



The use of a space is determined by a multitude of factors. Attributes ranging from physical built form, spatial arrangements, surveillance, and the visibility into a space have been noted as factors contributing to the determined use of a space within the Lillian H. Smith Library site. As previously stated, the interest and main goal of the research and observations conducted aims to identify and evaluate the social claims made through the project against the spatial claims being made by the various stakeholder groups. We can interpret spatial claims through varying uses of the library space, why it is being used in such a manner, and who is using the space in the way that it is. Due to the classification of the library as a public space, the contesting uses of the confronting stakeholder groups occupying the space create a dynamic condition which can similarly be observed in the immediate surrounding area of the library. Initial decisions to observe the Lillian H. Smith Library were made because of the diverse populations in the three surrounding neighbourhoods consisting of Kensington Market/Chinatown, Baldwin Village, and the Bay St. Corridor. As such, the following figure ground map serves to support the claim that the library is an extension of the public realm defined by claims over its spaces.

Built form has been determined as a factor influencing the use of space. In Steven Mannell's 1996 article *Petrified Futurism* the critic identifies the heavy stone massing and tight position to street and property lines as an assertion of the city block (p. 28). Additionally, Mannell claims the arches over the entrance points call to Richardsonian Romanesque architectural expression which reinforced "secure" distinctions between interior and exterior space and condition (p. 28). He even goes to conclude his critique claiming that interior form of the rotunda contrasts the exterior

heavy mason walls, reinforcing the division of inside and outside, thereby emphasizing the division of institution from the society it is purported to serve (Mannell p. 29). Through such mechanisms of separation between spatial conditions and occupants, varying uses of space can be seen as determined or reinforced through the architectural built form.

Programming of space was documented through multiple site visits and maintains one of the most prominent factors in determining the use of space. The open spaces scattered with tables were observed as packed full of older men with worn in clothes and many belongings, who seemed to be escaping the cold, whilst less intrusive spaces clustered with full height bookshelves experienced a similar demographic who appeared to be sleeping or changing clothes at times. Higher floors (third and fourth floor) saw fewer patrons and more employees present, with more difficult access to space and restrictions to many areas. The additional observations of this report look at the security measures present within the programmatic layout of the library and compare these to the ones present in the surrounding area and how such conditions mold the use and occupation of public space.

The coding displayed on this map shows the distinction between public and private space, where fully blocked out sections constitute private property with owner-dependent access. In future investigations we plan to add colour coded blocks showing varying degrees of public space access. Fully blocked cells with colour graded interiors will show private property for relatively public use. This will include examples such as CAMH and the University of Toronto campus which can be defined as institutions with a public oriented mandate. Colour graded cells will show public space with singular overwhelming institutional or security presence, whilst the current monochrome colour scheme shows white cells as public space with little to no intrusive presence in contrast to black cells which are completely private and inaccessible. Additionally, the observed security measures such as cameras, metal detectors, and convex mirrors, will be mapped out in accurate detail as such devices also dictate how many spaces are occupied.

Currently the map shows bookshelves and partition walls that have been shaded black if they extend high enough to block visibility, while half height bookshelves and furnishings have been left as outlined white boxes which show no visibility barrier. Such conditions have been noted as the use of a space can dramatically change based on its direct or indirect visibility to the general public or surveillance onlookers. Additionally, desks of library employees have been included as the only furniture in the floor plan since we have reason to believe their positioning is strategic. Each desk is presumed to have been put in the optimal vantage point for surveilling and mediating activities of each floor. In the future, it may be interesting to

observe and map the travel patterns of the employees through the space as they could prove to have significant effects in social occupations of space.

Observations of certain features in the nearby surrounding site were noted as well. Such features range from fences to partial blockades, to completely locked doors. The most significant pattern noticed are the through-spaces created between the University of Toronto buildings which are open to anyone for use, whilst spaces southeast of Spadian and College create open spaces as courtyards which are located on the insides of a conglomeration of houses, resembling the housing blocks of Barcelona. Although these spaces are technically public, they are much less accessible and are likely to be surveyed more through informal devices, such as the proximity of residents.

Overall, general assumptions of social claims have been confirmed through initial observations and mapping strategies. Although deeper observations are required for more accurate results, these beginning steps have identified certain spatial and social patterns within the library and of the surrounding neighbourhood. Through further research, more patterns.

#### Works Cited

Mannell, S. (1996). Critique: Petrified futurism. *Canadian Architect*, 41(9), 28-30.