Urban Geography, 2014
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2014.887298

Intoxifying gentrification: brew pubs and the geography of post-industrial heritage

Vanessa Mathews[a] and Roger M. Picton[b]*

[a]*Department of Geography & Environmental Studies, University of Regina, Regina, SK, Canada;* [b]*Department of Geography, Trent University, Peterborough, ON, Canada*

(*Received 5 October 2012; accepted 8 December 2013*)

This paper traces one craft brewery (Mill Street Brewery) across two industrial heritage properties—in Toronto's Distillery District and Ottawa's LeBreton Flats—to investigate the extent to which alcohol functions as a catalyst of urban change. Using an analysis of both planning and policy documents, as well as media coverage for the two properties, we explore the role that alcohol plays in recalibrating industrial landscapes into spaces of consumption, and the potential for craft breweries to alter the meanings of industrial heritage. We argue that craft beer works as a vehicle in the manufacture of new spaces of cultural consumption. Specifically, craft beer production and consumption are used to aestheticize the industrial past and pacify resistance to central-city gentrification.

Keywords: industrial heritage; alcohol; gentrification; craft brewing; Mill Street Brewery

This paper investigates how the production of craft beer, and its embodiment as a niche product, offers a manicured representation of the industrial past, while ushering in gentrification. We trace the function of craft beer as a vehicle of urban change across two post-industrial heritage properties in Toronto (Distillery District) and Ottawa (LeBreton Flats). We take as our focus one craft brewery, Mill Street Brewery, which entered both properties as a first-wave tenant. As such, the brewery helped to initiate a process of upgrading—forging a layer of niche consumption and catalyzing new forms of production over the residue of industrial architecture. We explore the role of alcohol in processes of urban change through the following two questions: (a) what role does the production of craft beer play in recalibrating industrial landscapes into spaces of consumption?, and (b) how do craft breweries alter the meanings of industrial heritage? In turning our attention to alcohol we focus on how the production and consumption of craft beer is a leading edge of gentrification in historic districts, attracting an upscale consumer base with disposable income and a penchant for cultural capital. We argue that the Mill Street Brewery is at the forefront in the theming and redevelopment of the two historical districts into spaces of trendy consumption, and that an intoxification for a niche product with cultural status accelerates the process of new-build gentrification.

Conceptually, this paper works towards combining the literatures on post-industrial heritage, niche consumption and gentrification. Heritage designations are repeatedly shown to work as precursors to gentrification, ushering in new systems of value that attract higher income residents and businesses. This paper draws on a rich literature in

*Corresponding author. Email: rogerpicton@trentu.ca

urban geography addressing how the consumption of heritage has altered the spaces of central-city landscapes often through the theming of historical districts to create new fashionable "craft marketplaces" in which to consume niche goods (Crawford, 1992; Zukin, 1991). In such places as South Street Seaport in New York, Faneuil Hall in Boston or Granville Island in Vancouver, local residents and tourists seek out unique experiences to distinguish their buying habits from patterns of mass consumption. The purchase of local, craft, historic and unique goods and experiences has become the focus of numerous local economic development initiatives (Donald, 2009; Leslie & Reimer, 2006). The craft beer industry in North America reflects this trend. Its product design and recipes are geared towards "authentic" beers that draw on traditional recipes, local histories, and small batch production techniques. By rejecting the mass produced industrial lagers, and experimenting with unique flavours and traditional brewing methods, the craft beer industry offers consumers choice, the potential for self-expression and status. Yet, as this paper will argue, the impetus to create unique experiences leads to a pattern of repetition across central-city sites.

While the consumptive aspects of local economic development policy have garnered significant attention, this paper is interested in how the production of alcohol operates as the driver in the creation of new urban spaces, and more specifically, how craft beer alters the symbolic meaning and function of abandoned/underused industrial districts. For example, in the transformation of Milwaukee, a local growth coalition capitalized on the working-class heritage (and the "cool factor" of beer production) to remake the city along creative city lines (Zimmerman, 2008). Craft breweries make use of heritage patina—industrial objects, signage and built form—to build interest, adding consumptive value beyond the pour. The production of craft beer and its embodiment as a niche product reinforces a manicured understanding of industrial history. Heritage markers are selective interpretations of the past, devoid of conflict and produced for marketing purposes. Furthermore, the status and authenticity of craft beer operates as a pacifier to the redevelopment of old industrial locations which helps make new development more palatable to local residents.

Our case study focuses on Mill Street Brewery, a craft brewery that emerged on the Ontario brewing landscape in 2002. At present, Mill Street operates in four locations in southern Ontario: a production-oriented brewery in Scarborough, two brew pubs housed on industrial properties in Toronto (Distillery District) and Ottawa (LeBreton Flats) and the newest location at Toronto's Pearson International Airport. We focus our attention on the Distillery District and LeBreton Flats brew pubs due to the conjoined practices focused on niche beer and industrial heritage production and consumption. Brew pubs work to attract (and produce) a discerning consumer, appreciative of premium beer and well informed of the differentiated value of each brew. Emphasis on locally inspired recipes (product design/naming), niche product lines, small batch production techniques, and its taste purveyors, are used to construct a selective representation of the past for these post-industrial locales.

The outline of the paper is as follows. First, we begin with a review of the literature on gentrification and historical districts. Second, we trace the major changes in Ontario's beer market including a shift towards industrial production, the ongoing consolidation in the industry and the emergence of the province's craft-brewing "taste revolution." Third, using reports, newspaper and magazine articles from 1980 to the present, and an analysis of recent planning and policy documents, we evaluate the redevelopment at the two sites to highlight the role of alcohol in the process of place-making. We conclude by providing a critical evaluation of the function of craft beer in the redevelopment of industrial locales.

Heritage, redevelopment and craft beer

For over three decades now, the literature on gentrification has argued that urban policy is oriented around creating the liveable city for elite and upper middle-class workers (Lees, 2008; Slater, 2008). The gentrification debates of the 1980s taught us how the consumption preferences of the middle class reinforced the process of neighbourhood change in central-city districts: it conditioned the return of the middle class to the central city (Ley, 1996; Smith, 1996). The focus on the pursuit of place-making was essential in refashioning working and industrial districts into desirable places for niche consumers (Zukin, 1991). Relying extensively on reservoirs of museums, galleries and historicized shopping districts as the hallmarks of the pursuit for "quality, entertainment and festivity" (Hannigan, 1998, p. 52), urban boosters pursue the construction of iconic architecture, such as the Guggenheim in Bilbao or the Royal Ontario Museum (Lee Crystal) in Toronto, as part of a broader attempt at image reconstruction (Rodriguez, Martinez, & Guenaga, 2001). This desire to create a new urban spectacle fits within the new competitive cities agenda whereby culture and central-city living are increasingly important to achieving the goals of local economic development (Florida, 2002; Peck, 2005).

The remaking of historic urban spaces into cultural products has become central to economic development (Zukin, 1998). Cities have oriented urban redevelopment schemes around the revitalization of the downtown core and historicized narratives have become prominent features of localized attempts to sell new regimes of desire in the urban realm (Jacobs, 1996). In many of these cases, the development, construction and marketing of historic and heritage districts and the reuse of historic buildings exemplify how cultural consumption is used as part of post-industrial urban renewal and economic development in local jurisdictions (Evans, 2003; Rybczinski, 2002). Heritage designations, while facilitating the protection and restoration of declining built form, also serve as catalysts to gentrification (Shaw, 2005). Preservation efforts require substantive capital investment, especially the remediation of post-industrial sites that hold the real or perceived threat of contamination. Most of the costs associated with the remediation of industrial sites in Ontario fall on the private sector, with the state acting as the facilitator (establishing designations, guiding the planning process, ensuring compliance with building codes) (Bunce, 2009; De Sousa, 2002). The amenity of heritage has proven itself to be a lure for middle-class patrons in their quest to seek out authentic urban experiences, and accordingly a useful model for developers seeking to profit from post-industrial lands.

Gentrification is at times framed as a positive component of rejuvenation, a process which transfers the identity of industrial heritage from a "dirty," "stigmatized past" to "a post-industrial present" (Rofe, 2004, p. 193). In this paper, we are particularly interested in how the commodification of heritage encourages class upgrading in older post-industrial locales, and how this process of historic valuation re-narrativizes the past. On this newly minted touristic "heritage trail" (Crang, 1994), narratives of history are recreated and embedded into the cultural fabric of the "city on display" (Eade, 1997; Hannigan, 1998). The result: a "dreamscape of visual consumption" (Zukin, 1991, p. 221) where people are taught how to gaze onto the heritage, architecture and culture of the tourist-city (Urry, 1990). Brew pubs are playing an important role in contributing to the preservation and revival of historic properties. Yet, heritage is not to be consumed only through gaze. The cultural preferences of consumption are driving central-city change. Urban centres are transformed into chic-cache living spaces, with refashioned industrial districts meeting distinguished tastes, becoming playgrounds for luxury consumption (Zukin, 1982). The commodification of heritage within urban change satisfies a consumer desire for the past (as aesthetic), while effacing the complexities of history. As Summerby-Murray (2002, p. 50) highlights, the discourse and production of industrial heritage landscapes are designed to meet the desires of consumers, and "can become fragmented, highly selected and idiosyncratic ruins of a past revolution." Industrial processes and products are romanticized in these reconstructions of identity without laying claim to their by-products of waste and danger (Barthel, 1996).

The growing movement towards small batch craft brews is highly intertwined with constructions of taste. The discriminating craft brew consumer works as an agent of taste, perceptive of the symbolic value contained within each bottle and every pour. This way of looking at craft beer is acquired in, and has purchase in, a particular "social habitus" (those learned dispositions and ways of seeing / acting that are attained in everyday life) (Bourdieu, 1984). The craft brew consumer engages in a process of social positioning via a display of his/her knowledge and actions of the niche product (e.g. food pairings, tastings, facts about the spectrum of styles and flavours). The locales of beer production and consumption are closely intertwined, with architecture becoming a key component of brand marketing. Place associations are becoming stronger referents to beer branding. As Pike (2011, p. 208) argues such "geographical entanglements can be of different kinds (e.g. material, symbolic, discursive, visual, aural), varying in their extent (e.g. strong, weak) and nature (e.g. authentic, fictitious)." Older industrial structures have emerged as ideal host environments for rebranding strategies, given their potential for cultural experimentation (Hutton, 2009). Not only do post-industrial structures offer a conceptual fit for new production processes, they also offer ties to local interests. These spaces satisfy a neo-local craving in the craft beer market where the reestablishment of local connections is favoured over mass production (Flack, 1997; Schnell & Reese, 2003). While older building stocks with a strong place identity are commonly recognized as predictors of gentrification, understanding of the construction of heritage in the process (and the associated outcomes in regards to historical remembering / forgetting) figure less prominently into the debates. The narrative of the Mill Street Brewery and industrial heritage is intertwined with shifting consumption tastes that have been brewing in the Ontario market for over a decade. In the following section, we chart the major changes in Ontario's beer production including a shift towards industrial manufacturing as well as the ongoing consolidation in the industry from prohibition onwards that led to the development of mass market beers by large breweries in order to capture a larger share of the national market.

Consolidation and mass consumption

Early breweries in Ontario were limited to small batch production techniques given the lack of refrigeration, preservatives or automation (Eberts, 2007). By the end of the nineteenth century, changes in alcohol production had made large-scale manufacturing possible. As alcohol production reached industrial proportions, reformers secured prohibition on the retail sale of alcohol in Ontario beginning in 1916. Breweries continued production, primarily by selling illicit liquor to the United States market, which at the time was also under prohibition (Eberts, 2007). Still, the effects of prohibition were noticeable. By 1919, 67 of 117 breweries operating in Canada at the start of prohibition were no longer in operation (Coutts, 2010), and when it ended in Ontario in 1927, brewers who barely survived were then vulnerable to mergers and acquisitions (Bowering, 2000). Beginning in 1930, a long process of consolidation was initiated with the merger of Ottawa's Brading's Brewery with Kuntz Brewery of Waterloo, Ontario. This first merger launched Canadian Breweries, and within a year the firm had gained control of ten breweries and 26% of the share of all beer sold in Ontario. Canadian Breweries' consolidation plan resulted in plant closures, job layoffs and a substantial reduction in the number of beer brands (Coutts, 2010). In 1944, the firm added the Capital Brewing Company, located on Ottawa's LeBreton Flats to its stable of breweries (Ottawa Citizen, 1944).

From 1945 to the 1980s, the Canadian beer industry was marked by "consolidation and homogenization, of the rise of marketing and the shift from craft to larger-scale-industrial processes" (Coutts, 2010, p. 80). Large regional breweries such as Labatt and Canadian Breweries expanded aggressively, buying up most of the remaining regional brewers to position themselves as national breweries, with only the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick escaping the grip of the "big three" (Molson, Labatt and Canadian Breweries) (Coutts, 2010). The shift in ownership was accompanied by a shift in the product and a strategy of beer standardization. Focused on the production of indistinct lagers, Labatt in particular, launched an aggressive mass marketing campaign that focused on lifestyle rather than beer itself to capture a larger share of the national post-war mass consumer beer market (Coutts, 2010; Eberts, 2007). This shift in marketing was part of a process that "stressed the image of beer rather than its taste or character" (Beaumont, 2001, p. 15). In the decades to follow, the large national breweries continued to amass wealth and power, through the purchase of smaller breweries (Eberts, 2007). From the 1960s to the early 1980s, the big three maintained a virtual stranglehold on the regional and national beer markets (Coutts, 2010).

In Ontario, the hold by the big three was supported by their ownership of Brewers Retail, the major distribution channel for beer in Canada's largest province. Incorporated in 1927, the same year prohibition was repealed in Ontario, Brewers Warehousing Co. functioned as a single network of retail stores for the sale of beer; it was operated by the brewers themselves, and was intended to appease advocates of the temperance movement. What began as a measure to help regulate beer sales morphed into a competitive disadvantage for all except the major players, due to the role of listing and handling fees. This chain of retail outlets, operating exclusively in Ontario, now called The Beer Store (TBS), captures 78.2% of the market share of beer sold in Ontario (LCBO, 2011). TBS remains a legal monopoly with the majority shares held by former domestic giants Labatt (49%), Molson (which bought Carling-O'Keefe/Canadian Breweries in 1989) (49%) as well as the large regional brewer Sleeman (2%) (now owned by Japanese brewer Sapporo). The fees imposed on producers make it expensive for smaller brewers to have their brands carried by the distribution network owned by their larger competitors (Krashinsky, 2013). Partly as a result of these constraints, the Ontario Craft Brewers (OCB) association was launched in 2005 to actively promote the niche breweries that were marginalized by the Beer Store model. The provincially owned Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) offers a retail alternative, with 20.8% of the beer retail market in Ontario (LCBO, 2011). While small breweries face competition for shelf space and limitations on packaging, recent efforts to promote Ontario brews by the LCBO and the OCB has resulted in craft beer sales rising 33% in 2012 at the provincially owned retailer (CBC, 2013). Small breweries wanting to sell direct to their public can also operate an on-site brewery store.

"Taste the difference": the craft revolution

The global standardization of beer tastes and the reduction in beer brands has led to a counter movement in brewing which includes a renewed interest in "older-style beers" (Poelmans & Swinnen, 2011, p. 25) that attempt to "create an image of authenticity" (Persyn, Swinnen, & Vanormelinge, 2011, p. 93). This rediscovery of old styles of beer and differential tastes harkens back to a past age of local markets and small batch production techniques (Eberts, 2007). In Ontario, the pioneer in the countermovement was Brick Brewing which opened the first craft brewery in the province in 1984, launching what some analysts have labelled "a microbrewery revolution" as consumers shifted away from corporate manufacturers to craft brewers (Bowering, 2000). Since the mid-1980s, craft brewers have more than doubled their share of Ontario's beer market from 2% to 5% (Ontario Craft Brewers, 2012). There are now approximately 50 licensed craft brewers in Ontario, employing a workforce of 600 people (Flavelle, 2012).

Beginning in the 1990s, a number of strategies were employed by Ontario brewers to reinvigorate the local beer market. First, Ontario's Ale Trail, though short-lived, was set up in the late 1990s to mimic the popular Niagara Wine Route and to help establish beer heritage tourism in southern Ontario (Plummer, Telfer, Hashimoto, & Summers, 2005). Second, as a trade organization for small craft brewers, the OCB aimed to collectively grow and develop the craft market for beer by promoting local production using natural ingredients through product and event marketing. Conceptually, these marketing campaigns tie into the growing demand for local niche speciality products in Ontario. As the LCBO has noted, a rise of a more "sophisticated base of consumers" for beer is marked by their desire for "food pairings" and distinguished beer styles (LCBO, 2011, p. 33). The slogan for the OCB—"Taste. The difference"—reflects this trend. The slogan can be read as marking differential quality from the mainstream industrial lagers, and via Bourdieu (1984), as the production of distinction or *terroir*. These constructions of taste and distinction relate to social class positions. As Flack (1997, p. 46) suggests, "beer connoisseurs...emerged in tandem with the rise of microbrewers...the beer that a person drinks has become a social marker or symbol of self-definition." One food critic attributes the recent upsurge in craft popularity to "an ageing population with a high disposable income," and the emblematic craft-brew consumer as "upscale, 25-plus years old and a white-collar worker" (Gains, 2000, p. 5). This emphasis on conspicuous consumption is not lost on the OCB that works to link the production of beer to craft beer culture as a form of cultural capital. Those who can "taste the difference" recognize taste in a symbolic sense, differentiating craft brews as a premium product versus the mass produced commercial brews as boringly mainstream. The upscale clientele and presence of premium specialty brands mimics the real-estate preferences of gentrifiers: the clientele have greater purchasing power, and the product (both its content and packaging) is remodelled / transformed to achieve distinction from mainstream offerings.

This taste revolution has affected change in the urban landscape. Post-industrial landscapes—in particular industrial architecture dating back to the nineteenth century—have emerged as locations of choice for new breweries throughout Ontario. As Eberts (2007, p. 10) suggests there is a pattern of Canadian breweries "locating in older premises with historic value, with some even tracing back to earlier incarnations of brewing businesses." In Ottawa, brew pubs and breweries played a decisive role in the gentrification of the Byward Market. As Tunbridge (2000, p. 275) notes, beginning in the 1970s in accordance to changes within Ontario's liquor laws (allowing patrons to imbibe outdoors, and loosening the regulations on Sunday drinks), the process of "legalizing local specialist breweries and brew pubs helped to keep pubs and restaurants the leading commercial impetus" in the market, which eventually spurred trendy consumption. The breweries housed within these properties directly contribute to the preservation and revival of historic buildings, and can catalyze gentrification depending on the level of commercial intent. For the brewers, the locations offer affordability and flexibility (and direct access to their public without the regulatory framework of TBS or LCBO), while the heritage value produces interest and authenticity that can be translated into the point of sale as these post-industrial locations become embedded in their marketing practices. In the next two sections, we introduce the Mill Street brand, and trace its contribution to the gentrification of two industrial heritage properties.

Mill Street Brewery

In 2002, East Toronto toasted its first commercial brewer in over a century: Mill Street Brewery, located just outside of the downtown corridor at the corner of Parliament and Mill Streets, in the Gooderham and Worts industrial complex. The Mill Street brand entered the craft market with four brews: one “modern” organic lager packaged in a “pony” bottle and three “historical ones, similar to 19th century brews” (MacKinnon, 2002, p. 7). The latter—Cobblestone Stout, Tankhouse Ale, Stock Ale—reference building names and features within the industrial distillery (Cioletti, 2004). Owing to its brand’s popularity, a second Mill Street location was opened in 2011 as part of the redevelopment of Ottawa’s LeBreton Flats. The two brew pubs are operated by F.A.B. Concepts Inc., a multi-concept hospitality company which owns and manages eleven additional establishments across southern Ontario. Contracting out to a pub-management company to manufacture the distinct character of the Mill Street brew pubs challenges the assumption that independence is a central pillar of craft breweries.

The brew pubs aim to attract a discerning consumer, appreciative of premium beer and well informed of the differentiated value of each brew. Consider the Mill Street Brewery “MBA program”—Master of Beer Appreciation—which targets an educated clientele and provides a platform to build knowledge and skills relating to beer consumption. In terms of locale, Mill Street’s branding plays off of the industrial heritage of the Distillery District and LeBreton Flats properties. On its official website, Mill Street Toronto draws parallels between modern forms of brewing practices and the history of alcohol production in the area: “We are East Toronto's first commercial brewery to open in more than 100 years, producing handcrafted beers in a neighbourhood once renowned for its beer” (Mill Street Brewery, 2012). Similarly, the Ottawa Mill Street official website marks the significance of its location in a “former grist mill...rich in industrial heritage and charm” (Ottawa Mill Street, 2012). Beyond the architectural fit, Mill Street constructs brand distinction through its batch production techniques using heritage recipes.

Distillery District

The Gooderham and Worts distillery has an extensive history of alcohol production (beer, whiskey, rum) and strong ties between alcohol and place identity. Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, over forty buildings were constructed on the thirteen acre property, each tailored to a specific function (e.g. steam mill, malting operations, tank and rack houses, storage, boiler house). The buildings—a collection of mostly red brick Victorian industrial structures—offer a window into the historic manufacture of alcohol (Figure 1). In 1990, production operations at the distillery ceased, and the buildings sat fallow for over a decade. Prior to the closure, the site was designated as a heritage destination by the City of Toronto Act in 1967, the Ontario Heritage Act in 1976 and Parks Canada’s Commercial Heritage Property Incentive Fund in 1988 owing to its landmark status and its contributions to the distilling industry. The area surrounding the property is underdeveloped at present, though there are a number of extensive redevelopment projects (e.g. West Don Lands, Port Lands, East Bayfront) underway that will add substantial population growth.

Figure 1. View of the Distillery District from street level showing industrial heritage.

In 2001, the Gooderham and Worts distillery was purchased by Cityscape Holdings, a private sector real estate company along with Bill Wiener and his wife Lillyann Goldstein for $10.75 million. The site was reopened to the public in 2003 as the Distillery District following an extensive set of renovations. Cityscape had prior experience with the transformation of heritage properties in Toronto and had already earned a reputation for its work in the industry. The collection of industrial buildings were gutted, cleansed and refashioned to form a cultural precinct combining art and heritage. The residue of history forms a backdrop to consumption, and lends a distinct place identity. A set of boutique retail stores, art tenants and restaurants now occupy the buildings catering to middle- and upper-class consumers. The Distillery District shares a great deal of similarities with the craft marketplace model of redevelopment with its emphasis on unique specialized products (there are no chain stores), in contradistinction to mass consumption. In particular there is a shared manipulation of heritage, drawing on built form and a sanitized social history for commercial intent (Tunbridge, 2001). Without the provision of extensive orientation or animation, the buildings remain relatively anonymous in terms of their past functions. While a series of small placards were recently added to each building to help orient visitors, the fragmented narratives either focus on the growth and development of the firm under the auspice of progress, or the machinery and tasks specific to each section of the site. While fulfilling the need for public orientation, these placards are flat representations of an industrial imaginary. In short, the developers of the Distillery District commodify heritage as visual spectacle (signage, built form, equipment) to appeal to middle-class consumers without disturbing the primary function of the site as a space of consumption.

The Mill Street Brewery joins the ranks of several other tenants who were brought on to the site in the formative stages of the redevelopment in order to build interest in the District. Opened in August 2002, the brewing venture preceded the public opening of the

Distillery by several months. The olfactory connection between the micro-brewery and the historic manufacture of whiskey (for which the factory was best known) worked to position the conceptual fit of Mill Street on the property, and lent legitimacy to the redevelopment as a whole. As one critic noted during the initial phase of development: "there is real excitement in the air—not to mention the lingering smell of malt" (Hiller, 2003, p. 1).

This celebrated return of alcohol production, as a form of industrial authenticity, must be read against Gooderham and Worts' role in the demise of small-scale firms in the late nineteenth century (MacKinnon, 2000). While many distillers began their ventures in the 1850s, growing demand for spirits led to a highly competitive landscape and the subsequent rise of larger firms and the disbanding of distilling operations by smaller entrepreneurs (MacKinnon, 2000). By the turn of the twentieth century, the majority of Canada's distilleries were housed in Ontario, the biggest being the Gooderham and Worts firm (Heron, 2003). The following sections highlight the history of alcohol production at the Distillery and the current iteration of the heritage property following redevelopment.

Industrial heritage and alcohol production

In 1837, the Gooderham and Worts families began their involvement in alcohol production. While the firm began producing beer to make use of excess grain, it eventually grew into a renowned whiskey maker. In 1860, production capacity at the plant reached 7,500 gallons of whiskey per day, owing to the addition of a new steam mill and distillery (Otto, 1988). Annual production capacity would eventually hit two million gallons by 1874/75 (Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 1966, p. 359). This increased output earned the company the title of the largest distillery in the British Empire, and necessitated an expanded workforce to aid in the production and circulation of the product (Masters, 1947).

During the First World War, the Gooderham and Worts grounds were under contract by the British Government for the production of acetone (Otto, 1988), earning the firm the title of principal producer of acetone within the British Empire (Carnegie, 1925). Although prohibition was already underway at this juncture, the directive at this time was that alcohol was required for the war measure and that following the war a referendum would take place allowing voters to either amend or repeal the legislation. In 1923, the plant was sold to Harry C. Hatch of Montreal who also acquired the Hiram Walker plant in Walkerville, Ontario in 1927, and merged the two as Hiram Walker—Gooderham and Worts (Otto & du Toit Allsopp Hillier, 1994). Following the end of prohibition in 1927, alcohol and spirits production at the Gooderham and Worts distillery resumed as part of a process of regional and national consolidation in the spirits industry. The merger provided economic stability and worked to propel trade to the United States market (which remained under prohibition for an extended period). As in the beer industry, consolidation would force the closure of older plants, and the last run of grain alcohol flowed through the site in 1957, as production was gradually transferred from the Gooderham and Worts property to the Hiram Walker plants in Walkerville, Ontario and Winfield, British Columbia. In the decades to follow, on-site manufacturing was limited to the production of industrial alcohol and rum.

Policy and planning

Following the cessation of the site operations in 1990, a comprehensive planning framework for the Distillery was initiated between the site owners and the City of Toronto (Caulfield, 2005; Mathews, 2010). In total, four by-laws addressing zoning, heritage protection and site plan control were passed by the Toronto City Council in May 1994. The new planning by-laws relaxed the zoning from industrial to general use, approved a mixed use redevelopment scheme, permitted the demolition of two buildings and protected the remaining buildings under a comprehensive heritage easement agreement. Height and density allowances were increased throughout most of the site to foster development for profit.

Two conditions accompanied the rearrangement: buildings were to remain within maximum height allowances and the owners compelled to produce a Heritage Masterplan to govern the adaptive reuse of buildings. The Heritage Masterplan is made up of twelve reports produced under the direction of the City of Toronto between 1988 and 1994 that provide comprehensive details of the site including its industrial heritage, archival materials, signage and built form. As part of this regulation, and relevant to the Distillery District case, in 1996, the provincial government established guidelines for the remediation of contaminated lands (De Sousa, 2002) and relaxed zoning by-laws in the industrial area to spur development (City of Toronto, 2002).

Underused in the early 1990s, redevelopment of the Gooderham and Worts property was catalyzed by Options for Homes, a non-profit organization that constructed three below-market apartment buildings on site between 1997 and 2000 (City of Toronto, 2008, p. 6). The architecture for the Options for Homes buildings attempted to blend in with the Victorian industrial aesthetic and satisfied the provision for a minimum of 25% of total approved dwelling units required as affordable housing that was mandated in the planning framework (City of Toronto, 1994). The residents of the three buildings were the first permanent tenants following the closure of the plant. These residents paved the way for the next phase of development for Cityscape. When the developer bought the property in 2001, it won the rights to construct three market condominiums. Most of the first-wave tenants welcomed future development, given the isolation and lack of services in the area. The condominiums range in scale from 32 storeys to 40 storeys and diverge from the industrial aesthetic through modernist design lines. While the first of the three condominiums (32 storeys) was sanctioned in the planning framework for the site dating back to 1994, the two additional condominiums (35 and 40 storeys) required revisions of height and density allowances (Ontario Municipal Board, 2008).

Promotional materials for the Distillery District regularly invoke the language of alcohol production through references to brewing and spirits marking the role of niche consumption. The three market condominiums (Pure Spirit, Clear Spirit, and Gooderham) are named in accordance to the history of the site, as are a handful of retail stores and restaurants including The Boiler House, Pure Spirits Oyster House and Grill and Mill Street Brew Pub. At the beginning stages of the venture, the Mill Street partners were keen to collect a little piece of Victoriana by "cleaning up some of the century-old distilling equipment around the Gooderham site for use in their brewery" and incorporating "a small museum about the brewing process" (MacKinnon, 2002). The heritage museum and old equipment was downsized when the brewery was transformed into an upscale brew pub. The location of the distillery at Mill Street and Parliament Street formed part of the company namesake (Mill Street Brewery), cementing the linkages between product and place and contributing to product differentiation.

While the Distillery location initially included the core production of handcrafted beers, in 2006 the space underwent extensive renovations transforming the 6,000 square foot production facility into a brew pub / retail store with seating for 370 (220 indoor and 150 on the two patios) (The Bar Towel, 2007). At this juncture, a majority of production operations moved off-site to an industrial facility in Scarborough. Given that Mill Street was relatively new to the playing field, the company was unable to secure a bank loan; instead, businessman Irvine Weitzman was brought on as the Chief Executive Officer, financially backing the expansion plans and gaining part ownership of the company (Ladurantaye, 2008). The move was triggered by the growing popularity of the Mill Street brand that demanded an expanded set of operations with greater capacity. Despite the historic fit of locating a brewery on distillery grounds, the heritage regulations posed some complications for production. The movement of vehicles is restricted on-site, and no vehicles are permitted during late evenings. The facility in Scarborough increased the annual production rate tenfold (McDowell, 2006) and enabled a distribution system that would extend the reach of the company beyond Ontario. Located in a non-descript industrial park, this facility offers a marked contrast with the heritage aura. Small batch runs continue on the Distillery grounds, but the venture is now exclusively a site for cultural consumption and product testing. Recently, Mill Street expanded its operations at the Distillery, with the newly formed Beer Hall (opened April 2013). Situated directly adjacent to the brew pub at the base of one of the newly constructed condominiums, Mill Street's Beer Hall offers seating for an additional 600 patrons, and a functioning distillery to produce beer schnapps (Rubin, 2013).

While the current iteration of the Distillery emphasizes niche consumption and individuality, these expressions of identity are layered over the memory of mass production. The heritage designations by all three levels of government marked the buildings as worthy of retention. Through a process of redevelopment, the buildings were gutted and repurposed for cultural consumption by the private sector. Mill Street entered into the project early on as a brewery and retail store, attracting a discerning consumer base appreciative of the craft beer scene. Mill Street offers a strong conceptual fit within the industrial complex and creates a strong link between product and place. As the craft brand gained popularity, the operations were moved off-site and the original space was converted into a brew pub retaining a limited number of batch runs to remain authentic. Craft beer played (and continues to play) a decisive role in recalibrating the property into a landscape of consumption. Beyond satisfying a neo-local olfactory craving, the brew pub manufactures distinction through a play on history that simultaneously distances consumers from the complexities of an industrial past as well as the daily rhythms of production in the post-industrial present (Figure 2).

LeBreton Flats

LeBreton Flats has its own history of beer and alcohol production and holds an association to working-class history. From 1852 until the end of Second World War, the area was dominated by lumber mills, paper mills, hydro-electric generating stations, and a mix of manufacturing concerns—including breweries. Like most of the district, the breweries were expropriated as part of an ambitious "slum" clearance and urban renewal project in the 1960s and the production of beer ceased in 1969 (Ottawa Citizen, 1957). In 1974, the National Capital Commission (NCC), reacting to the pressure of heritage advocates and preservationists, undertook a comprehensive inventory of heritage buildings and began the process of rehabilitation, retrofitting some of them into active spaces of consumption. As

Figure 2. View of the Thomkins-Perkins Mill (LeBreton Flats).

part of this programme of heritage preservation, the Thomkins-Perkins Mill was restored, refitted and leased as an upscale steakhouse. In the early 1990s, a tri-partite process to redevelop the Flats into a mixed-use development was launched.

In 2001, the federal government announced funding for the Canadian War Museum as the central piece for the redevelopment of LeBreton Flats. In this case, rather than a city-initiated process as it was with the Distillery District, the lead governmental agent was the federal government's planning agent, the NCC. The new Canadian War Museum would be accompanied by several condominium towers built by Claridge Homes, an active participant in Ottawa's nascent and booming condominium market. The Ottawa-based firm had built a reputation as the preferred builder for government-initiated housing projects and had developed the experience needed to negotiate the government tendering process and to meet the heightened heritage demands of the NCC. Claridge had just completed a new 11-storey, exclusive residence for Ottawa's "lifestyle" enthusiasts, with units priced between $500,000 and $2 million, offering views of the Rideau Canal and the Gatineau Hills (Turner, 2004) clad in stone that reflected the history of the adjacent Chateau Laurier hotel (Cook, 2004). The new development on LeBreton Flats initiated the process of attracting both visitors and residents with cultural cache to the once vacant brownfield site.

The redevelopment of historic buildings in LeBreton Flats is currently limited to the Thomkins-Perkins Mill, Ottawa's oldest surviving stone mill. The NCC expects to take advantage of the industrial "authenticity" as it offered "unique opportunities for industry-related and historic interpretive programming" (NCC, 2005, pp. 112–113). The area's heritage architecture is to act as a "bridge" to the city and to the "area's industrial, aboriginal and natural heritage" (NCC, 2005, pp. 2–3). This authentic interaction with industrial production however does not extend to ongoing industrial uses. Functioning sites such as Domtar Paper, in the view of the NCC, do "not support favourable public experiences" (NCC, 2005, pp. 112–113). Second, like the Distillery District, while some machinery has been rescued and salvaged for reuse, the Flats are largely denuded of their working machinery.

The NCC's architectural concern for heritage development demands that the new tenant fit the NCC's vision of museums, cafes, waterfront trails and heritage buildings as the core of the animated cultural spaces it aims to create in the district. The animation and celebration of the industrial heritage at the nearby Victoria Island, and the mills around the Chaudière Falls, became prime targets of the federal government's cultural animation of the area's past (NCC, 2005, p. 3). Several public spaces were built around an existing aqueduct, with historicized glitzy names that made reference to the water features such as the "Pooley's Bridge Mews," "Canal Mews" and "Canal Square" many of which were expropriated and levelled by the NCC (Claridge, 2004, p. 5). Mill Street was among the first commercial ventures in the redevelopment. Not only does a brew pub mesh with the NCC's quality of life agenda, Mill Street—in joining the new condominiums clad in its officially sanctioned colour palette of greys and browns—fits the NCC's preferred architectural profile. The brew pub's interior showcases the building's Victorian stone-walls and large windows. While the first phase of housing was completed before its opening, the brew pub lends credibility to the NCC's agenda of "live, work and play" on the Flats (NCC, 2003). Inside, the pub showcases aerial photographs of the Flats and its industrial history, yet no mention is made of the tragic expropriation in 1962. The NCC had razed the mixed-use, working-class, low-income neighbourhood, in the process reducing the available stock of affordable housing, and creating enormous turmoil by displacing the 2,292 residents who still lived on the Flats (Picton, 2010). By forging a manicured history, the brew pub enhances the visibility and desirability of the condominium development by lending an "authentic" feel to the district, one that too easily forgets this past.

Industrial heritage and alcohol production

Industrialization on the Flats was initiated in 1852 when American capitalists, enticed by cheap water power lots and infrastructure, used the hydraulic power of the Chaudière Falls, and underpaid labourers, to launch their lumber business empires (Dales, 1957). During the following two decades the "industrial community of LeBreton Flats mushroomed" (Taylor, 1986, p. 64), and by 1874 the five largest lumber producers in Canada were located near the falls (Fisher, 2000). Despite a dramatic fire in 1900 that destroyed much of the Flats, its taverns, breweries, foundries and residential dwellings were all rebuilt; many continued to operate on the Flats in the 1940s (Fear, 1979). Yet, this mix of enterprises, as the 1950 *Plan for the National Capital* (Gréber, 1950, p. 123) noted, overwhelmed the senses by "spreading soot, smell and smoke." The olfactory and visual potpourri of industrial discharge included those of the Brading's and Capital Breweries.

Established in 1865, Brading's Brewery Company was the cornerstone of E.P. Taylor's Canadian Breweries empire (Coutts, 2010). Along with other properties near Pooley's Bridge, the Brading's plant was expropriated in 1938 as part of the federal government's plan to beautify the national capital (Ottawa Citizen, 1938). After expropriation, the government leased the plant back to the Canadian Breweries until production ceased in 1956 as part of the firm's efforts to close plants with smaller capacity (Ottawa Citizen, 1956). The closing would reflect an industry wide focus on "fewer, bigger, better plants owned by fewer firms" (Deacon, 1956, p. 24) including the consolidation of Brading's and Capital in 1944. As a result of the corporate plan, Capital Brewery, built in 1902, would benefit from a million-dollar expansion (Ottawa Citizen, 1945), at one point producing as many as 166 million bottles of beer per year (Fox, 1969). However, despite these changes, the Brading's brand would disappear as the updated plant started bottling O'Keefe in 1956. Ultimately, this second larger plant would be caught up in Ottawa's post-war urban renewal projects and be demolished in 1960 "as part of the government's 'clean up' campaign" for the area (Ottawa Citizen, 1960, p. 1). The last bottle from the consolidated capital plant was brewed in 1969 as Canadian Breweries moved its one million dollar bottling line and 50 salaried employees to Toronto (Fox, 1969).

The state-induced deindustrialization stretched from a 1937 federal government plan to beautify the capital. These initial efforts would be extended after the Second World War as part of a massive urban renewal plan that included new national archives and a planned Department of National Defence Headquarters on and near LeBreton Flats (Picton, 2010). A massive urban realignment would follow and Ottawa's central-city industrial districts would be expropriated and razed as part of the federal government's plans for the national capital, thus accelerating deindustrialization on LeBreton Flats and leaving but a few fragments of that production.

Policy and planning

The ambitious post-war urban renewal plan for LeBreton Flats was abandoned in 1974 as a result of a government restraint programme and changes to urban renewal policy. Redevelopment would be stalled until 1992 when negotiations between the City of Ottawa, the regional municipality of Ottawa Carleton and the NCC led to a land assembly agreement that consolidated land ownership. In 1996, the NCC developed a plan for a mixed-use redevelopment for the brownfield site. The detailed area plan envisioned a new cultural, residential and retail neighbourhood as a "unique blend of old and new" that would act as a "bridge" to "restore and reconnect" LeBreton Flats to "the urban fabric" (NCC, 2005, pp. 2–3).

In 2002, the NCC made an application for subdivision to the City of Ottawa and requested relaxed zoning to "increase flexibility" for the mixed-use redevelopment. In addition, it requested and received an increase to maximum allowable height limits, and exemptions from planning studies and park and day-care construction (City of Ottawa, 2003a, 2003b). As part of these negotiations, the NCC's request for proposals noted that developers bidding for the "Phase 1" redevelopment of the Flats had to meet the City of Ottawa's requirement for 25% of all new residential units to be affordable as part of their development plan. However, as local housing activists noted, the NCC's initial definition of "affordability" was pegged at the equivalent of a $220,000 condominium that in the judgement of local housing observers, was "not really affordable" (City of Ottawa, 2003a). Moreover, there was no "clear direction" in the NCC proposal that "core need housing targets" for Ottawa's lowest income earners would be met (City of Ottawa, 2003b). These exceptions and incentives are consistent with the case of the Distillery District and highlight how redevelopment of brownfield sites depend on and require special incentives, often in the process reducing affordability and accelerating the pace of gentrification.

In 2004, Claridge unveiled its vision for LeBreton Flats. The project, to be broken down into six phases consisted of a cluster of low-rise and high-rise buildings, aimed to create a healthy, vibrant, urban community to attract an upscale clientele. As developer Neil Malhotra noted, the firm was astutely aware of the role niche consumption plays in the return to the city (Enman, 2005, p. J11):

> It's a cliché, I know, but location is everything—and here you've got location. You're right downtown. Everything is within walking distance. It's perfect for two demographics—the young crowd who loves the night life, and older people who've maybe decided to downsize.

Claridge President Bill Malhotra added a similar sentiment: "People," he noted, "want the lifestyle" (Turner, 2004, p. I1). The most recent proposal for the third phase of the development exemplifies the priorities of the developers who are keen to market the Flats as a niche luxury residential destination. Billed as "the perfect fusion of vibrant downtown living and green design," the third tower features a host of luxury amenities including an "outdoor Zen pool, concierge service, indoor gym and sixth-floor rooftop terrace" (Claridge, 2011).

The NCC was eager to accommodate a new tenant in the restored Thomkins-Perkins Mill, empty since 2007, to help animate an area lacking in services and commercial activity. In 2010, just as the first phase of the LeBreton Flats housing development was being completed, the NCC reached an agreement with Mill Street on a 10-year lease. Mill Street's first brew pub outside Toronto would be a large 6,000 square foot open-concept brewery with 18-foot ceilings and skylights and include a full restaurant with seating for 270, room for another 120 patrons on the patio, plus retail and event space (Eade, 2011). Located within walking distance of one of Canada's largest concentrations of offices and their thirsty workers, it was a prime site indeed.

City planning staff recommendations on the zoning variance reflect the desire by policymakers to reframe the spaces of LeBreton Flats as a historically themed place to consume niche products. City planners approved the brewery since it was a "conceptual fit" and would tie with "the industrial roots of the area" (City of Ottawa, 2011). Alcohol consumption would add to the natural and historic heritage of the area. However, zoning regulations clearly stipulated that the manufacture of beer for distribution off site would only be allowed on the condition that a restaurant continues to operate on-site. A stand-alone brewery would not "be permitted on site" since it might have too great an impact "on the character of the surrounding land uses" (City of Ottawa, 2011).

With a clear view of the industrial heritage of the site, the brew pub and its beers appealed to the nostalgia of the adjacent manufacturing area. Its waterfront location offered consumers a full view of the power plant's spillway and the turbulent waters of the Bronson Channel, and provided consumers a gaze of the historically themed Thomkins-Perkins Mill. Fittingly for this type of beer-based "neo-localism" (Flack, 1997), Mill Street's first Ottawa product, the Portage Ale, was meant to mimic beers produced on LeBreton Flats "in the 1800's and 1900's" (Mill Street, 2012). As brew-master Joel Manning noted (Eade, 2011):

> Craft brewing is … a connection back to the way things were in the 1800s when there were literally hundreds of brewers across Ontario, many from immigrants making specialty beers they were used to in the old country.

As Manning added, these products are "a throwback to the way beer was traditionally done in this country" (Eade, 2011). Such perspectives evoke an aesthetisization of the past and a sanitization of local heritage that is present in the architecture and the publicity surrounding the launch of heritage beers.

The parallels between Toronto's Distillery District and Ottawa's LeBreton Flats model of development are notable. The more recent of the brew pubs in Ottawa shows how Mill Street was not a side-piece to development: the popularity of the brew pub has enhanced the potential for redevelopment of the mainly vacant brownfield site. As the *Ottawa Citizen's* city page columnist noted, the Distillery District is a "vibrant cultural mecca" and the perfect model for mixed-use development (Chianello, 2012, p. C1). Cityscape partner Matthew Rosenblatt recently noted how the addition of the Ottawa brew pub has encouraged his firm to consider a residential development on LeBreton Flats similar to that of the Distillery District (Chianello, 2012, p. C1):

> We are definitely interested in reaching out to Domtar about the possibility of working together with them, or potentially purchasing the property, to create something special that would make their company—as well as local residents—proud.

The developers of the Distillery District recognize the catalytic potential of the brew pub to shift the representation of the industrial past and attract an upscale class of consumers necessary for future capital development. Markers of the past are made visible within the contemporary arrangements but presented without complexity or contestation on the ground allowing them to be easily packaged for consumption.

Conclusion: inebriating history and the production of post-industrial consumption

The Canadian craft beer revolution orients its production towards the distinguished taste preferences of discerning consumers. This focus on taste, difference and old brewing traditions stands in stark contrast to the standardization of industrial lagers and the narrowing of brands that resulted from the pre-craft renaissance process of consolidation in the Canadian beer industry. Most specifically, craft brewing exhibits an attachment to local histories in the branding of both its beer and places of consumption. In both Toronto and Ottawa, Mill Street fulfils the desire of planners and city boosters to transform industrial locations into themed districts with upscale condominiums. To return to Rofe (2004), the identity of the two sites has shifted towards cosmopolitan consumption, and away from the stigmatized identity of an industrial past. The animation of architecture is essential for the transformation of these post-industrial settings into places to consume craft goods, and history is a featured underpinning of the novelty and desirability of niche products.

The Mill Street brew pub was not only a conceptual fit in both developments, but central to the process of producing and circulating brand identities and attachments, taste differences, emotions and lifestyles, upmarket values and geographic associations (Pike, 2011). With the precision engineering of F.A.B. Concepts Inc., the brew pubs circulate the uniqueness of industrial heritage and the lifestyle (image, status) attached to the Mill Street craft products and pub experiences. Succumbing to the brewmaster's niche product, consumers can easily romanticize the aesthetisized past and imagine the (positive) gentrified future for industrial relics. Beer, then, we argue, acts as an intoxicant that allows for the absorption of the spectacle of industrial heritage and the transmission of niche consumer lifestyles. As others have noted (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990), heritage is socially constructed; its parameters shift and change according to the intended audience. In the case of the Distillery District and LeBreton Flats, nostalgia and authenticity are the primary products manufactured in these locations. Emphasis is placed on the consumption of the past through the looking glass of beer.

This aestheticization of history raises questions related to the effect of replicating such preservation efforts. As Flack (1997, p. 49) warned more than a decade ago, the "cookie cutter approach" of "gutting and renovating a historic building to brew five or six shades of the amber spectrum behind a Plexiglas wall has become all too common." As was the case with lofts (Zukin, 1982), and historicized shopping districts (Zukin, 1991), the Distillery District has become a model to be exported to LeBreton Flats. While the recipe of industrial architecture, local interests and beer satisfies contemporary consumer market trends for niche goods, craft production is becoming standardized and replicated in a host of locales. Given the popularization of this model of development, further study and attention are warranted to investigate the associated motivations and intentions, and the impact of these developments on urban geographies and urban social life. Our inquiry into the role of consumption and production of craft beer at the Distillery District and LeBreton Flats properties located in Toronto and Ottawa yields evidence that brew pubs produce a discerning consumer and create a locale for niche consumption that accelerates the transformation of brownfield sites into themed districts for trendy consumption.

The niche production and marketing of beer associated with the historic theming of place by Mill Street Brewery demonstrates how craft beer catalyzes the reconstruction of industrial spaces into places of consumption. The use of old industrial locations as on-site brewery stores emphasizes the importance of place and aesthetics at the point of sale to build a unique consumer experience. Mill Street was a perfect conceptual fit for the lifestyle, central city, mixed-use development promoted by the NCC, the City of Ottawa and Toronto, by Claridge and Cityscape. In the Distillery District and LeBreton Flats locations, cultural consumption practices celebrate small batch production and craft beer consumption as a marker of cultural capital. This valorization of the unique and the local, as part of the craft marketplace, works to smooth over the industrial pasts of these locations. At its extreme, consumers drink "history" through age-old recipes and gaze at labels that offer a throwback to past events and names. The development of brownfield sites depends on and requires special incentives to remake industrial relics into spaces of consumption, often in the process reducing affordability and accelerating the pace of gentrification. As beer lends legitimacy and fabricates desirability to the development process, it renders the locale more attractive for residential upgrading, emboldens the process of gentrification and pacifies concern for housing affordability. In this narrative of decline and renewal, the brew pub acts as an accelerant to the privately led, publicly coordinated creative destruction of the industrial past.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Richard Shearmur and three anonymous referees for their helpful critique and insights on various drafts of this article.

References

Ashworth, Gregory J., & Tunbridge, John E. (1990). *The tourist-historic city: Retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*. London: Belhaven.

Barthel, Diane (1996). *Historic preservation: Collective memory and historical identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Beaumont, Stephen (2001). *The great Canadian beer guide*. Toronto, ON: McArthur and Company.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowering, Ian (2000, June 28). Ale trail honours rich, sudsy history. *Ottawa Citizen*.

Bunce, Susannah (2009). Developing sustainability: Sustainability policy and gentrification on Toronto's waterfront. *Local Environment: International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, *14*(7), 651–667.

Carnegie, David (1925). *History of munitions supply in Canada, 1914–1918*. New York, NY: Longman's Green and Co.

Caulfield, Jon (2005). The Distillery District. *Urban Planning Overseas,* 85–97.

CBC News (2013). LCBO Sales up 4% thanks to new stores, "efficiencies" Ontario craft beers surge in popularity, with 33% increase in sales. *CBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/lcbo-sales-up-4-thanks-to-new-stores-efficiencies-1.1377017

Chianello, Joanne (2012, March 1). Distillery District to Domtar—Call us! *Ottawa Citizen*.

Cioletti, Jeff (2004, February 15). Barley, hops and maple leaves: Canadian brewers are crafting a legacy. *Beverage World*.
City of Ottawa (2003a). *Planning and development committee report—Official plan amendments* (Report No. 42B). Ottawa, ON: Author.
City of Ottawa (2003b). *Planning and development committee* (Meeting Minutes 48). Ottawa, ON: Author.
City of Ottawa (2011). *Report to planning committee and council* (Ref N°: ACS2011-ICS-PGM-0150). Ottawa, ON: Author.
City of Toronto (1994). *By-laws, volume 1 (By-laws 1994–0395; 1994–0396; 1994–0397; 1994–0398)*. Toronto, ON: Author.
City of Toronto (2002). *King parliament secondary plan*. Toronto, ON: Author.
City of Toronto (2008). *Staff report for action—Final report—55 Mill St. (Ref N°: 06 189754 STE 28 OZ)*. Toronto, ON: Author.
Claridge Homes (2011). Fusion: LeBreton Flats. Retrieved from http://claridgecondos.com/fusion/
Claridge Homes, Dan S. Hanganu Architects, and Daoust Lestage Inc (2004). *LeBreton Flats: Conceptual design proposal.* Ottawa, ON: Claridge Homes.
Cook, Maria (2004, October 16). Only one builder wants to develop LeBreton. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Coutts, Ian (2010). *Brew north: How Canadians made beer & beer made Canada*. Vancouver, BC: Greystone Books.
Crang, Mike (1994). On the heritage trail: Maps of and journeys to Olde Englande. *Environment & Planning D*, *12*(3), 341–355.
Crawford, Margaret (1992). The world as a shopping mall. In Michael Sorkin (Ed.), *Variations on a theme park: Scenes from the new American city* (pp. 3–30). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
Dales, John H. (1957). *Hydro-electricity and industrial development: Quebec 1898–1940*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Deacon, Paul S. (1956, September 15). Brewers go to battle for 14 gallon thirsts. *The Financial Post*.
De Sousa, Christopher A. (2002). Brownfield redevelopment in Toronto: An examination of past trends and future prospects. *Land Use Policy, 19*, 297–309.
Dictionary of Canadian Biography (1966). William George Gooderham. In George W. Brown, David M. Hayne, Francess G. Halpenny, & Ramsey Cook (Eds.), *Dictionary of Canadian biography: Volume XI* (pp. 358–360). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
Donald, Betsy (2009). *From Kraft to craft: Innovation and creativity in Ontario's food economy.* (Working Paper Series: Ontario in the Creative Age). Toronto, ON: Martin Prosperity Institute, Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto.
Eade, John (1997). *Living the global city: Globalization as local process*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Eade, Ron (2011). Mill Street Brew pub on track to open late November in Ottawa. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved September 16, from http://blogs.ottawacitizen.com/2011/09/16/mill-street-brewpub-on-track-to-open-late-november-in-ottawa/
Eberts, Derek (2007). To brew or not to brew: A brief history of beer in Canada. *Manitoba History*, *54*, 2–13.
Enman, Charles (2005, February 12). Living the high life: Rideau Street's twin towers promise urban location, elegant condos. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Evans, Graeme (2003). Hard branding the city—From Prado to Prada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27*(2), 417–440.
Fear, John (1979). "The lumber piles must go": Ottawa's lumber interests and the great fire of 1900. *Urban History Review, 8*(1), 38–65.
Fisher, Doug (2000). *Our times: A pictorial memoir of Ottawa's past*. Ottawa, ON: Ottawa Citizen.
Flack, Wes (1997). American microbreweries and neolocalism: "Ale-ing" for a sense of place. *Journal of Cultural Geography, 16*(2), 37–53.
Flavelle, Dana (2012, January 12). Craft beer funding goes flat: $8m boost to level field with brewing giants axed in liberal cuts. *Toronto Star*.
Florida, Richard (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Fox, Bill (1969, December 13). O'Keefe moves out of Ottawa. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Gains, Paul (2000, April 8). Brewing interest: The craft beer makers of Waterloo and Wellington counties have banded together to create a self-guided industry tour. *National Post*.
Gréber, Jacques (1950). *Plan for the national capital*. Ottawa, ON: National Capital Planning Service.

Hannigan, John (1998). *Fantasy city: Pleasure and profit in the postmodern metropolis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Heron, Craig (2003). *A distilled history*. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines Press.
Hiller, Susanne (2003, May 24). Art gets a home: The Distillery Historic District a metamorphosis from booze to culture. *National Post*.
Hutton, Thomas A. (2009). Trajectories of the new economy: Regeneration and dislocation in the inner city. *Urban Studies*, *46*(5&6), 987–1001.
Jacobs, Jane M. (1996). *Edge of empire: Postcolonialism in the city*. London: Routledge.
Krashinsky, Susan (2013, May 17). Beer spruces up in battle for market share. *The Globe and Mail*.
Ladurantaye, Steve (2008, October 21). Raising the bar at Mill Street Brewery. *The Globe and Mail*.
LCBO (2011). *LCBO Annual Report 2010–2011*. Retrieved from www.lcbo.com/aboutlcbo/annual/flip_2010_2011/
Lees, Loretta (2008). Gentrification and social mixing: Towards an urban renaissance? *Urban Studies, 45*(12), 2449–2470.
Leslie, Deborah, & Reimer, Suzanne (2006). Situating design in the Canadian household furniture industry. *Canadian Geographer, 50*(3), 319–341.
Ley, David (1996). *The new middle class and the remaking of the central city*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
MacKinnon, Donna Jean (2002, June 27). Trio brewing up history: Heritage recipes planned for brewery on site of 1800s distillery. *Toronto Star*.
MacKinnon, Tanya L. (2000). *The historical geography of the distilling industry in Ontario: 1850–1900* (Unpublished master's thesis). Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo.
Masters, Donald C. (1947). *The rise of Toronto: 1850–1890*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
Mathews, Vanessa (2010). Set appeal: Film space and urban redevelopment. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *11*(2), 171–190.
McDowell, Adam (2006, March 9). Mill Street Brewery outgrows Mill Street: Production to move to Scarborough. *National Post*.
Mill Street Brewery (2012). *Our beers*. Retrieved from www.millstreetbrewery.com
National Capital Commission (NCC) (2003). *LeBreton Flats private development design guidelines (draft)*. Ottawa, ON: NCC Property Development and Planning Division.
National Capital Commission (NCC) (2005). *Canada's capital core area sector plan*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
Ontario Craft Brewers (2012). *Industry fact sheet*. Retrieved from www.ontariocraftbrewers.com/pdf/media_IndustryFactSheet.pdf
Ontario Municipal Board (2008). *Distillery SE development corp* (File No. PL070831). Toronto, ON: Author.
Ottawa Citizen (1938, August 17). Government takes all properties to bridge on Wellington Street. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Citizen (1944, March 31). Two famous firms join hands. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Citizen (1945, November 13). Brading's Brewery buys more property. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Citizen (1956, September 14). Brading Breweries men protest loss of jobs. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Citizen (1957, October 4). Demolishing old brewery. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Citizen (1960, March 24). Old brewery bites the dust. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Ottawa Mill Street (2012). *Our beers*. Retrieved from http://ottawa.millstreetbrewpub.ca
Otto, Stephen A. (1988). *Gooderham and Worts heritage plan* (Report No. 2—A report on the buildings at Gooderham & Worts' Distillery and an assessment of their heritage significance). Toronto, ON.
Otto, Stephen A., & du Toit Allsopp Hillier (1994). *Gooderham and Worts heritage plan* (Report No. 1 –Aboriginal and early European settlement). Toronto, ON.
Peck, Jamie (2005). Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29*(4), 740–770.
Persyn, Damiaan, Swinnen, Johan F.M., & Vanormelinge, Stijn (2011). Belgian beers: Where history meets globalization. In Johan Swinnen (Ed.), *The economics of beer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Picton, Roger M. (2010). Selling national urban renewal: The National Film Board, the National Capital Commission and postwar planning in Ottawa, Canada. *Urban History, 37*(2), 301–321.

Pike, Andy (2011). Placing brands and branding: A socio-spatial biography of Newcastle Brown Ale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 36*(2), 206–222.
Plummer, Ryan, Telfer, David, Hashimoto, Atsuko, & Summers, Robert (2005). Beer tourism in Canada along the Waterloo-Wellington Ale Trail. *Tourism Management*, *26*(3), 447–458.
Poelmans, Eline, & Swinnen, Johan (2011). A brief economic history of beer. In Johan Swinnen (Ed.), *The economics of beer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rodriguez, Arantxa, Martinez, Elena, & Guenaga, Galder (2001). Uneven redevelopment: New urban policies and socio-spatial fragmentation in metropolitan Bilbao. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *8*(2), 161–178.
Rofe, Matthew W. (2004). From "problem city" to "promise city": Gentrification and the revitalisation of Newcastle. *Australian Geographical Studies, 42*(2), 193–206.
Rubin, Josh (2013, April 11). Mill Street Brewery brings distilling back to Distillery District. *Toronto Star*.
Rybczinski, Witold (2002). The Bilbao effect. *Atlantic Monthly, 290*(2), 138–142.
Schnell, Steven M., & Reese, Joseph F. (2003). Microbreweries as tools of local identity. *Journal of Cultural Geography, 21*(1), 45–70.
Shaw, Wendy (2005). Heritage and gentrification: Remembering the "good old days" in postcolonial Sydney. In Rowland Atkinson & Gary Bridge (Eds.), *Gentrification in a global context: The new urban colonialism* (pp. 57–71). London: Routledge.
Slater, Tom (2008). "A literal necessity to be re-placed:" A rejoinder to the gentrification debate. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 32*(1), 212–223.
Smith, Neil (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city.* London: Routledge.
Summerby-Murray, Robert (2002). Interpreting deindustrialised landscapes of Atlantic Canada: Memory and industrial heritage in Sackville, New Brunswick. *The Canadian Geographer, 46*(1), 48–62.
Taylor, John H. (1986). *Ottawa: An illustrated history.* Toronto, ON: Lorimer.
The Bar Towel (2007). *Mill Street announces major growth in 2006*. Retrieved from www.bartowel.com/?p=259
Tunbridge, John E. (2000). Heritage momentum or maelstrom? The case of Ottawa's Byward Market. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 6*(3), 269–291.
Tunbridge, John E. (2001). Ottawa's Byward Market: A festive bone of contention? *The Canadian Geographer, 45*(3), 356–370.
Turner, Karen (2004, March 20). Big prices, big sales at the big three. *Ottawa Citizen*.
Urry, John (1990). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
Zimmerman, Jeffrey (2008). From brew town to cool town: Neoliberalism and the creative city development strategy in Milwaukee. *Cities, 25*(4), 230–242.
Zukin, Sharon (1982). *Loft living: Culture and capital in urban change*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
Zukin, Sharon (1991). *Landscapes of power*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Zukin, Sharon (1998). The theming of America: Dreams, visions and commercial spaces. *Contemporary Sociology, 27*(3), 283–285.