Toronto Shopoholic (2009).
developer contributions to public realm amenities has helped secure public art and can be seen throughout the King-Spadina area. The Port Lands performed poorly in these criteria. P14 of the *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* states the need for a coordinated arts program for public and private developments. The outcome of this policy has not been seen in the Port Lands.

**Table 5-6:** Summary and rank of art in the environment criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art in the environment</td>
<td><em>King-Parliament Secondary Plan policy:</em> “...public art provided for Gooderham &amp; Worts Special Identity Area will reinforce the heritage character and assist in the historical interpretation of the Area” (p.15)</td>
<td>Public art is integrated with open space, public space, and private space throughout the area.</td>
<td><em>Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy:</em> P14) “There will be a coordinated Central Waterfront public art program for both public and private developments” (p.7). The Plan suggests that public art will be coordinated through precinct planning. There is no public art or art exhibitions on display in public places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rank</em></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rank" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Rank" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Rank" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION

Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 provide assessments of the built environments, plans and creative activities for the Distillery District, King-Spadina, and the Port Lands. The evaluative criteria which consisted of conditions and success factors of “good” creative clusters were primarily drawn from Montgomery (2003; 2004) and supplemented by Durmaz (2015) and Wansborough and Mageean (2000). The methods for evaluating the built environment were adapted from Ewing and Clemente’s (2013), Scoring Sheet Measuring Urban Design Qualities. The methods were then adapted to assess how effectively the plans encouraged these criteria. Montgomery’s (2004), Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration Part 2 guided the collection of information on creative activities. The three qualitative analyses included a ranked score for each of the criteria provided in Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5.

This Chapter contains a summary of the findings and analysis. It includes a comparison of the built environments and plans within respective case studies to see whether the built environments accurately reflect the plan.

Table 6-1: Summary of Evaluations Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Distillery District</th>
<th>King-Spadina</th>
<th>Port Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment Analysis</td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Analysis</td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Activity Analysis</td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="null" alt="Symbol" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 The Distillery District

The Distillery District’s built environment ranked very good overall. The area contained a wide variety of uses and sizes and types of buildings that stimulated one another. The streets and laneways were active and provided a pedestrian environment that was visually appealing and comfortable for walking. The district’s buildings and laneways were well maintained and decorated, giving the area an impression that it’s cared for as well as safe. Furthermore, the area did an excellent job of preserving and adaptively reusing the heritage industrial buildings to house a range of retail and service businesses, studios, offices, and entertainment venues. The heritage objects and traditional signage portrayed a distinct sense of place that vividly made reference to local traditions and industrial past.

The King-Parliament Secondary Plan is an example of an excellent Secondary Plan that guides and stimulates growth and change. Through Section 15: Site and Area Specific Policies and Appendix 3: Design Guidelines, the Plan goes above and beyond the scope of the other Plans by including a clear and detailed series of land use and urban design policies that contribute to quality of place. There is particular focus on supporting elements that contribute to making the area a mixed use, pedestrian-friendly and publically accessible place. The Plan does an excellent job of putting forward policies that protect, preserve and reuse heritage buildings as well as maintain and enhance the heritage landscape. Appendix 3: Design Guidelines lacks visual aids like diagrams, descriptive pictures and maps.

Artscape’s involvement in the area greatly contributed to the Distillery District’s excellent creative activity ranking by providing affordable work and retail space to creative workers for artistic production purposes. The various performance theatres, galleries, studios,
arts events and festivals attract tourists and local residents to the area at all hours of the day and
to consume food, culture and entertainment throughout the year. The various pieces of public art
reinforce the area’s heritage past as a distillery. The annual Christmas Market is an excellent
example of that attracts residents and tourists to visit the area.

6.2 King-Spadina

King-Spadina presented a very diverse built environment. Its mixed use land use
planning approach that integrated a combination of residential, commercial office and
commercial retail, in one or separate buildings. These buildings provided suitable space for a
range of activities and businesses. The old heritage industrial buildings were adaptively reused
for creative uses, such as advertising, graphic design, art studios and entertainment venues. King-
Spadina also is demonstrative of a very vibrant street life. The combination of the surrounding
day and evening businesses and use of outdoor patios maintained active streets throughout the
day. These semi-public places served a dual purpose, providing space for recreational activities
as well as alternative workspaces. Public amenities like street furniture, street lamps, public art,
street and business signs, bike racks, street trees and podiums provided human scale and visual
diversity to the streetscape. The tall buildings in the western half of the study area took away
from the area’s overall sense of pedestrian scale.

The King-Spadina Secondary Plan communicates its vision of the neighbourhood as a
mixed use area that has the capability of evolving as the neighbourhood matures. It specifies that
the area should contain a wide range of activities in the creative industries, such as film, media,
design, and technology. Although not as explicit as the King-Parliament Secondary Plan, there is
considerable emphasis placed on preserving and adapting heritage buildings to accommodate
new workplaces. Policies also encourage new developments to be compatible with existing pattern of development and built form characteristics. The *Toronto Urban Design Guidelines: King-Spadina* provides clear and descriptive recommendations to enhance the built environment’s making aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian-friendly.

King-Spadina’s creative activity ranked as excellent. The area is the centre for the city’s fashion, entertainment, and media sectors. It has a vibrant day and evening economy with many venues that host numerous events, exhibitions, performances and festivals throughout the year, such as Much Music Video Awards (MMVAs), Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF), Nuit Blanche, and Luminato. The area is also home to a long list of local and national businesses and organizations that play a critical role in arts development in the city and country.

### 6.3 The Port Lands

Overall, the Port Lands is a cautionary case of how not to plan a diverse built environment and pedestrian-friendly streetscape. The majority of the industrial and commercial buildings did not have a relationship with the street. Deficiencies included poor transparency, large front and side yard setbacks, expansive parking lots, vacant lots and building facades that did not contain architectural detail. Sidewalks were observed to be in poor condition and discontinuous. Few streets were lined by street trees, street furniture, and human scale lighting. It is not surprising that a limited number of pedestrians and cyclists were observed during the site visits. Despite the area’s limited quality built environment, the Port Lands’ local traditions and history were exhibited by remnant industrial heritage characteristics like the dock wall, Shipping Channel, cement silos and various maritime activities. These qualities give the Port Lands a foundation to further enhance its distinct sense of place.
The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* does little to nothing to support a built environment that is comfortable and visually appealing for pedestrians. The Plan makes no reference to policies that shape street life or the built forms relationship with the street. Nor does the Plan define the range of uses for the area. The Plan supports preserving and adapting old and heritage buildings for the creative industry. While placing little focus on the future of the built form, the Plan puts emphasis on elements that contribute to its distinct sense of place and local history. The Plan’s “Big Moves” support planning and development initiatives that embrace its maritime, waterfront, and heritage characteristics. One of the main initiatives is to transform the area into a place that will be recognized as having a network of spectacular parks and public spaces.

The Port Lands ranked as having a limited creative activity ranking. The area is deficient in public art, arts development initiative or organizations, and day and evening uses. The industrial district’s lack of diverse creative businesses also contribute to this ranking. The Port Land’s contains several major firms in the film sector. However, what are missing are the smaller firms and actors that provide opportunities to produce and consume culture. There is only one identified artist workspace and no art galleries or performance venues.

6.4 Lessons Learned

The Distillery District’s and King-Spadina’s built environments, creative activities, and plans did a very good job of displaying the majority of conditions that lead to developing and sustaining a creative cluster. Planners, developers, and municipal governments around the world should look at these case studies to understand how their strong community plans have lead to the successful regeneration and redevelopment by stimulating and guiding growth and change in the built environment. These diverse, pedestrian friendly and distinct built environments offer a
variety of opportunities for creative production and consumption. Both areas integrated numerous venues, public art, workspaces, galleries, and public and semi-public spaces. This research showed that the Port Lands demonstrated few of these necessary conditions and success factors. If the redevelopment of the Port Lands is to include a creative cluster precinct, it is important that the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative’s future plans align with the criteria of a “good” creative cluster. The following are the most important lessons or recommendations that should be considered in helping create an environment that is attractive for a clustering of creative firms and workers in the Port Lands. These are the result of existing literature, site visits, and conversations with informants.

**Recommendation #1: Promote a high quality built environment that is diverse, to human scale and designed to support vibrant street life.**

The Distillery District and King-Spadina are both examples of diverse built environments that provide a public realm that is comfortable and support high quality pedestrian activity. Future planning and development in the Port Lands should adopt policies that support a diverse built form that contains a mix of land uses, building types, and unit sizes so that businesses can evolve as the surrounding neighbourhood transforms. It is also important to have a diverse mix of ground level uses that not only stimulate one another but also animate the public realm at all hours of the day. Ground floor uses should accommodate outdoor dining, cafes, bars, lounges, shops, display spaces, and walk-up services. Building units and the public realm should be planned to encourage transparency and active frontages.

The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* should be modified to include a series of general built form policies that outlines the built form’s relationship with the public realm. It should look at implementing policies from the *King-Parliament Secondary Plan and King-Spadina*
Secondary Plan that enhance and maintain the public realm by requiring future planning and development to, “enhance the public nature of streets, open spaces, and pedestrian routes,” and to, “provide public uses which are directly accessible from grade level” (City of Toronto, 1996a, p.2; City of Toronto, 1996b, p. 3). Policies should encourage developments that form and animate edges, provide surveillance opportunities, and enhance the lower levels of buildings. The Plan should also support elements of human scale, such as pedestrian scale lighting, street trees, and diverse signage.

Recommendation #2: Adapt former industrial buildings for creative purposes with the intention of attracting a greater diversity of creative production and consumption businesses, arts development agencies and organizations.

As Hutton (2002) and Martins (2015) suggest, creative firms and workers are attracted to former industrial buildings and warehouses because their internal configurations are advantageous to a variety of design and entertainment related purposes. Similar to the Distillery District, there is an opportunity to accomplish this in the Port Lands by using Section 37 obligations of the Municipal Planning Act to secure below market workspaces in exchange for height/density bonuses. This may encourage arts development organizations, similar to Artscape, to adapt industrial and warehouse buildings to provide affordable work and retail spaces for the creative sector. If successful, the Port Lands has the potential to attract a greater diversity of creative uses, such as advertising, graphic design, fashion, music companies, artist studios and galleries, and small performance venues.

Recommendation #3: It is important that plans and policies support creating visually distinct areas by identifying, preserving, and building on existing qualities that make an area unique.

The third recommendation stems from understanding an area’s qualities of place that make it distinct. Smit (2011) states that planning for visually distinctiveness should be of
particular importance to economic development initiatives, specifically those that are looking to attract creative industries. For this reason, she recommends that an area’s existing visual quality should be reviewed (Smit, p.180). The Distillery District did an excellent job of maintaining and enhancing its built form, urban design, and cultural landscape elements creating distinct quality of place.

*King-Parliament Secondary Plan* did an exemplary job of articulating policies that identify, preserve, and improve the national heritage site’s built form, design, and cultural landscape. The Plan not only supports the preservation of the exteriors and interiors of the heritage buildings but also the look and feel of the district. The Plan refers to The *Landscape History, Inventory and Guidelines of the Heritage Masterplan* to guide development and urban design decisions in the district. This document outlines how historic and new architecture and design elements should be planned and integrated so that they fit in with historic landscape.

The *Central Waterfront Secondary Plan* does an excellent job of identifying opportunities to integrate industrial and maritime characteristics like the dock wall, Hearn Generating Station, and shipping channel into the Port Land’s future. However, the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative should involve local planners, designers, historians, architects, sociologists, and demographers to create a customized and site specific guideline similar to the Distillery District’s *Landscape History, Inventory and Guidelines of the Heritage Masterplan*. This document should help articulate the cultural landscape characteristics that contribute to Port Land’s special atmosphere. It should also provide urban design guidelines to help maintain, integrate, and enhance old and new elements into the future development plan.
6.5 Future Research

Creative industry jobs are quickly transforming into the economic engines of many Canadian cities. According to The Ministry of Tourism and Culture (2010), creative industries generate about $12.2 billion in GDP for Ontario's economy annually (The Ministry of Tourism and Culture, p.4). This is more than agriculture, forestry and mining sectors combined (The Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2010). Additionally, studies have shown Canada’s creative industries are forecast to grow at approximately the same rate as the global market (The Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2010). For this reason, it is important for Canadian cities to provide proper environments to accommodate the growth of these creative industries. It would be interesting to apply these evaluative criteria to major Canadian cities’ former industrial areas to identify the most suitable locations for creative firms and workers. Cities can use this evaluative criteria framework to help identify deficiencies in prospective areas’ and propose changes to improve them.
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Appendix A: Email Script

Hello my name is Andrew Misiak, and I am currently completing my Master’s in Planning from the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University. I am conducting a research study on using creative clusters as a policy mechanism for urban regeneration. My master’s report will focus on comparing the potential for creative clusters by evaluating the existing and planned built environments of The Distillery District (Toronto, Ontario), King-Spadina (Toronto, Ontario) and the Port Lands (Toronto, Ontario).

I received your contact information through _________, and am contacting you because I would like to ask you some questions about the creative clusters and how you were/are involved in the planning, design, and or operation.

At a time and location that is most convenient to you, it would be greatly appreciated if I could sit down with you in person or over Skype for an interview. The interview would take between 30 to 45 minutes.

I have attached a Letter of Information that will provide you with the information that will help you in deciding whether or not you wish to participate in this research project.

If you have any questions or concerns they can be directed to myself, Andrew Misiak, or to my research supervisor, Dr. David Gordon.

Andrew Misiak
Masters of Planning Candidate
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
647-628-6947
andrew.misiak@queensu.ca

Dr. David Gordon
Research Supervisor
Professor and Director
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 x 77063
gordond@queensu.ca

Dr. John Meligrana
Research Supervisor
Professor and Assistant Director
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 x 77145
john.meligrana@queensu.ca

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,

Andrew Misiak
Appendix B: Letter of Information

DATE: ______

LETTER OF INFORMATION

“Comparing Potential for Creative Clusters for Urban Regeneration”

Principal Investigator: Andrew Misiak
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
E-mail: andrew.misiak@queensu.ca

Co-Investigator(s):
Faculty Supervisors:
Dr. John Meligrana, Professor and Acting-Director
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
E-mail: john.meligrana@queensu.ca

Dr. David Gordon, Professor and Director
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
E-mail: gordond@queensu.ca

About This Letter

In reading this letter, you will be provided with a complete overview of the Master’s research project being conducted by Andrew Misiak under the supervision of Dr. David Gordon and Dr. John Meligrana of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. The provided information will assist you in deciding whether or not you wish to participate in the research project.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this masters report is to compare the potential for creative clustering as a policy mechanism for urban regeneration. The scope of this research is focused on evaluating and comparing the existing and planned built environments. By analyzing The Distillery District (Toronto, Ontario), King-Spadina (Toronto, Ontario), and the Port Lands (Toronto, Ontario), this study aims to offer lessons to urban designers and urban planners that are looking to use creative clustering strategies for urban regeneration.

You are invited to take part in this study through a semi-formal interview because of your role as a planning professional that had influence on the development and or management of an area that contains a creative cluster. Through this semi-structured interview I hope to confirm policies and practises; address the research gaps identified in my site analysis and document review; and, gain insight into a planning professionals’ rationale of incorporating cultural principles in community planning policies.
Completion of this study will lead to a final Master’s report submission to the School of Urban and Regional Planning of Queen’s University for the Master of Planning degree requirements.

Procedures involved in the Research (What will happen during the study?)
Approximately 5 business days before our scheduled semi-formal interview, you will receive an interview schedule. This interview schedule will contain a list of policies that have been collected from the area’s plans, as well as a list of questions that will be asked during the interview.

On the day of the interview I will provide you with a copy of the same interview schedule that was previously presented to you. You may use this during the duration of the interview for your own reference. I will also provide you with a copy of your Consent Form and review the Letter of Information with you, as well as the semi-formal interview process.

Following the formal introductions and answering any questions you may have about the study, we will begin the semi-formal interview. The semi-formal interview will be recorded using an audio recorder in order to allow myself the ability to refer to recordings and confirm hand-written notes at a later date.

You will be asked the questions on the interview schedule and will have flexibility to refer to any of the policies and practises referenced on the schedule.

At the end of the semi-formal interview I will indicate we’ve reviewed all the questions on the interview schedule, dedicate some time for you to ask questions of me that are related to this study, and wrap up our interview.

Potential Harm, Risks or Discomforts (Are there any risks to participating in the study?)
The harm, discomforts, or risks involved in participating in this study are minimal and are important to outline. You may feel uncomfortable when answering questions related to the policies or practises relating to creative clusters. In addition, you may worry about how other staff, and professionals of your organization will react to your interview responses.

Throughout the semi-formal interview you do not need to answer questions that you do not want to answer or that make you feel uncomfortable. Furthermore, you may withdraw from the semi-formal interview at any time.

The following steps will be conducted to ensure your privacy as well as mitigate any potential sources of harm, risk, or discomfort:

- The interview schedule that will be sent to you 5 business days before our scheduled interview will contain the list of policies and questions that I will refer to in the interview. This will give you time to gauge how you’d like to answer certain questions and become comfortable with the interview process; and,
- All audio recordings and hand-written notes will be labeled: Date of the Interview - Confidentiality and Identity Preference. None of the recordings will be labeled with the higher education institution in order to further protect identities

Potential Benefits (Are there any benefits to doing this study?)
Your participation can help provide answers to some of the strategies used and challenges with developing as well as implementing creative clusters. Your efforts in developing creative clusters as a planning professional can help external planning professionals and policy makers in understanding how to implement creative cluster policies and practises in their policy documents (ex. Official Plans, Master Plans, Secondary Plans, Precinct Plans, etc), development guidelines, and jurisdiction.

Confidentiality (Who will know what I said or did in the study?)
The following steps will be conducted to ensure your privacy as well as mitigate any potential sources of harm, risk, or discomfort:
The preference you stated in your Consent Form related to confidentiality and identity will be abide by myself (Principal Investigator and Interviewer);

All audio recordings of the semi-formal interviews will be stored on a password protected computer and external hard drive;

All hand-written notes of the semi-formal interviews will be stored in a locked office and personal residence where only the Principal Investigator has access to;

Measures to improve security and confidentiality of interview participants will be reviewed with the participants through this Letter of Information, but also at the beginning of the interview.

Every effort will be made to protect your confidentiality and privacy. However, please keep in mind that we are often identifiable through the stories we tell and the answers given in the semi-formal interview. In addition, since those who participate in planning relating to creative cluster development is small, others may be able to identify you on the basis of references you make. Please keep this in mind in deciding what to share with me.

Once the study is complete, an archive of the data, without identifying information, will be deposited for up to 2 years according to Queen’s University’s General Ethics Research Board data retention policy.

**Participation and Withdrawal (What if I change my mind about being in the study?)**

Your participation in this semi-formal interview is voluntary.

If you decide to be part of the study, you can decide to stop (withdraw), at any time, even after signing the Consent Form or part-way through the semi-formal interview.

If you decide to withdraw, there will be no consequences to you. In cases of withdrawal, any data you have provided will be destroyed unless you indicate otherwise.

If you do not want to answer some of the interview questions, that is fine and we can still continue the interview process.

**Information about the Study Results (How do I find out what was learned in this study?)**

I expect to have this study completed by approximately May 2015. If you would like a brief summary of the results by the end of the Master’s report, please let me know how you would like it sent to you. Alternatively, a summary of the results will be posted at Queen’s University’s Research and Learning Repository (QSpace: https://qspace.library.queensu.ca/).

**Questions about the Study**

Any questions about study participation may be directed to Andrew Misiak at andrew.misiak@queensu.ca.

Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the School of Urban and Regional Planning Unit Research Ethics Board at patricia.collins@queensu.ca or 613-533-2188 x77060

*This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen’s University policies.*
Appendix C: Consent Form

DATE: ___

CONSENT FORM

“Comparing Potential for Creative Clusters for Urban Regeneration”

I __________________________ (print full name) have read the information presented in the Letter of Information about a study being conducted by Andrew Misiak of the School of Urban and Regional Planning of Queen’s University. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about my involvement in this study and to receive additional details I requested. I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I may withdraw from the study at any time.

Note: Once completed, signed, and dated, a copy of this Consent Form will be mailed and delivered to the interviewee.

1. I agree to participate in the study (check one):
   □ Yes
   □ No

   _________ (initial)

2. I have been given a copy of the Letter of Information (check one):
   □ Yes
   □ No

3. I agree that the interview can be audio recorded (check one):
   □ Yes
   □ No

4. I would like to receive a summary of the study’s results at the end of the Master’s report (check one):
   □ Yes
   □ No

If yes, please provide an email address __________________________ and/or mailing address:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
5. **I want my identity kept confidential (Confidentiality and Identity Preference) (check one):**
   - [ ] Yes (full identity and name will not be revealed, nor will a pseudonym be used)
   - [ ] No, I prefer to be identified by a pseudonym (eg. Interviewee A, Interviewee B)
   - [ ] No, I prefer to be identified using my full identity and name

6. **I agree to be contacted about a follow-up interview should it be required by the Principal Investigator, and understand that I can always decline the request (check one):**
   - [ ] Yes. Contact information: ______________________________________________________
   - [ ] No

Full Name (print): _________________________________

Signature: ________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________
Appendix D: Interview Questions

For the Distillery District:

1. Were you, or your organization, consulted during the planning of the creative cluster? If so, how would you describe your role (or the City of Toronto’s) in the planning process?
2. Do you think the King-Parliament Secondary Plan has been effective in guiding the development and design of the Distillery District?
3. How does the built environment convey a sense of meaning and identity for the area? Are there particular heritage buildings, landscape features, or building identifiers that make it suitable for creative uses?
4. When you are a planning/designing a creative area how do you envision the future uses (retail, commercial, creative, recreational) and activities? Did you plan for day and evening uses? Space for arts initiatives?
5. Are any of the arts development initiatives only possible to offer because of a particular land use strategy or design aspect of the area?
6. How does the Distillery differ from other creative clusters/ regeneration areas (in terms of design, planning, etc)?
7. Has there been any feedback, either positive or negative, about the design of the Distillery District? Are there any additional changes (design, programs, etc) that you would like to see? Can you describe some of the specific changes?
8. What do you think are the important lessons from the Distillery District that should be shared with other communities?
9. Do you see any similarities/differences between the Distillery District and the Port Lands?
10. What next steps do you think the Port Lands should take?

For the King-Spadina area:

1. Were you, or your organization, consulted during the planning of the creative cluster? If so, how would you describe your role (or the City of Toronto’s) in the planning process?
2. Do you think the King-Spadina Secondary Plan has been effective in guiding the development and design of the area?
3. How does the built environment convey a sense of meaning and identity for the area? Are there particular heritage buildings, landscape features, or building identifiers that make it suitable for creative uses?
4. When you are a planning/designing a creative area how do you envision the future uses (retail, commercial, creative, recreational) and activities? Did you plan for day and evening uses? Space for arts initiatives?
5. Are any of the arts development initiatives only possible to offer because of a particular land use strategy or design aspect of the area?
6. How does the King-Spadina differ from other creative clusters/ regeneration areas (in terms of design, planning, etc)?
7. Has there been any feedback, either positive or negative, about the design of the King-Spadina? Are there any additional changes (design, programs, etc) that you would like to see? Can you describe some of the specific changes?
8. What do you think are the important lessons from the King-Spadina that should be shared with other communities?
9. Do you see any similarities/differences between the King-Spadina and the Port Lands?
10. What next steps do you think the Port Lands should take?

For the Port Lands:

1. Do you think the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan has been effective in guiding the development and design of the Port Lands?
2. How does the built environment convey a sense of meaning and identity for the area? Are there particular heritage buildings, landscape features, or building identifiers that make it suitable for creative uses?
3. When you are a planning/designing a creative area how do you envision the future uses (retail, commercial, creative, recreational) and activities?
4. How are creative uses being integrated into Port Lands precinct plans? Is a particular land use strategy and urban design plan going to be used to support this?
5. How does the Port Lands differ from other regeneration areas (in terms of design, planning, etc)?
6. What do you think are the important lessons from the Port Lands that should be shared with other communities?
7. What next steps do you think the Port Lands should take in its urban regeneration/redevelopment process?

For creative/cultural planner:

1. Could you comment on how your position or organization is related to the creative cluster?
2. Were you, or your organization, consulted during the planning of the creative cluster? If so, how would you describe your role in the planning process?
3. How does the built environment convey a sense of meaning and identity for the area? Are there particular heritage buildings, landscape features, or building identifiers that make it suitable for creative uses?
4. When you are planning/designing a creative area how do you envision the future uses (retail, commercial, creative, recreational) and activities? Did you plan for day and evening uses? Space for arts initiatives?

5. What type of arts development programs/initiatives are offered at the creative cluster? Are any of these only possible to offer because of a particular land use strategy or design aspect of the area?

6. How does this creative cluster differ from other creative clusters/regeneration areas (in terms of designs, planning, etc)?

7. Has there been any feedback, either positive or negative, about the design of the creative cluster?

8. Are there any additional changes (design, programs, etc) to the creative cluster that you would like to see? Can you describe some of the specific changes?

9. Does the creative cluster positively contribute to the community development of surrounding area? If so, how?

10. What do you think are the important lessons from the creative cluster that should be shared with other communities?

11. Do you see any similarities/differences between King-Spadina, Distillery District and the Port Lands?

12. What next steps do you think the Port Lands should take?