

SNAPSHOT: Cultural Facilities Assistance

Creative City Network of Canada – Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project

Legislation, policies, and plans

All municipalities indicated that they offer some type of assistance to cultural facilities (see Table 1). Council-appointed committees or advisory groups are responsible for the overall direction of civic-owned facilities in 38% of the responses. All respondents have existing policy and legislation regulating facility support and public use.

TABLE 1 Cultural facilities legislation, policies, plans, and mechanisms					
	Yes	In proc.	Total	Council members?	
Cultural facility development					
Legislation	3	5	8		
Policy	5	2	7		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	8	7	15		
Cultural facility support/use					
Legislation	8	4	12		
Policy	10	5	15		
Cultural Plan/ Strategy	6	7	13		
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups for civic-owned facilities	12	1	13	5	38%
Cultural facility development – private development					
<i>Local government encourages development of cultural facilities by private developers through:</i>					
Allocation of development cost charges or bonusing programs (e.g., public amenity bonusing provisions)	4	(Toronto*, Vancouver, North Vancouver)			
Provision of City-owned land	6				
Other	2	**			
Direct operation/programming					
Local government directly operates and programs a cultural facility(ies)	22				
Notes: * Toronto - Section 37 of the Planning Act ** Other comments: The City may provide land to two proposed museums [not counted in the Provision of City-owned land category] Capital contribution					
Legislation/policy/plans: All respondents. Private development support or direct operation: 19 respondents.					

39 municipalities responded to the *Cultural Facilities Assistance* section of the survey.

Data years reflected in this report: 2003–2005

creativecity.ca

Cultural facility development

Twenty-two municipalities indicate policies or plans for the development of facilities. Local government encourages the development of cultural facilities by private developers in various ways: through the easing of development cost charges or through bonusing strategies (e.g., public amenity bonusing provisions) in four urban centres, through the provision of city-owned land in six municipalities and, in one case, through capital grants.

Direct operation and programming

Twenty-two municipalities operate and manage programming for cultural facilities, rather than relying on non-profit cultural organizations and community groups provide these community services.

Support to cultural organizations for facilities

Local governments also offer facility-related support to cultural organizations, and diverse and often unique agreements have developed in each community. Large urban cities, for example Toronto, Ottawa, and Vancouver, report a variety and combination of mechanisms for facility support.

a. Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned public facilities

In the most prevalent model, 19 municipalities contract non-profit cultural organizations to operate a civic-owned public facility, such as a theatre, museum, or art gallery, for free, or for a nominal or reduced annual fee (see Table 2). These organizations may also be eligible for operating grants or other forms of non-monetary support such as maintenance, security, and so forth (15 municipalities). In ten municipalities, capital support for these facilities is provided through the municipal budget process; in nine of those municipalities, capital grants are also available.

b. Cultural organizations occupying civic-owned and managed properties

As a second model, 18 municipalities support a wide range of cultural organizations by allowing them to use civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at a reduced cost. In these circumstances, a municipal department manages the facility. Eight municipalities provide capital support for these facilities through the budget process and eight provide capital grants.

c. Cultural organizations operating their own or leased facilities

In a third model, 16 municipalities provide operating grants to cultural organizations that own or lease their own facilities. Other operating support under these circumstances, in the form of maintenance, security, or utilities, is not common, and only one municipality reports covering water and sewer costs. Eight municipalities provide capital grants to non-profit organizations that own and operate their own facilities. Property tax permissive exemptions or

SNAPSHOT: Cultural Facilities Assistance

TABLE 2			
Facility support to cultural organizations			
Type of support available	Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned facility	Other cultural organizations occupying civic-owned properties	Cultural organizations operating their own or leased non-civic facilities, which are not civic-owned
Operating support			
Use of civic-owned building for free	12	10	-
Use of civic-owned building for a nominal fee (e.g., \$1/year)	7	8	-
Use of civic-owned building with reduced rent	11	11	-
Use of civic-owned land	14	12	-
Operating grant	14	14	16
Other operating support (e.g., maintenance, security costs, utilities, etc.)	15	14	0
Support through a fee-for-service program	5	5	3
Property tax permissive exemption or other property tax relief	-	-	12
Other	5 *	2 **	6 ***
Capital support			
Capital budget allocation	10	8	0
Capital grants	9	8	10
Grants for facility planning or equipment acquisition	5	4	4
Other	0	0	0
Other (operating support) comments:			
<p><i>*Cultural organizations contracted to operate civic-owned facility:</i> The City took over operation of the community arts centre from a non-profit society, as requested by the society; Only one organization/facility; We are currently developing an arts centre and subject to Council approval it will be operated by the City with community involvement in the form of partners and an Advisory Committee; Insurance Grant</p>			
<p><i>**Other cultural organizations occupying civic-owned properties:</i> Operating costs of civic-owned facility only; Parks & Rec Community Services accepts bids for banners etc</p>			
<p><i>***Cultural organizations operating their own or leased non-civic facilities, which are not civic-owned:</i> Water and sewer paid by City; Lease subsidy; Service agreements; Our proposed revised Investment Program recommends operating grants; In Ontario, all theatres with less than 1000 seats are tax exempt; Operating grant to society; rehearsal studio and scene shop through regional arts service</p>			
Overall, 24 respondents indicated one or more of the operating support options above, and 15 respondents indicated one or more of the capital support options above.			

SNAPSHOT: Cultural Facilities Assistance

other property tax relief is reported in 12 municipalities, although the reporting may not reflect that in Ontario all theatres with less than 1,000 seats are exempt. Three municipalities report fee-for-service agreements.

Grants for facility planning or equipment acquisition are reported by approximately 20% of the municipalities responding, whether facilities are civic-owned or not.

Snapshot: Public Art has been updated from the Creative City Network of Canada's *Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project (Phase One Pilot)* to incorporate additional responses that followed the pilot group of respondents.

The full Phase One Pilot Report is available at www.creativecity.ca/framework

Respondents: Banff, AB; Brantford, ON; Camrose, AB; City of Kitchener, ON; City of Windsor, ON; County of Oxford, ON; District of Saanich, BC; Edmonton, BC; Fredericton, NB; Grand Prairie, AB; Halifax Regional Municipality, NS; Hamilton, ON; Highlands, BC; Kelowna, BC; Kingston, ON; Mississauga, ON; Moncton, NB; Nanaimo, BC; New Westminster, BC; North Vancouver (City & District), BC; Ottawa, ON; Port Coquitlam, BC; Port Hope, ON; Port Moody, BC; Portage la Prairie, MB; Prince George, BC; Red Deer, AB; Regina, SK; Richmond, BC; Saskatoon, SK; Sooke, BC; St. Catharines, ON; St. John's, NL; Strathcona County, AB; Toronto, ON; Township of Esquimalt, BC; Vancouver, BC; West Vancouver, BC.

Published by Creative City Network of Canada

#408 – 402 West Pender Street
Vancouver BC V6B 1T6 Canada
604-688-2489

Project contact: Nancy Duxbury, PhD – nancy@creativecity.ca
Data Analysis: Sonja Bichsel, M.A.

© March 2007 Creative City Network of Canada

The Intermunicipal Comparative Framework is a project of the Creative City Network of Canada, supported through a contribution from the Department of Canadian Heritage and with the collaboration of municipal staff from across Canada.



Patrimoine
canadien

Canadian
Heritage

creativecity.ca