

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Reminder notes:

Midterm is on Monday, February 9th

- Material covered: up to Ruppert's reading

Refresh from Monday's class:

- Downtown Core (ie. Regent Park, Distillery, Spadina)
- Throughout history, things have changed
- Change in form (buildings replaced with different structures), function (shape of building is the same, way we use them are different; like the Distillery District)
- Why have such changes occurred?
 - I. Accommodation to growing population
 - II. Economy (in hopes to attract people, jobs; to bring in more money)
- *Argue that modernization of space, is equally important

Today's class: Dundas Square (How this area has changed in the years)

Yonge Street (Toronto's main street) 1796

- Most important in Canada
 - Value of businesses
 - Length (longest)
 - Image that we project to the world
- Aware that not every part is equally important
- Example:* Southern part from Bloor St. to Lake is more important than North

Focus: Southern portion (Yonge/Dundas)

- How it's developed in 1960s
- 1960s: pro-development mood
 - Certain sectors capitalize on city and get best possible return
 - Build high rise buildings for office space
- 1940s to 50s:
 - Low rise construction only

Pro development mood

- Effort to build Spadina Expressway
 - Was suppose to link Northern citizens to Southern parts of city
 - Not all Torontians agreed
 - Residents opposed b/c of uncomfort
 - Destroy previous historical structures
 - Against general pro development mood
 - Destroy uniqueness of the city

- Oppositions was represented politically by a group of people that got elected in 1972 to represent different neighbourhoods

- Led by Mayor: David Crombi
- All opposed to pro development mood
- Not happy about building skyscrapers
- First measures of mayor: limit height limit downtown
- Reform movements is being successful in 1970s
- Their impact:
 - End of 1960s: Eaton was a factory and decided that it wasn't profitable anymore; replace it with malls, or high rise towers for residents
 - Breaching height limitation so no high rise towers, only mall

Eaton Centre 1977

- Impact on general area:
 - Not good, drove all retail that use to be outside on the street to inside the mall
 - Creation of geographical circulation
 - Upper/middle class people started to move within confined spaces of mall
 - Outside: not affluent, drug users, etc.
- Considering who was suppose to belong on Yonge Street
- Best people to circulate only...
- Didn't portray great image
- Politicians at City Hall and residents started to find a solution

1994: City Council approved plan for redevelopment of the area

- Conjoined effort of City Hall and businesses on Yonge Street
- Public and private sector joined efforts
- Getting rid of low income criminals circulating in area

1997: Official Plan adopted at City Hall

- Taking advantage of Expropriation act (Sec. 7)
- City of Toronto if needed to improve a certain area, had authority to expropriate in exchange for fair compensation
- Owner will be monetarily compensation but they can't refuse the money and keep the land
- City has authority to take land anyways; among owners were private store owners, Ryerson University, The Salvation Army
- Method of taking land: expropriation
- Opposition started: Ontario Muncipial Board
 - admin. tribunal: planning decisions across Ontario
 - every side must have lawyer or expert witnesses or non experts (residents)
 - few groups dropped out of court challenge (ie. The Salvation Army; they found a space Yonge/Victoria to rent, Ryerson University; allowed to use 12 movie theatres to hold classes according to a deal made)
- Result: lost; this is a by-law that has been passed, nothing can be done about the

expropriation act

Her thoughts: Testaments during the hearing, all agreed that Yonge St was problematic and needed to be changed; only opposition is that private owners could improve with expropriation while the City thought it was appropriate. Most arguments of the transcripts are not expressed in economic language, it's more moralized language; Yonge St. is "sick" and need to be cured, "eating" at the body of the City, "looks bad". It's a moral argument.

- Reasons retailers moved inside
 - Attract higher traffic volumes
 - More convenient to shop inside, avoid bad winter
 - Accommodations not available outside (*Example: place to rest, restrooms*)
 - Won't encounter people you don't necessarily want to (*Example: homeless*)
 - Ability to control/circulate those inside the mall (*Security*)

The moral geography of Yonge-Dundas

- When it was defined as "bad"
- Done with comparison to the past
- 1960s: looked like a nice area, family friendly
- Now: high criminality, no comfort or sense of security for families to visit

Other neighbourhoods: Bloor Yorkville and Queen Street West

- Both are still central, but better than Yonge St
- Less homelessness, garbage, criminal activity

Other cities: Times Square in NY, Piccadilly Circus in London

- Central areas
- Cleaner and less criminality

Conclusion: So why can't Yonge Street follow the success of the above areas?

I. Certain places tend to be problematized more than other spaces

- Three decades of discussion isn't found for other areas of the city; WHY?
- Why not Jane and Finch?
- Not all spaces are the same, importance ranking
- Yonge St:
 - Portray certain image
 - Higher priority for City Hall

II. This problematization resulted in moralization of conduct

- Some people are more prone to commit sin than others
- Effect on who can circulate in the area
- Example: people that are the weaker link; *homeless people*

