ATTACHMENT 5: Artscape - Feasibility Study for a Cultural/Creative Hub



Cultural/Creative Hubs in Priority Neighbourhoods

March 22, 2011



Feasibility Study for a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis



Prepared by

Tim Jones, Pru Robey & Edward Birnbaum, Artscape

& Patrice Njoh, Local Cultural Coordinator

March 22, 2011 TorontoArtscape Toronto, Canada

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	7
1.1 Definitions	7
1.2 Our Approach	9
2. Cultural/Creative Hubs: Conditions for Success	12
2.1 Case Studies	12
2.2 Conditions for Success	15
3. The Creative and Cultural Sector in Priority Neighbourhoods	21
3.1 Workers and Jobs	21
3.2 Infrastructure and Facilities	24
4. A Model for Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods	27
4.1 Conditions for Success	27
4.2 Site Selection	28
4.3 Project Design and Building program	30
4.4 Governance and organisational structure	32
4.5 Affordability and Financial Sustainability	35
4.6 A Note on Development Timelines	37
4.7 Building Capacity in Priority Neighbourhoods	38
5. A Community Cultural Hub in Weston Mount Dennis	39
5.1 Overview and Data Considerations	39
5.2 Brief History	40
5.3 Identity	41
5.4 Demographics	41
5.5 The Cultural and Creative industries and employment	42
5.6 Cultural and Creative Assets and Resources	45
5.7 Planning Context	46
5.8 A Creative/Cultural Hub in Weston Mount Dennis: Key Themes and Issues	47
5.9 Development Partners and Potential Sites	
6. Developing a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis: Feasibility Assessment.	54
6.1 Weston Mount Dennis Cultural/Creative Hub:	55
6.2 Weston Mount Dennis Cultural/Creative Hub: Outline Uses	55
6.3 Potential Sites	56
6.4 Financial Sustainability	58
6.5 Elements for Successful Project Implementation	58
Appendices	62
Appendix 1. Definition of 'Culture'	62
Appendix 2. Interviewees and Attendees	64
Appendix 3. Building Manager and Tenant Representative Survey	67
Appendix 4. Confluence of Development	
Appendix 5. Literature Review	
Appendix 6. Open House Notes	80
Appendix 7: Local Cultural and Creative Assets and Resources	
Appendix 8: Full Case Studies	
Appendix 9: Operational & Capital Proformas	

· · ·	ſ	- .
LIST	στ	Figures

Figure 1: Cultural Mapping	8
Figure 2: Cultural/Creative Sector Jobs in Toronto and Priority Neighbourhood Average	
Figure 3: Number of Cultural/Creative Sector Jobs in Priority Neighbourhoods	22
Figure 4: Cultural/Creative Sector workers living in Toronto and Priority Neighbourhood	
Figure 5: Per Cent of Cultural Occupations by Place of Residence in Priority Neighbourhoods	23
Figure 6: Number of Cultural/Creative Sector Workers by Residence in all Priority Neighbourhoods	24
Figure 7: Cultural Establishments and Resources in the GTA with Priority Neighbourhoods	25
Figure 8: Weston and Mount Dennis	40
Figure 9: Residences of Culture Workers within the Study Area, by Census Tract	43
Figure 10: Culture Jobs within the Study Area, by Census Tract	44
Figure 11: Creative and Culture Resources in the Study Area	
Figure 12: Residents of Selected Areas Employed in Culture	48
Figure 13: Long List of Potential Sites	51
Figure 14: Potential Sites	57
Figure 15: Case Study Locations	83

Executive Summary

This study has two distinct but interconnected elements. Based on precedent and other desk research a model for the development and operation of Creative/Cultural Hubs in Toronto's Priority neighbourhoods has been developed. That model has then been tested and applied to the Weston/Mt. Dennis neighbourhood, supported by extensive community engagement and research.

A Model for Cultural Creative Hubs in Priority Neighbourhoods

The model for Cultural/Creative Hubs developed for this study is rooted in the 'conditions for success" gleaned from literature review, interviews and from in depth case study of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto and internationally. As a result of our research the following success factors for a Cultural/Creative Hub in Priority Neighbourhoods were identified:

- Vision
- Critical Mass
- Diversity of Uses
- Platforms for Collaboration
- Sustainability
- Partnership.

Artscape research has demonstrated that creative people and organizations gravitate to neighbourhoods that have a combination of low rent opportunities, a critical mass of other creative enterprise and a range of services and amenities required to support their activities. Priority Neighbourhoods generally have an abundance of affordable space but lack the other ingredients necessary to attract creative people. The introduction of a hub that clusters dozens of creative people together in a neighbourhood has been demonstrated in other Toronto neighbourhoods to have a dramatic and catalytic effect. Such developments can put challenged neighbourhoods on the map for creative people, attract businesses such as galleries, cafes and specialty retail and set the stage for broader regeneration.

A two-part strategy has been devised to attract a critical mass of creative people, organizations and small businesses into a Cultural/Creative Hub in priority neighbourhoods. The first involves the provision of affordable artist live/work units. As artist live/work is in strong demand and short supply across the city, anchoring hubs with this component is the surest way to attract enough creative people (whether from inside or outside the area) to give them significant community impact. The second and equally

important component is the provision of affordable commercial space. As Priority Neighbourhoods are largely under-served by traditional cultural facilities, there is strong community demand for spaces that can house events, performances, exhibitions, shared equipment and services, workspace, etc. Sustaining these spaces however will be challenging in areas where there are not dense concentrations of creative people. By bringing the components together, both will be strengthened and made more viable by the existence and proximity of the other.

The proposed mix of uses is 75% artist live/work and 25% Creative Convergence space. This report outlines a variety of scenarios ranging from 28,000 to 64,000 square feet in both adaptive re-use and new construction developments. The expectation is that some if not all, of the ground floor space will allow for public access and programming opportunities.

The exact mix of tenants, uses and programming will be subject to the particular opportunities and creative and cultural sector needs identified in the neighbourhood. Creative Convergence Space will include three streams of activity:

- Rental
- Events, meetings
- Programming / shared services/subsidy.

The governance model for the Cultural/Creative Hub model is designed to balance public interest, community engagement, risk and responsibility. An independent not-for-profit organization with strong ties to the local and the creative community would be best placed to serve and protect the public interest the project will represent. Community engagement and stewardship is built into all aspects of project governance.

A Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis

In order to explore the potential to develop a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis primary and secondary research methodologies, including community engagement, one on one interviews, data analysis and focus groups, were employed to map the cultural and creative assets and resources in the neighbourhood; explore issues and opportunities in relation to the potential for a Cultural/Creative Hub and to identify and assess potential sites for a Cultural/Creative Hub.

On balance our research indicates that there is community enthusiasm and potential for the development of a significant new piece of creative and cultural infrastructure in Weston Mount Dennis. Notwithstanding the challenges faced by this community and the relatively limited cultural and creative infrastructure that currently exists, a Cultural/Creative Hub is

feasible subject to significant funding and community partnerships. It can play a role in stimulating local economic development and support community cultural development and engagement to enrich the lives of those who live and work in, or close to, this community.

We have identified that there is:

- Significant active support within this community for the project
- A willingness to explore a range of opportunities and project visions
- Receptiveness to attracting artists and creative businesses to the neighbourhood
- A strong and determined Project Champion in local Councillor Nunziata
- A number of potential developable sites in appropriate locations.

A Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis could be developed based on the model for Cultural/Creative Hubs in Priority Neighbourhoods offering the neighbourhood the potential to attract and retain creative capacity and to create a critical mass of creative activity and business opportunity.

There is a strong demand in the neighbourhood for a "place to go" and for a space to "showcase" the community's talent. The availability of publicly accessible, programmable space with community access and shared management with the community and tenants will be a critical component of the Weston Mount Dennis Creative/Cultural Hub. The spaces most often referenced through the research and engagement process were:

- Flexible performance and event space
- Café
- Community meeting room.

From a long list of potential sites for a Cultural/Creative Hub we have identified 5 potential sites which will now require further review.

Project development, including the design and operation of a pilot project, will require investment from the City of Toronto ranging from \$1.3M to \$5.1M (including land), depending on the scale of development. Another \$5M to \$22.9M will be required from community and other Government stakeholders.

Elements for Successful Project Implementation

Four key elements are required to ensure that the proposed Cultural/ Creative Hub has the best chance of succeeding in Weston Mount Dennis. These steps will require a long

term commitment from the City of Toronto, as well as the local community and a diverse group of stakeholders.

1. Select a Project Proponent

Through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, select a proponent/ consortium with the capacity and expertise to plan for, develop and operate a facility of the size and complexity envisioned in this report.

2. Engage Community Stakeholders

Engage local residents in the development and planning of the proposed facility through public meetings and consultations and a Community Advisory Group consisting of selected representatives from key local agencies.

3. Initiate Project Work

Require the selected proponent/ consortium to develop a business plan for a new Cultural/ Creative Hub based on market testing within the Weston Mount Dennis area, and across the city of Toronto.

4. Build Capacity for Sustainability

Leverage existing creative and cultural activity and build additional capacity in the community by encouraging the use of underutilized spaces and strengthening management skills of local arts and culture providers.

1. Introduction

In July 2010, the City of Toronto issued a Request for Quotations (RFQ) for a feasibility study for a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mt. Dennis. The purpose of the RFQ was to identify and retain a team of researchers who could create a model for a Cultural/Creative Hub that could be used in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods, and to apply that model to the Weston/Mt. Dennis area. The City of Toronto requested that two potential sites be identified and that the hub be a multi-tenanted facility with a focus on creative/cultural businesses accessible to the general public through programmed activity or space provision.

To ensure that the model was grounded and well researched, a survey of best practices among Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto and internationally was mandated as was substantial primary and secondary research into the state of the cultural and creative sector in the study area. The public's involvement and input was to be solicited through an information meeting with key local organisations and networks, a Community Open House and a presentation to the community of the report findings.

This report investigates the feasibility of Cultural/Creative Hubs in socially, economically and culturally disadvantaged areas. This report hopes to offer some answers as to how Cultural/Creative Hubs may be one tool that can be used to stimulate economic growth and the broader benefits of culture- led regeneration in Toronto's Priority neighbourhoods.

1.1 Definitions

The following definitions have been used throughout out this study:

Cultural and Creative Jobs

The City of Toronto's Economic Development & Culture Department has defined cultural and creative professions using 48 of the National Occupation Classification categories. These categories are the same as the ones outlined in the "Canadian Framework for Culture Statistics" (2004). Furthermore, these 48 occupations were used as the criteria for a study entitled "Mapping Artists and Cultural Workers in Canada's Large Cities' by Hill Strategies, 2010. (For a complete list of the 48 NOCs categories used please see Appendix 1)

Cultural and Creative Activities and Assets

The research team used emerging culture mapping practice and literature to determine what activities to include in our mapping assessment. The potential depth and range of cultural assets in a community is reflected in the recent Cultural Resources Mapping: A Guide for Municipalities, it is summarized in the figure below. (For maps of the local cultural and creative resources and assets please see figure 11).

Figure 1: Cultural Mapping



Source: Cultural Resources Mapping: A Guide for Municipalities, 2010

For the purposes of this study, research and mapping focussed on identifying cultural and creative infrastructure, facilities and activity in the neighbourhood. This includes a spectrum of practice and activities from traditional arts practice to ethnic cooking classes. Assets ranged from art galleries and theatres, to archives and print shops. Infrastructure was

taken to include both dedicated and occasional places and spaces used for creative and cultural activities.

Cultural/Creative Hub

The RFQ states that a Cultural/Creative Hub "is a facility that demonstrates, by way of a business plan, a mandate to:

- Use the majority of its leaseable space for businesses within the cultural/creative sector;
- Provide public access to programming and/ or space;
- Facilitate collaboration and networking among its business tenants;
- Partner with industry sectors."

1.2 Our Approach

Two avenues of research were pursued, in tandem, during the preparation of this report. One stream of research investigated the literature on and best practices of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto and internationally, the other focused on the geography, demographics, stakeholders and cultural and creative assets in the specific study area – Weston Mount Dennis. The findings from each aspect of our investigation informs the other.

The methodological decisions for this report are guided either by the RFQ issued for this study, or with guidance from City of Toronto Staff at the Economic Development & Culture division.

1.2.1 A Model for Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods

To create a generic model for Cultural/Creative Hubs the research team pursued four strategies.

- Developed in-depth Case Studies of 8 of the leading facilities in the field
- Undertook a literature review,
- Interviewed 6 city wide arts/cultural organizations, and;
- Assessed the financial parameters of these institutions.

In addition, a limited analysis of creative and cultural employment in the City's13 neighbourhoods was undertaken.

1.2.2 A Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis

Assessing the feasibility of a Cultural/Creative Hub in the study area required desk and primary research. A range of strategies were employed to determine if, and how, a Cultural/Creative Hub might benefit Weston/ Mount Dennis as follows:

Interviews

Artscape's researchers attended community meetings organized by local resident groups and interviewed 20 key informants who have a lead role in 16 local organizations (For a complete list of interviewees please see Appendix 2).

Interviews focussed on

- What and where cultural activities took place in the study area
- The capacity of groups to take on or be a major part of the proposed hub
- Their vision for a Cultural/Creative Hub
- Potential sites for a hub

Tenant Representatives at (3) TCHC buildings and (2) private residential towers within the study area were identified and asked to complete a survey exploring the activities that take place in their respective buildings. These interviews were conducted by the Local Cultural Coordinator and the information gathered was included in the cultural resource map that illustrates the creative/cultural assets, resources and activities that take place in the study area. (For a summary of these surveys please refer to Appendix 3)

Community meetings

An information exchange with local stakeholders launched this project and was attended by roughly 20 local organisational leaders and active citizens. (To see a list of individuals present at the meeting see Appendix 2.)

An Open House was held on the evening of November 4th at the York West Active Living Centre on Weston Road at Lawrence Ave. Attendees at the meeting totalled more than 40 and represented a variety of cultural, age and interest groups from the local area. Participants were asked to map local cultural activities, to offer their vision for a Hub and, to comment on potential sites. The local councillor and MPP also attended, and gave their support to the project.

Focus groups

2 Focus groups were held attracting a total of 22 participants. A youth focus group attracted 15 participants recruited by the Local Cultural Coordinator and Frontlines. Youth who attended the meeting were encouraged to discuss where cultural activities take place in the area and their vision for a Cultural/Creative Hub. A local artist's focus group

attracted seven participants who took part in a mapping and round table discussion focussed on cultural and creative activities in Weston Mount Dennis and how a Cultural/Creative Hub might benefit the arts in the area.

Local Cultural Coordinator

In line with RFQ requirements and with the advice of Urban Arts, Artscape retained the services of Patrice Njoh as the local cultural coordinator for this research. The Local Cultural Coordinator interviewed tenant reps in the area, identified participants for interviews and helped to promote and recruit for the open house and focus groups.

Site Visits

A long list of 8 sites was identified through interviews and engagement with local residents and stakeholders. Prospective sites were discussed with participants at focus groups, interviews and open house. All prospective sites were visited and their development and planning contexts investigated. A list of prospective sites was then developed.

Data Analysis and Mapping

Creative and Cultural employment data were examined for the study area and for all Priority Neighbourhoods. Data was collected from the 2006 census and was mapped and analyzed by census tract. Maps and statements made through public consultations were compiled and have been presented in visual form as well as integrated into the findings of this report.

2. Cultural/Creative Hubs: Conditions for Success

2.1 Case Studies

To understand the conditions for success in the development and operation of Cultural/Creative Hubs 8 facilities were selected for Case Study review. These facilities were chosen to ensure that a broad range of size, mandate and jurisdictions were represented. Three are located in the GTA, four in the United States and one in Europe. They range in size from a few thousand square feet with a handful of studio spaces to hundreds of thousands of square feet and state of the art technical equipment. In all cases the projects offer workspace, and in some cases resources or services, based on an affordable (below market) rent / charge reflecting the challenge faced by the majority of creative and cultural organisations and individual artists in accessing stable, secure and affordable workspace.

The conditions for success drawn from this review are organized according to theme. Not every lesson applied to each facility however, they are chosen because they have broad implications and relevance to this report.

Vision	• A strong shared vision is a critical factor in the success of a project
	 Visions are tailored to the specific site, community and goal of the project; they are not interchangeable or reproducible
	 The development of a project's vision is rooted in consultation and research with those that it intends to serve
Capacity	 Experience with developing and managing projects is a significant asset to the lead organization
	 A project champion who can develop wide public support can play a key role
	 Visionary Leaders articulates the vision, builds support and drives project momentum
Critical Mass	 A critical mass of creative individuals and organisations creates the dynamic environment which distinguishes these facilities
	 During the research period, demand for the services the facility is intending to provide should be market tested to ensure sufficient demand.
	• Successful projects most commonly emerge in areas with high numbers of creative people or organizations.
Diversity	 A diversity of uses, activities, users and tenants enriches the project and attracts an ever widening circle of supporters
-	 A diverse tenant base attracts a wider pool of potential funders and supporters
	 A diversity of organizations and individuals within a single facility creates a micro-economy in which start-ups can flourish
Partners/collaboration	 A diverse and growing circle of funders, partners and stakeholders plays a key role in project development and sustainability
	 Collaboration is valuable but can be time consuming fewer partners can mean a shorter development timeline
	 Successful partnership with the local municipality is a key factor in project success
	 The main partnership and stakeholder building period is during the capital development phase.
Programming and Community	 Ongoing community engagement is an essential feature of successful Cultural/Creative Hubs
Engagement	 Incubator programs require structure; time limited tenure, compulsory courses and a rich variety of programs
	 An expectation that tenants will contribute to the community in which they are based is the most effective form of providing ongoing engagement with the public
	 Public accessibility and public programming is an essential feature of successful Cultural/Creative Hubs.
Financial Sustainability -	 Projects require a no or low cost site and strive to cover the cost of capital development through funding and philanthropic support to secure affordability and avoid carrying financing in operational budgets
	 Projects seek to operate on a cost recovery basis based on affordable (below market) rents however this is often not realistic
	 If based on well researched demand, a project should expect to be fully tenanted in less then 18 months
	 Affordable rents may also require an additional sliding scale with more developed organizations paying more.

Summary of Conditions for Success

Site Selection	 A free or nearly free building or land is the most important site selection consideration
	 Neighbourhoods with high numbers of artists and creative businesses are ideal for a hub
	• A converted industrial or commercial building is a good home for this type of project.
Governance	 Non-Profits are the most common and most of effective models for operating this type of facility
	 A Board of Directors with tenants, community members and professionals offers transparency and leadership
	• Non-profit organization can be created solely to operate the facility.

Summary of Reviewed Organizations

Artscape Wychwood Barns/ Toronto

Located in Toronto, this converted TTC streetcar barns houses individual artists, environmental groups, arts organizations as well as a greenhouse and a programmable space. The project was developed by Artscape, it has a community board to advise and program the shared space.

401 Richmond/ Toronto

Operated by UrbanSpace, this award-winning facility is located in downtown Toronto. The building was purchased by Margie Ziedler in 1994 and today houses galleries, artists studios and small businesses. With countless gallery openings, a rooftop garden, workshops and bookstores 401 Richmond has become a centre for arts and culture in the city.

Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts and the Cossart Exchange/ Hamilton, Ontario

Hamilton, Ontario has recently been transformed into a centre for creative individuals fleeing high rents in other cities. The ICCA and the CE were created to respond to the lack of infrastructure and training offered to artists and creative entrepreneurs in the city. The ICCA is a simple co-location facility that brings costs down through shared services while the Cossart Exchange is a multi-tenanted facility with numerous agencies and organizations offering courses and incubation programs.

AS220/ Providence, Rhode Island

Designed as an unjuried and uncensored venue for the arts, AS220 operates three buildings in the historic centre of Providence, Rhode Island. Its facilities contain live/work spaces as well as cafes, print shops and other creative businesses. AS220 does not focus on a particular discipline but tries to be a venue of every facet of the creative sector.

Arts Incubator of Kansas City/ Kansas City, Missouri

This converted warehouse building takes new creative entrepreneurs through a two year career/business building program. The space also contains galleries and small arts organizations which bring the public into the building on a regular basis, making it a hub in the creative Crossroads district.

McAllen Chamber Creative Incubator/ McAllen, Texas

Developed by the Chamber of Commerce and the City of McAllen, Texas this facility is housed in a decommissioned community college. Tenants are required to present their works or hold workshops on a regular basis and the public is encouraged to attend gallery openings and classes offered by the tenants. The building is the centre of the City's strategy to grow the arts and culture industries in McAllen.

Hot House Creative Cluster/ London, England

When the City of London was experiencing dramatic rent and property value increases, FreeForm, an arts organization, decided to create a permanent space where creative entrepreneurs could establish themselves without moving to the outer suburbs. The facility was designed with the highest green design standards and actively engages the local and city-wide creative communities.

Artspace/U.S.A.

Artspace owns and operates 24 facilities in 17 cities. Each of Artspace's projects are distinct however, some aspects of its projects are ubiquitous such as a concentration on creating affordable space where artists and creators can live and work. Many of its buildings have rental units that are funded in part through low-income tax credits or other programs that fund affordable space provision. (Please refer to Appendix 5 for Full Case Study Reports)

2.2 Conditions for Success

2.2.1 Vision

Whether fully articulated or not, all the projects investigated in this best practice review are based on a strong shared vision that emerged from research and engagement. Visions are essential for all Cultural/Creative Hub facilities to succeed, however they are not interchangeable or reproducible. A project's vision must be tailored to the specific site on which it is located, the community it intends to serve and the goals it hopes to achieve. All

8 facilities share the desire to create affordable space for artists and creative and cultural professionals however, in their programming; sector-specificity and scope are dependant on local factors and vary accordingly.

A period of research before a vision can be adequately articulated is essential. The vision for the Imperial Cotton Factory for the Arts in Hamilton (ICCA) emerged from more than a year of research into the state of studio culture and infrastructure in the city, followed by consultation with artists to identify potential tenants and their space, access and programmatic requirements. As a result the ICCA vision reflects the needs of Hamilton's artistic scene and articulates a goal of creating a co-locational facility that fosters an exchange of ideas and creates a community where one was previously lacking.

Needs underpin visions. The period of research and consultation is used to identify an unmet desire or demand among the creative/cultural community and the wider local community. The Vision for the Artscape Wychwood Barns evolved from a passionate and committed community and a singular and complex site. The Arts Incubator of Kansas City's vision responds to lack of skills and programming for artists after graduation. Hot House in London created a vision that responds to the need for affordable inner-city artistic and creative space in a city where rents are prohibitive.

2.2.2 Capacity

Three types of capacity issues are relevant to the development and operation of a Cultural/Creative Hub: The capacity of the lead organization to take on the development and operation of the project; the capacity of individual artists and creative/cultural organisations to commit to and sustain tenancy, and the capacity of both project champions and visionaries to drive forward and build support for the project.

Lead organizations with development experience usually have a much easier time building support and guiding projects from inception to fruition. Artscape's history of multi tenanted facility development and management helped tremendously with the long development process associated with the Artscape Wychwood Barns. Similarly, AS220's experience developing projects in the past has shortened the timeline for its recent development projects.

A project champion can play a key role in the successful development of a Cultural/Creative Hub. Local Councillor Joe Mihvec consistently championed the Artscape Wycwhood Barns project, for example, playing a critical role in its successful realisation. Most of the projects we reviewed had a visionary leader associated with it: Jeff Baker who imagined and founded the AIKC, Tim Jones the CEO of Artscape and force behind the Wychwood barns, Margie Ziedler who purchased the site and conceived of 401 Richmond and; Jeremy Freiburger who created the ICCA (for more details on these figures and their projects please see Appendix 7 for full case studies). The visionary leader articulates the vision and brings bring an ever expanding circle of financial, creative community and political support to and drives the momentum of the project.

2.2.3 Critical Mass

In all cases the Cultural/Creative Hubs we reviewed are located in neighbourhoods with a concentration of creative businesses and people. This reflects on the well documented tendency of individuals and businesses in the creative and cultural sector to cluster in dense, closely networked urban environments.

Clustering arts, culture and creative people, organizations and small businesses together is a proven strategy in regenerating neighbourhoods. In their quest to express their ideas, find markets/audiences and engage collaborators, creative people help foster local identity, build social scenes, and contribute to local economic development. The value generated by these activities is closely related to the number, density and proximity of the players within the cluster. A few creative people scattered across an area will have significantly less impact than the same number who are clustered together in facilities where there are opportunities for community interaction. If regeneration of the local community is one of the goals of Cultural/Creative Hubs, the facilities need to serve a sizeable community of artists.

Financial sustainability is another factor that influences the size of Creative/Cultural Hubs. Many Creative/Cultural Hubs are financially self-sustaining without requiring ongoing operating subsidy. In order to achieve this objective while remaining affordable for their target tenant populations, they need to spread staff and other overhead expenses over a large enough number of square feet. Artscape and other Creative/Cultural Hub operators have generally found that it is difficult to make facilities less than approximately 30,000 square feet financially viable without ongoing operating subsidy.

Market testing is an essential component of the pre-development phase to ensure the site, location and project can attract and support the uses envisioned. The energy and momentum that Cultural/Creative Hubs possess is a direct result of a critical mass of creative tenants. In these facilities it is the sum of these diverse creative individuals and organisations working in the same environment that is more powerful than each of them working in isolation.

2.2.4 Diversity

Our survey of leading cultural and creative projects has revealed the importance of a diverse mix of tenants, uses, activities and participants to the success of these projects. Diversity in this context refers to a diversity of disciplines and sectors, activities and users and types of tenants (non-profits, sole-practitioners, businesses, etc.) and stages of development (start ups to well established). Cultural/Creative Hubs depend on the energy and co-operative spirit that is created between tenants and the diversity of the tenant base heightens this dynamism. Furthermore, a diversity of tenants, uses, users and activities opens the projects to a more diverse pool of potential funders and supporters.

A diverse mix of tenants can also create a micro-economy which can support the economic prospects of start-ups. The Hothouse and 401 Richmond for example both describe how collaboration between tenants has allowed creative business to thrive.

2.2.5 Partners/Collaboration

Successful Cultural/Creative Hubs secure their financial sustainability and public support by ensuring that an ever widening circle of funders, stakeholders and supporters are engaged in the project. Most of the projects reviewed have five of six major partners who have offered political, financial and public support. A diverse funding base also helps to insulate projects from financial shocks. For instance, when Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans the philanthropic support offered to the Arts Incubator in Kansas City dried up forcing the facility to depend on other sources. Building a network of partners, stakeholders and supporters is an ongoing process but the major focus is during the predevelopment and development phase.

The local municipality is commonly the most important partner for these projects, playing a key role in championing, funding and enabling project development. The support given to the Artscape Wychwood Barns by both the local councillor and a wide variety of council departments was essential to the project's success.

2.2.6 Programming and Community Engagement

The level of programming offered by Cultural/Creative Hubs is dependant on their mission. Incubator-based projects like the Arts Incubator of Kansas City, offer many more courses and programs than facilities with mandates solely focussed on providing affordable space.

Public access to space, activities and programming at Cultural/Creative Hubs builds public support for a project and creates wider social and cultural benefits. Artscape Wychwood Barns includes a "Community Gallery" programmed and managed by the local community and has a large rentable space which is used for community events. In addition many tenants offer classes and courses to the community. The Arts Incubator of Kansas City offers open studio tours one day every month that attract up to 4,000 people in addition to providing events space to local community organisations. Hot House does not offer its own programs however the space is open to the public for numerous events and tenants offer programs and workshops. This animates the space and ensures the facility offers benefits to a broader constituency.

2.2.7 Financial Sustainability

i) Capital

There are few, if any, Cultural/Creative Hubs operating in spaces purchased at market value. Most commonly, land is donated by a municipality or organization, or the space was purchased by a philanthropic supporter. 401 Richmond was purchased in 1994 by Margie Zielder for the significantly below market price of 1.5 million. This has allowed the facility to offer affordable workspaces for artists and arts organisations. Despite many attempts, Urbancorp has been unable to replicate the 401 Richmond model because they have never again found a building of similar size, style and location at such low cost.

In order to ensure affordability for tenants these projects strive to cover the majority of the cost of capital development through funding and philanthropic support as opposed to carrying the cost of financing over the longer term. The Artscape Wychwood Barns, for example, attracted capital funding from over 30 different funding sources.

ii) Operational

All of the projects reviewed are predicated on the principle that work or live/work space for the cultural and creative sector must be affordable in the context of local market comparables and the affordability thresholds of the sector. The Cultural/Creative Hubs we reviewed strive to exist on a cost recovery basis, in other words, on the income from tenant rents alone, however this is not always feasible. While many of the projects reviewed were self-sufficient; others rely on sustained support from government and philanthropic interests. The Arts Incubator of Kansas City receives 1/3rd of its income from philanthropy and the rest from rents, while Hot House is fully self sufficient.

Most of the facilities we reviewed achieve a balanced budget after 5 years of operation and were fully tenanted within 18 months.

2.2.8 Site Selection

In terms of site selection there are essentially two types of projects, those that began because of a building or site and those that searched for one. Of the many factors to weigh when selecting a location for a cultural/creative hub, cost is by far the most important.

As discussed in section 2.3.3 (above), areas with a high number of creative individuals and businesses are ideal locations for Cultural/Creative Hubs. Facilities of this type build on critical mass and the energy, networks and access to markets that exist in creative and cultural clusters. The adaptive re-use of former industrial properties with high ceilings and lots of light are ideal choices for and strongly preferred by the sector.

2.2.9 Governance

The most common type of organization leading Cultural/Creative Hubs are non-profit organisations with a mandate to provide affordable workspace for artists, cultural organisations and creative businesses. With the exception of the Chamber of Commerce in McAllen Texas, government involvement in the facilities reviewed comes in the form of subsidies and grants. Often an organization is created specifically to operate a single facility, for instance, Urbancorp was designed only to mange 401 Richmond and was set up at the time the site was acquired.

Involving the local and wider creative community in the decision making process of the facility increases a sense of transparency in the organization. A Board of Directors with members from the communities that the facility intends to serve is essential in maintaining public support and where relevant to the mandate of the project as at the Artscape Wychwood Barns community stewardship at all levels of project governance will play a key role in ensuring project success

3. The Creative and Cultural Sector in Priority Neighbourhoods

The Priority Neighbourhood designation was created in 2005 to direct funds to those areas of the city that had a high demand for, but a lack of, social services. Poverty, high levels of new immigrants and a lack of investment characterize these areas however, they are also very dissimilar from one another. Each has its own ethnic and demographic makeup and distinctly different built forms. To date, all the facilities that could be considered Cultural/Creative Hubs are located in the centre of Toronto. Other types of hubs (i.e Health, Community Services etc) have been built in Priority Neighbourhoods and other parts of the inner suburbs.

3.1 Workers and Jobs

In the context of this report, it is interesting to note the different levels of employment in, and clusters of the creative and cultural industries in the 13 Priority Neighbourhoods. Census Data provided by the City of Toronto, and used in the 2010 Hill Strategies report entitled 'Mapping Artists and Cultural Workers in Large Canadian Cities' revealed how diverse each neighbourhood is in its relation to cultural industries¹.

Place of work

On average, there are a little more than half as many creative jobs in priority neighbourhoods compared to as a whole Toronto (3.71% vs 5.94%). ^{2 & 3}



Figure 2: Cultural/Creative Sector Jobs in Toronto and Priority Neighbourhood Average

Source: Census of Canada, 2006

¹ Mapping Artists and Cultural Workers in Canada's Large Cities' by Hill Strategies, 2010.

² Statistics Canada, 2006 Census.

³ Thanks to Elena Bird for collecting and preparing this data



Figure 3: Number of Cultural/Creative Sector Jobs in Priority Neighbourhoods⁴

There is great diversity in the percentage of culture jobs between the Priority Neighbourhoods from 2.41%, Eglinton East- Kennedy Park, to 6.97% in Flemington Park-Victoria Village. Interestingly, Flemington Park-Victoria Village exceeds the city average with 6.97% of all jobs in the area considered 'cultural'. When grouped together, there are less culture jobs as a percentage of all employment opportunities in priority neighbourhoods than city average, but more than the national average. The large ranges in population and commercially/industrially zoned in the Priority Neighbourhoods might account for the variation in culture jobs between Priority Neighbourhoods.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006 & Artscape 2010

⁴ Thanks to Jason Melindy for preparing and supplying GIS data used in this report.

Place of residence

Priority neighbourhoods are home to a smaller percentage of culture workers than the national or city average. 3.31% of all those living in Priority neighbourhoods work in fields considered cultural compared to a city-wide average of 6.32%.



Figure 4: Cultural/Creative Sector workers living in Toronto and Priority Neighbourhood

The percentage of culture workers living within each priority neighbourhoods varies, from less than 2 % in Jamestown to nearly 6% in Crescent Town. The reason for the heterogeneity in place of residence of culture workers among Priority neighbourhoods is not apparent.





Source: Census of Canada, 2006

Source: Census of Canada, 2006



Figure 6: Number of Cultural/Creative Sector Workers by Residence in all Priority Neighbourhoods

Source: Artscape, 2010

3.2 Infrastructure and Facilities

In Toronto, as in most urban areas, creative and cultural sector establishments are heavily concentrated in the downtown. In 2008 Artscape mapped over 9,500 creative and cultural sector establishments including sole traders in the city of Toronto. Mapping reveals the density of creative and cultural establishments co-locating in particular neighbourhoods that offer a thick urban fabric of amenities, proximity to major public transit corridors, presence of academic institutions, relatively affordable living and/or work space, and opportunities for interaction with other individuals, organizations and businesses.

The west end neighbourhoods along Queen Street and King Street West, and extending into the 10km radius in Liberty Village and the Parkdale and Roncesvalles neighbourhoods are highly concentrated. Other areas where establishments are densely clustered include Yorkville, the Avenue and Davenport design area and Cabbagetown. The Riverdale neighbourhood also has some density in establishments as do the Bloor/Landsdowne and Junction neighbourhoods.



Figure 7: Cultural Establishments and Resources in the GTA with Priority Neighbourhoods

Source: Artscape, Convergence Centres: Building Capacity for Innovation, 2009

The clustering of creative business and activity in downtown areas is an internationally recognised phenomenon. The creative and cultural sector is drawn to dense urban districts with distinct identities. These types of urban neighbourhoods support diverse labour markets, offer easy access to a range of suppliers, collaborators and markets and enable knowledge exchange through formal and informal networks. Creative and cultural sector workers and businesses place a high value on the face-to-face networking and social exchange found in these neighbourhoods. Despite the potential offered by new technologies for the sector to scatter to more affordable areas of cities and their suburbs, in Toronto, as in cities elsewhere, the creative and cultural sector by and large continues to live and work in the downtown core.

This picture of infrastructure and employment distribution does present challenges for the development of cultural and creative hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods. At the same time there is a clear opportunity to develop a facility model which seeks to attract and build a critical mass of creative individuals, businesses and activity to these neighbourhoods in order to gain the economic, social and cultural benefits associated with creative and cultural cluster.

4. A Model for Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods

The City of Toronto has requested that a "generic model" for the development of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods be developed, building on the lessons learned and "conditions for success" identified from precedent research.

In developing this model we have been mindful to take full account of:

- The key assumptions for the creative and cultural sector in Priority Neighbourhoods as set out above (section 3).
- An understanding of each neighbourhood's unique identity, needs, and opportunities must be reflected in the final vision and components for the project.
- An understanding that for the potential to cluster certain types of uses together in response to differing local / project specific opportunities will differ in each neighbourhood.

4.1 Conditions for Success

The generic model for the development of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority neighbourhoods is set out in the following pages and is founded in a number of principles;

Vision

Built on a strong, shared vision, the Creative/Cultural Hub will support and catalyze social, cultural and economic revitalisation in the neighbourhood.

The hub will be built on a strong shared vision which is the essential element in the creation and sustainability of a Creative/Cultural Hub and is founded in robust research, and community engagement. Creating a shared vision is necessarily a collaborative process which draws on the expressed views and circumstances of diverse stakeholders; which responds to the particular identity, assets, resources and needs of a community and reflects the particular economic, social and environmental realities of each neighbourhood.

Critical Mass

The hub will cluster and support a critical mass of creative and cultural individuals and organisations, businesses, activity and users, creating opportunity and affordability for local individuals and organisations/businesses while attracting and retaining additional capacity to the neighbourhood. Affordable artists' live/work accommodation will be used

to leverage investment into the Hub and will retain and attract critical mass and capacity in the neighbourhood.

Diversity of Uses

A diversity of uses, users, partners, perspectives, stakeholders and funding streams the Hub, broadens its appeal and contributes to long term sustainability.

Platforms for Collaboration

The Hub will be intentionally designed and tenanted to encourage and support collaboration between tenants and between tenants and the wider community. This will build creative and economic benefits generated through the advantages gained from density and proximity.

Sustainability

The model is designed to ensure long term operational stability, sustainability and affordability based on a cost recovery operational model. The development of rent geared to income (RGI) artists live / work studios will respond to demand / need across the Cultural and Creative sector in Toronto, will build critical mass, and will be used to leverage investment in the hub as a whole.

Partnership

The Hub will be developed and operated in concert with a range of community and other development partners. Effective partnerships will play a key role in securing the success and long term sustainability of the project allowing risks and responsibilities to be shared; building confidence; creating a sense of ownership in the project; attracting resources from a diversity of sources and contributing to capacity building.

4.2 Site Selection

Site selection may be driven by a number of factors;

- Often a perfectly located and vacant site is the catalyst for the creation of a Cultural/Creative Hub
- Sometimes a neighbourhood may have a much loved old building looking for a new idea
- A development may be in need of a cultural component
- The site or property will be developable within the required timetable and within capital and operational budget parameters.

In order to secure the development of a Cultural/Creative Hub which can provide affordable (below market) commercial (work) space the property or land will be purchased at low or no cost or long term leased on a minimal rent.

Options may include:

- The adaptive re-use of a former industrial or commercial property
- The adaptive re-use of surplus public sector owned property
- The development of a new build facility on a developable surplus public sector site as a stand alone facility or as part of a mixed use development.

Site selection in Priority Neighbourhoods will be sympathetic to the psychogeography of the neighbourhood which will be tested through effective engagement with the local community.

4.2.1 Key Local Considerations for Site Selection

Key local considerations for site selection in Priority Neighbourhoods:

- Is the proposed property or site located in an area considered "uncontested" by the local community as a whole (i.e. taking into account "split" neighbourhoods, turfs etc)?
- Is the property or site highly visible, well known and in an area with busy day and evening activity and economy?
- Is the property / site located in a walkable area which is regarded locally as "safe"? Considerations will include quality of street lighting, quality of streetscape.
- Is the property / site in safe walking distance of major residential and business communities in the neighbourhood?
- Is the property / site close to public transit?
- Is the property / site in a location that strengthens existing Creative and Cultural businesses, activities and agencies in the local area?

Additional considerations:

- Does the property / site provide sufficient scope to house the desired function?
- Is there a conducive planning / zoning framework in place? (In some cases if the project vision offers a focus on particular areas of practice i.e. dirty or industrial crafts this requirement may need to be mitigated to accommodate for zoning, public nuisance and safety considerations.
- Have potential development partners with an existing or potential interest in the site been identified?

4.3 Project Design and Building program

The Cultural/Creative Hub is designed to combine a Creative Convergence Centre which has a range of commercial uses with artists' live/work accommodation in a ratio of approximately 25% commercial and 75% live/work. A Creative Convergence Centre is designed with the intention of encouraging business growth, innovation and collaboration and clusters creative people, businesses and activity in a publicly accessible facility. Creative Convergence Centres in Toronto include, for example, the Artscape Wychwood Barns and the Evergreen Brickworks.

By combining both live/work, for which there is an abundance of need across the City, with the diversity of space and uses found in a Creative Convergence Centre for which there will be local demand but limited capacity to deliver, the Hub will create a cluster of creative practitioners, creative and cultural businesses and activity in a dynamic multidimensional facility.

The Cultural/Creative Hub will include both public and private (work / organisational and living) spaces and will be intentionally designed to encourage and support collaboration between the individuals and businesses based in the Hub and between the Hub tenants and the wider local community.

The project vision, and the values that underpin it, will form the foundation for the development of a clear tenanting, programming, animation and outreach policy. In the context of this vision the approach should be founded on the following principles:

- Curating the tenant mix to ensure that selected tenants have the mandate, vision and potential to contribute towards the overall hub vision
- Building community stewardship into programming governance.
- Building effective and collaborative relationships with local business, community facilities, groups and organizations and with arts organizations, events and festival programmers across the neighbourhood.
- Building the capacity of tenants prior to, and post, occupancy to ensure their stability and effectiveness.

4.3.1 Building Program Components: Ground Floor – Creative Convergence Centre

With an optimal footprint of between 7,000 and 16,000 s.f the ground floor of the Hub will be developed as a Creative Convergence Centre comprising a mix of uses which may include a combination of any or all of the following:

- Individual artists work studios
 - i.e. Visual arts studio; graphic design studio; software development studio; furniture maker studio etc
- Individual artists and creative business workspaces with retail / services
 - Jewellery designer and direct from maker retail space.
 - Graphic design business and retail outlet.
 - Musician / composer and teaching space
- Creative Business Workspaces
 - o i.e. Business location for Creative Industries micro business
- Shared workspace and creative business incubator
- Arts and Cultural Organisation workspace
 - o i.e. Business location for not for profit arts and cultural organisations
- Arts and Cultural Organization workspace with activity space
 - $\circ\;$ i.e. Dance organisational workspace and dance studio.

The expectation is that some if not all of the ground floor space will allow for public access and / or public programming opportunities. This might include:

- Larger performance and event space
- Multi purpose studio space(s)
- Public gathering place
- Café
- Community meeting rooms.

The exact tenant mix and (thus) use will be subject to the particular opportunities and creative and cultural sector needs identified in the neighbourhood and may include both local creative and cultural sector start ups, individual artists and arts and cultural organisations and may or may not include one or more anchor tenants moving to the community with a view to developing services / programming and/or a permanent home / identity in the community.

4.3.2 Building Components: Floor(s) above - Artists Live/Work

With between 21 and 48 units, averaging 750 s.f., the upper floors will provide Rent Geared to Income Live / Work accommodation for artists and creative professionals and their families. It is expected that in each Priority Neighbourhood an agreed target percentage of units will be filled by locally based artists and creative professionals with the remaining units being filled by artists and creative professional from across the city.

A diversity of cultural and creative practitioners will live and work in the Hub and collectively will offer a range of public facing activities and programming, for example:

- Open Studios
- Arts Markets
- Independent retail outlets
- Workshops / classes
- Services
- Programming and events in collaboration with ground floor tenants and the wider community

4.4 Governance and organisational structure

The power and capacity of small non-profits and local community members to lead developments and drive change in their neighbourhoods is often under-estimated. Individually, they may not have a lot of capacity or resources but collectively they became a powerful force in generating momentum and attracting the interest and investment to realize the project. The goal is to create partnerships where all parties win and positive cultural, economic, social, and environmental bottom lines are generated.

Ideally, the governance model for the Hub will not be locked in stone at the beginning of the development process as it will likely need to evolve through discussion with the interested parties and respond to the ultimate form and function of the project. However, a number of principles and a basic framework of roles and responsibilities can be established, principle among these in ensuring effective community stewardship for the project.

The governance model for the Cultural/Creative Hub model has been designed to balance public interest, community engagement, risk and responsibility. An independent not-for-profit organization with strong ties to the local and the creative community would be best placed to serve and protect the public interest the project will represent.

Toronto and other major urban centres have spawned intermediary organizations to manage multi-tenant projects of this sort because many of the small organizations which populate them generally:

- o lack the capacity to develop and manage real estate
- o need an independent third party to manage their collective interest
- o benefit from shared resources and services
- o do not want or are unable to carry the legal and financial responsibility for facilities

o want assurance that their long-term interests are protected

The governance model is designed to build cooperation and collaboration between tenants and to develop effective collaborative relationships between tenants, the Facility Operator and the community.

4.4.1 Governance Principles

- Ultimate authority on budget, policy, and operations must rest with the party that carries the financial and fiduciary responsibility for the Hub.
- The party that carries the financial and fiduciary responsibility for the Hub will be a not for profit organisations with a charitable mandate
- Community stewardship will be built into all policy-making committees and boards.
- The roles of the facility operator and partners will be tailored to take advantage of their key strengths.
- The project will be managed in a way that engages an ever-expanding circle of supporters.
- The objectives, principles and values that will govern the Centre will be spelled out in a tenant charter that will be appended to leases and licensing agreements.

4.4.2 Facility Developer / Operator

The Facility Developer / Operator will take lead responsibility for the development and operation of the project. As the entity with legal and financial responsibility for the Hub, the Board of Directors will:

- Approve operating and capital budgets
- Set operational policies
- Oversee human resource management
- Ensure local representation on its board
- Appoint members of the Capital Project Team, Community Association, Program Advisory Committee etc..

The Facility Developer / Operator will be a not-for-profit organisation, and will be legally and financially responsible for the development and operation of the Hub. The Facility Operator will have established capacity to develop and operate a facility of this size for the purpose of a Cultural/Creative Hub. This will be evidenced by:

 Organisational capacity to undertake and manage capital development and / or facility operation - evidence of sufficient experience, trust, longevity, financial stability etc

- Locally connected and / or understanding and commitment to the neighbourhood
- Ability to bring partners to the table to develop a shared vision.

The Facility Developer / Operator will own or lease the building and may or may not utilize space in the building for its own operations. The Facility Developer / Operator may also manage any events and performance space and café / catering facility. The Facility Operator will have the capacity and responsibility for raising significant capital funding to develop the building, either solely or in partnership.

The Facility Developer / Operator will take the lead role in:

- Securing sufficient government and private funding and financing to complete the capital project
- Overseeing the design and construction of the Hub
- Setting operational policies and hire personnel to operate the Hub
- Building partnerships and negotiating agreements with development and operational partners
- Managing the property and tenant relations on an ongoing basis
- Coordinating programming and manage event services for the Hub
- Consulting with stakeholders and the community through a range of advisory bodies, committees and meetings
- Managing marketing and communications for the Hub.

4.4.3 Capital Project Team

The Facility Developer / Operator will develop the capital project with input and advice from a Capital Project Team with representation from the local community, tenants, and development and operational partners. This advisory group will:

- Advise on design issues
- Help translate ideas and suggestions from the Community Steering Committee and the public into a coherent architectural plan
- Provide advice on capital budget priorities
- Ensure that key stakeholders needs are incorporated into the project's design.

4.4.4 Community Steering Committee

A volunteer Community Steering Committee should be established to play a number of roles including:

Advise on the project vision and design during the development process
- Play a supportive role in capital fund raising for the project
- Advise on community relations
- Adjudicate applications for tenants
- Advise on development of a tenant charter
- Contribute to other sub-committees including a Program Advisory Committee to make recommendations on programming choices and policies.

4.5 Affordability and Financial Sustainability

The model for the development of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods is intended to offer a common framework with sufficient flexibility to accommodate multiple variables. These key variables include:

- The particular needs and identities of each neighbourhood
- The substantial differences in both capital and operational costs associated with adaptive re-use / new build
- Site selection / Scale of actual development

As a result, and with the agreement of the City of Toronto, in place of the single Pro Forma requested we have provided a range of options as follows:

Adaptive Re-Use

28,000 s.f. total building (7,000 commercial/21,000 s.f. Live/Work) 48,000 s.f. total building (9,000 commercial / 36,000 s. f Live/Work) 64,000 s.f. total building (12,000 commercial / 48,000 s.f. Live Work

New Build

28,000 s.f. total building (7,000 commercial /21,000 s.f. Live/Work) 48,000 s.f. total building (9,000 commercial / 36,000 s. f Live/Work) 64,000 s.f. total building (12,000 commercial / 48,000 s.f. Live Work

The overarching requirement is to achieve commercial workspace that is genuinely affordable in the context of the economic realities of Priority Neighbourhood communities and affordability thresholds in the creative ad cultural sector.

The model is built on an assumption that space within the Cultural/Creative Hub will be consistently allocated proportionately 25% commercial and 75% RGI Live/Work.

In every case, the ground floor model includes provision for an event space (or spaces) of between 1,750 s.f. and 4,000 s.f., is included in the total commercial space allocated.

Operational Budget Pro Forma

The exact mix and balance of uses in the commercial space will vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood but will be built on 3 revenue streams:

o Long term Rental

The operational model assumes a *net* rent of \$1 p.s.f for commercial space that will be sufficiently affordable to attract long tem tenants in the context of priority neighbourhood comparables and will in addition reflect the affordability thresholds in the creative and cultural sector.

Short Term Rental

Income will also be generated through short term rental of public, programmable space for showcases, events and performances, community meetings etc.

Programming/Shared Services/Subsidy

Additional strategies will include the development of shared services and shared / temporary workspace; programmed activities and potentially operating subsidy. The balance and achievability of these will require further consideration in each individual instance.

- The operational budget assumes a Rent Geared to Income (RGI) subsidy per average 750 s.f. unit of \$750.00
- The operational budget also indicates the creation of a Capital Reserve fund, a recommended best practice to ensure long term sustainability
- The operational Budget shows no requirement to pay property taxes. This is based on the following assumptions:
 - The affordable housing portion (75%) is exempt
 - The event / performance space (25% of the Creative Convergence Space) is exempt (exemption applies to performance spaces with a capacity of under 1,000)
 - The remaining ground floor Creative Convergence Centre space (18.75% of the total property) will be eligible for a TIEG with 100% property tax exemption in year one of operations, rising to 100% over ten years.

See Appendix 9: Operational Proforma

Capital Budget Pro Forma

- The capital development budget assumes that property/site acquisition is achieved at no cost
- The capital budget reflects the necessity to generate substantial funding from all three tiers of government for the capital development in order to reduce/negate the need for long term financing (and the implication for true affordability.) Including:
 - o Federal/Provincial affordable housing development subsidy
 - o Cultural Spaces Canada (Canadian Heritage)
 - Ontario Trillium Foundation
 - Federal/Provincial infrastructure funding
 - o Southern Ontario Development Agency support
 - City of Toronto.
- The additional necessity to attract philanthropic support for the capital development is reflected in the pro forma
- The Capital Development pro forma assumes that Section 37 Funding will be identified and applied to Cultural/Creative Hub developments in priority neighbourhoods. Section 37 funding was recently instrumental in Toronto, for example, in the development by Artscape of Artscape triangle Lofts
- The pro forma assumes that development charges will be waived as this is primarily an affordable housing project and that additional municipal fees will be waived as a City contribution to the project
- A 25 year mortgage term is assumed

The capital development model for the ground floor spaces will assume that the facility operator will develop and fit out the space(s) as opposed requiring the tenant to undertake fit out (tenant improvements) themselves.

See Appendix 9: Capital Proforma

4.6 A Note on Development Timelines

Developments of the sort envisioned take time. In general terms we would expect the predevelopment phase to take up to 2 years. This will include:

- Vision Development
- Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Development
- Project Feasibility
- Securing Capital Funding.

Subject to the size and scale of the development the development phase may take from 1 to more than 2 years.

4.7 Building Capacity in Priority Neighbourhoods

While the generic model for the development of Cultural/Creative Hubs in Priority Neighbourhoods focuses on the development of physical infrastructure it will also be important to ensure that human capital in the neighbourhood is also invested in and supported through capacity building initiatives.

While the profiles of each Priority Neighbourhood varies (see section 3 above) as we have seen in general terms these communities have fewer creative and cultural facilities, professional organisations, services and creative and cultural sector workers than the downtown, where the majority of employment and establishments – including all Creative/Cultural hubs – are located.

Although the model and priorities for capacity building in each Priority Neighbourhood will vary, connecting and leveraging existing creative and cultural assets and capabilities and supporting additional capacity building in the community will play an important role in the success of the project. Capacity Building for sustainability may include the following three elements:

- Build on existing creative and cultural programming and provision in the neighbourhood
- Support skills development in existing creative and cultural organisations
- Shared workspace and small-scale creative business incubation development.

5. A Community Cultural Hub in Weston Mount Dennis

5.1 Overview and Data Considerations

Weston Mount Dennis is an amalgamation of two distinct communities, each with their own history and identity. Straddling the ridge between the Humber Valley and Black Creek, the area is physically separated from the rest of the city by natural features as well as railways and industrial lands. Economically, Weston/Mount Dennis was once closely integrated into the national economy, manufacturing iconic Canadian products such as the CCM skate, the Moffat stove and the steel used for Bay Street towers.

Many of the historic homes and buildings in Weston Mount Dennis have survived and today the neighbourhoods retain a small-town feel. The pace of building slowed as jobs disappeared and the gentrification that has transformed nearby areas such as The Junction has largely passed Weston Mount Dennis by. The impending rail line upgrade that will run through the Weston Mount Dennis promises to transform the area, and its relationship to the rest of the city.

The study area for this report is slightly smaller than the boundaries of either the Priority Neighbourhood or the local council ward. Some of the data used for this report comes from the previously mentioned sources while other statistical information relates only to the study area itself. These limitations are stated throughout the report.

Figure 8: Weston and Mount Dennis



Source: Artscape, 2010

5.2 Brief History

The first settlement in the area was the village of Weston, a stop on the Toronto, Grey & Bruce Railway. During the 19th and early 20th century the area was an industrial suburb surrounded by agricultural lands. Weston's housing is divided between single detached homes on large lots that fill the leafy side streets, and tower buildings along the ravines and major streets. The tower buildings in the area have lower rents than many other parts of the city making them attractive to new Canadians.

The ill-fated Eglinton subway, cancelled in the mid 1990s, included a proposed stop in Weston. The promise of transit caused a property speculation boom, which collapsed when the Provincial government scrapped the plans in 1995. Some residents have suggested that Weston's commercial property market has never recovered, and blame the vacant lots and lack of development on property owners waiting to achieve a reasonable return on the inflated values of 15 years ago.

Mount Dennis, to the south of Weston, developed much later. The area was largely farmland until the 1940s when sub-divisions of tract housing and small owner-built homes

were constructed. The few tower buildings in the area are located along Emmet Avenue which winds down into the Humber valley, and are home to a significant portion of Mount Dennis' population. The major industrial employer for the area was the Kodak Canada plant, which manufactured cameras and film until its closure in 2005. Today, the section of Weston Road that runs through Mount Dennis retains the two-three story brick facades of mid century development, but the activity and economic vitality is gone.

5.3 Identity

The study area's linear geography, as well as its physical isolation, has fostered a distinct identity among residents. Some have described the area as less of a neighbourhood and more of a 'strip'. The economic, social and psycho-geographical life of Weston Mount Dennis is centred along Weston Road. The road serves as the area's landmark, shopping strip, transportation route and cultural centre. Among the city's Reggae and Dancehall scene, Weston Road is known as the origin of numerous performers and promoters.

Affordable rents in Weston Mount Dennis has made the area a destination for new immigrants, today it is a centre of Caribbean and Somali culture in the GTA. Unlike Chinatown or Little India, Weston is not immediately identified with a specific cultural group because incomes and a lack of economic vibrancy mean that this identity is not reflected heavily in the commercial life of the area.

Over the years, an increase in crime and violence has created a negative impression of the community. The perception that parts of the study area are dangerous place is reflected in the opinion of those we interviewed.

5.4 Demographics

The high number of tower buildings with low rents has made the area a particularly attractive place for new immigrants. Weston Mount. Dennis is one of the few areas in the City of Toronto where a new immigrant can find housing without having to prove their status in the country or Canadian credit history. The proximity to Pearson Airport is more than geographical. The Weston Mount Dennis immigrant population often uses the neighbourhood as an initial landing place, and then moves on.

The population of the priority area is evenly split between those that live in buildings above 5 stories and those in low rise/single family housing. From our primary research we have noted that the tower buildings in the area appear to receive most of the new immigrants who settle in the area, while the population in the low/rise/single family homes is more stable.

Weston Mount Dennis's population is characterized by pockets with a high degree of recent immigration and poverty, surrounded by areas with affluent long-term residents. More than 14,000 people lived in the study area in 2006⁵. On average, incomes are much lower than the rest of the city and nearly half the population are immigrants, a further half of those immigrants have been in Canada for less than 20 years⁶. Until recently, immigration to Weston Mount Dennis had been dominated by southern European settlers. In the past decades, Carribean, South-East-Asian and South-Asian immigrants have become the major ethnic groups in the area⁷.

5.5 The Cultural and Creative industries and employment

Employment data reveals that the study area has much fewer cultural workplaces and less residents employed in the Cultural and Creative sector than the City of Toronto average. Thematic maps created with these data sets illustrate that the Creative and Cultural centre is the North-East corner, the low-rise residential section of Weston. However, the most striking conclusion drawn from the employment data is not the divisions within Weston Mount Dennis, but the markedly low participation and production occurring in the study area compared to the rest of Toronto.

Within the Weston Mount Dennis area, the lowest percentage of residents employed in the Cultural/Creative sector is 2.03% in the census tract between Lawrence and the Irving Tissue plant, the highest at 5.52% is in the single-family home section of Weston to the east of the train tracks, even this is less than the city average of 5.9%⁸.

⁵ Census of Canada, 2006

⁶ City of Toronto. (2006) City of Toronto Neighbourhood Profile-Priority Communities.

⁷ Census of Canada, 2006

⁸ Census of Canada, 2006



Figure 9: Residences of Culture Workers within the Study Area, by Census Tract

Residences of Culture Workers in Each Census Tracts



Source: Census of Canada, 2006 & Artscape, 2010

The densest concentration of Creative and Cultural sector jobs, is the north-east section of the study area, the single-family residential section of Weston (see figure 10). This area has the highest number of jobs in the sector despite the absence of a commercial strip, which indicates that much of the Creative and Cultural production is happening within the homes of residents. The area with the lowest percentage of jobs in culture, with less than 2%, is the neighbourhood surrounding Emmet Avenue.







Source: Census of Canada, 2006 & Artscape, 2010

According to census data, the study area is not a centre for any specific sub-sector of the Creative and Cultural sector. Rather, there is a fragmented quality to sector participation and production in Weston Mount. Dennis. No single occupation dominates employment or participation in the Creative and Cultural sector. There is a low level of participation in nearly every sub-category of the sector. (See figures 9 & 10)

5.6 Cultural and Creative Assets and Resources

The Cultural and Creative assets and resources of the study area were mapped using

- The City of Toronto's Cultural Facilities Analysis (2004)
- Business Directories
- Mapping exercises with local residents
- Interviews, Focus groups and Tenant Representative Surveys

Local residents suggested commercial, natural and agencies that they see as cultural assets and these were added to the facilities map. It reveals a concentration of cultural activities along Weston road, particularly near the corner of Lawrence.

enversion
enversion
enversion
enversion
enversion
enversion
enversion
enversion

Figure 11: Creative and Culture Resources in the Study Area

Source: Artscape, 2010

Urban Arts, Frontlines and The Learning Enrichment Foundation (L.E.F.) were the most commonly identified locations where residents took part in cultural and creative activities. Input from the community also revealed cultural infrastructure that had not been identified earlier such as barber shops, hair salons and parks. No artists studios were identified (outside of private residences), the area also lacks dedicated performance space, has no movie theatre, Dance Hall or privately run dance or music studio. (For a list of the sites indicated on Figure 11 please see appendix 7).

The major arts provision based arts organisations in the study area are Urban Arts and Artists to Artist Foundation. Urban Arts (formerly Y Arts) plays a significant and expanding role in the cultural life of the community offering music production, digital media, dance and visual arts programming targeted at young people.

In pursuit of 'hidden' cultural activities that occur less formally and infrequently, tenant representatives and building managers of local Toronto Community Housing and prominent private high-rise towers were identified and interviewed. The responses to these interviews indicate that there is little to no cultural/creative activities occurring in the common areas/ party rooms of the tower buildings in Weston Mount Dennis. (For the complete interviews with tower building representatives, see Appendix 3)

It should be noted that this map does not include other sections of the city, and therefore, is not useful for comparative purposes. However, comments made during interviews and focus groups with residents indicate that they feel there is a lack of cultural facilities in the area compared to other neighbourhoods. "There is nothing" or "I don't go anywhere in the area" were common responses when asked it indicate the cultural assets of Weston/ Mount Dennis.

5.7 Planning Context

The study area is a section of one of the city's 13 Priority Neighbourhoods. Priority Neighbourhoods were identified in 2005 as areas of Toronto that lack social services but have a high demand for them. As a result Weston Mount Dennis has been targeted for investment and infrastructure development and policy review to create a climate where socio-economic conditions can be improved.

The Metrolinx proposal to create improved service and a high-speed link to the airport, are the most important planning developments currently underway. This includes closing John street to vehicle traffic, burying tracks through much of the former village of Weston and building a new station south of Lawrence Street.

Weston Road is considered an 'Avenue' by the City of Toronto's planning department. In general this designation means that Weston road is more permissively zoned to encourage growth of population, urbanization and job opportunities. A formal Avenue Study has not been completed for the Weston Road area meaning that design and planning guidelines for the area have not been specified.

5.8 A Creative/Cultural Hub in Weston Mount Dennis: Key Themes and Issues

The following themes and issues were raised during interviews and focus groups that were conducted with community residents and stakeholders. Some are grounded in the empirical data that the city and the census collect, others derive exclusively from the experiences of local residents and their comments to us. These themes should not be interpreted as reflections on the neighbourhood as a whole, but rather impressions and opinions of our interviewees and meeting participants in the context of the feasibility of a Cultural/Creative Hub in the Weston Mount Dennis community.

5.8 1 Arts Provision Vs. Professional Arts

Interviews, focus groups and meetings revealed that there is a high demand for programming focused on arts and cultural activities. The expansion of Urban Arts is a testament to that desire among local residents, particularly youth, in Weston Mount Dennis. Furthermore, our engagement with local residents has revealed a strong desire for expanded arts programming. Informants from diverse backgrounds who live and/or work in Weston Mount Dennis expressed their desire to see the creation of a Cultural/Creative Hub, hoping that it would provide expanded access to the arts for residents. This interest in arts programming and services is contrasted with the small number of professional artists residing or working in the area. Statistical information reveals that the number of people residing in the area who are employed in creative and cultural occupations, and the number of those jobs located in the study area is well below the city average. Statements made at the artist focus group reinforced this finding. The area lacks a studio culture as well as showcasing infrastructure for professional artists.

Engagement revealed that both cultural and creative sector workers and local residents in general are open to the prospect of using a new creative and cultural facility to attract professional artists and creative businesses to the neighbourhood.



Figure 12: Residents of Selected Areas Employed in Culture

Source: Census, 2010

5.8.2 Local Leadership Capacity

Many local organizations and individuals contacted for this report expressed a lack of confidence in their own, or other groups within the area, ability to lead the development of the proposed hub. Many of the service organizations in Weston Mount Dennis are small and relatively new.

Active resident organizations enthusiastically support the concept of a Cultural/Creative Hub in their neighbourhood, and will play an important role in mobilizing support among the community. Two groups stand out for their stability and capability, the L.E.F. and Urban Arts. The L.E.F. is involved in their own redevelopment and expansion projects and therefore unable to concentrate their efforts on this project. Urban Arts has expressed a desire to be a part of any Cultural/Creative facility, and as the leading arts organization in the area their support is essential, however, the relocation and expansion of their space and programming might hinder their ability to fully take part, even in the short term.

5.8.3 Enthusiasm for a Cultural/Creative Hub

Enthusiasm for this project is high and expressed by a diverse group of residents and stakeholders. Other development projects, proposed or realized, have periodically been met with opposition by resident groups in the area; however, a Cultural/Creative Hub was viewed as an asset. It must be noted that there were some concerns expressed that the introduction of artists and culture workers might cause property values to rise and the displacement of less affluent renters in the area.

The excitement this project generated is evidenced not only by the comments made in our engagement, but also through the turn-out at focus groups, information meetings and the Open House. Youth, local artists, organization leaders and community members all expressed a desire for a Cultural/Creative facility in the area where residents could showcase talent and take part in arts programming.

5.8.4 Confluence of development

A significant number of construction/infrastructure projects are currently underway or are imminent. As is to be expected, there are varying levels of understanding related to the timelines and details of these projects among residents. Local interviewees frequently referenced upcoming projects with a sense of guarded optimism. Even the train track improvements, which have been criticized by local residents and organizations, were framed as a potential benefit for the area.

Local residents and organizations we spoke with understand the next few years to be a period of transition and there is some trepidation about the effects of these changes. Some fear that the improvements to the infrastructure might bring with it an increase in local land values, pushing out low-income residents. (For a more complete understanding of all the projects that are proposed or underway in the area please refer to Appendix 4).

5.8.5 Poverty, Violence and Population Flow

Nearly 25% of the population in Weston Mount Dennis is considered low-income after tax. Many of the residents we spoke with suggested that the impact this poverty has on service delivery and social issues cannot be ignored. Discussions of the placement of a Cultural/Creative Hub were often met with comments that people do not use things that are further than walking distance as many residents cannot afford the bus fare on a regular basis. Costs of any kind could be a barrier for local organizations to take part in the proposed Hub.

Crime in the study area has spiked in recent years, and residents suggested that safety is a new concern. One of our interviewees mentioned that a local youth drop in-centre, was created as a safe place for youth when the streets were no longer safe for them. Safety is a major concern in the area and will be a key factor in selecting a site and the operation of a Cultural/Creative Hub. The study area has about the same number of recent immigrants⁹ as the entire city of Toronto (19.3% and 21.6% respectively)¹⁰. Our primary research revealed a more nuanced and slightly contrary impression of immigration from local service organizations. The area is understood to be a landing zone where new immigrants stay for a short time and then move to other areas in the city. The turnover in residents is not evenly distributed across the study area. Informants suggested that the occupants of the single family homes in both Weston and Mount Dennis were stable, while residents in the apartment towers did not remain long.

5.8.6 Resource Competition

The Weston Mount Dennis area is, in fact, two distinct neighbourhoods. The imposing Irving Tissue Mill marks the border between the two areas. More than a symbolic divider the long stretch of residential and industrial lands bordering Weston Road as it passes by the mill, form a mental and physical barrier.

Residents noted that Weston and Mount Dennis are slightly competitive about resource allocation. Because of the physical as well as psychological divisions within the study area it was not uncommon to hear the opinion that a focus group or meeting held in one of the neighbourhoods would only attract residents or employees from that area. There is a perception that no one will travel between the neighbourhoods. A Cultural/Creative Hub will need to be located in an area accessible to both communities.

5.9 Development Partners and Potential Sites

Potential sites for the development of a Cultural/Creative Hub were identified through the recommendations and opinions of local residents and stakeholders. The following is the long list of sites we identified with their individual merit, planning and development status.

⁹ Recent immigrant in the Census is defined as "immigrants who landed in Canada between January 1, 2001 and census Day, May 16, 2006."

¹⁰ United Way of Toronto. (2009) Action for Neighbourhood Change: Neighbourhood Socio-Economic Profile.

Figure 13: Long List of Potential Sites



Source: Artscape, 2010

Map Reference Number	Site	Context	Pros	Cons
1	Base of tower building on George Street	The bottom floors of this tower building are currently vacant and could be re-purposed for an institutional use.	1.Large site 2.In centre of Weston 3.Symbol of revitalization/ tower renewal	 1.Extensive renovation would be needed 2. Current owner has not been contacted 3. Far from Mount Dennis
2	Weston Federal Building (CanadaPost)	The large Weston Federal Building located on Weston road north of Lawrence has housed a distribution centre for Canada post for several decades. The consolidation of several distribution centres has apparently made this property redundant. Little is known about the current status of the building beyond rumours that its sale is immanent.	 Ideal location Frontage on Weston Road Public sector ownership increases ease of acquisition 	 Future is uncertain No indication of the internal configuration or condition of the building Smaller size Mount Dennis has limited access
3	Municipal Parking lot on John Street	The 70,000 s.f Green P parking lot on John Street next to the Weston GO train station has been hosting farmers markets on Saturdays for a number of years. The site was re-imagined as a hub for the neighbourhood in a widely circulated visioning piece by Paul Bedford and University of Toronto planning students. The parking lot will be the centre of construction during the GO line improvements as the adjacent track is tunnelled, and John Street is closed to vehicle traffic. At present 50% of the site is leased to Go Transit but TPA expects this to be terminated when construction of the new station is completed. TPA plans to re-evaluate the site at this time but expects that there will be a declining requirement for parking on the site. The TPA leases the site from the City of Toronto.	 Large site Pedestrianization of John street could place the site at the centre of a neighbourhood plaza Lot is City land making acquisition procedure simple In the centre of 'old Weston' 	 Site has limited visibility, not on Weston road Noise and pollution considerations once train improvements are completed Timeline unclear Site is not close to residents in Mount Dennis
4	Weston Park Baptist Church Land	The Weston Park Baptist Church bought The site to the south of their Church building. 2/3 of the site was subsequently sold to Metrolinx and will be the home of the new Weston GO stop. The Church retained the section of the site closest to its church and has been in talks with institutions in the hopes of developing a 'hub'. The goal is to build a centre for community activity with church related and non-religious organizations as tenants. The WPBC is seeking the mix of tenants and activities that is most beneficial to local residents.	 Willing partner in the WPBC Site is located on Weston Road near major intersection Vacant land GO station next door will increase exposure 	 Church partnership could deter sections of the community Church is unsure of their timeline, funding and desires

		Metrolinx is currently creating a masterplan for the Weston GO station	1. Great exposure once	1. Competition for
5		which will be constructed on the vacant land to the south of the WPBC on Weston Road. There is a great deal of commercial and institutional	the station is completed 2. Timeline is conducive to	inclusion with the station may be fierce
	New GO Station	interest in the site. A potential partnership opportunity with Metrolinx	this project	2. Mount Dennis residents
		could be helpful in the development of this project.	3. Located on Weston Road	do not have easy access to the site
			4. Walkable for most	3. Noise of trains may be
			tower residents	a factor
		The 'Price Chopper' site refers to the former discount grocery store	1. Located nearly in the	1. Not in the centre of
		which has been purchased by Metrolinx to serve as a staging area and	middle of Weston and	either neighbourhood
		parking during construction of the upgraded tracks. The site will be	mount Dennis.	2. Noise from tracks might
6	'Price Chopper'	released for a new use once the tracks have been upgraded in	2. Large site	be an issue
		2014/15. It is unclear whether the existing one story building will be	3. Faces onto Weston	3. Located in a low traffic
		demolished or not. The site is in Weston however, it is close to the	road	area
		border of Mount Dennis.		
		The former Kodak Canada factory site on Eglinton Road is the largest	1. Vacant Land	1. Politically charges
7		and most politically charged site in the area. It has been the subject of	2. Large site	2. Not walkable
	Kodak lands	numerous redevelopment proposals since the site became vacant		3.Size may be a detriment
	Roadk Idilus	several years ago. Technically outside of the study area, difficult to		
		access and its extremely large size make it inappropriate for this		
		project.		

6. Developing a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis: Feasibility Assessment

Intensive local research and engagement in the Weston Mount Dennis neighbourhood and statistical analysis reveals both challenges and opportunities with respect to the potential to develop a Cultural/Creative Hub based on the model set out in section 4 (above).

The following is a summary evaluation of the feasibility of a Cultural/ Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis.

Challenges	Opportunities
Limited Creative and Cultural Sector Infrastructure	Expansion of Urban Arts indicates high demand and need for Creative/Cultural facilities/ services in neighbourhood
Lower than average employment in the Creative and Cultural Sector among residents	Engaged and active community members & networks with a strong desire to see something happen.
Very few Creative Businesses located in the neighbourhood	Engaged and active young people, supported by key agencies / organisations (Frontlines, Urban Arts) with a strong desire to participate and contribute and entrepreneurial spirit.
Lack of a single clear vision for a Creative/Cultural Hub	Community willingness to explore a range of options and opportunities
Fragmented neighbourhood	Significant new development and a range of development opportunities in the neighbourhood.
No clear project leader with development capacity in the neighbourhood	A strong and determined Project Champion, Cllr Nunziata, committed to the project idea.
Representation of and perception within the neighbourhood that the area is unsafe	Potential development sites in accessible locations within reach of all parts of the community.
Demographics reveal significant economic challenges	The development of Cultural/Creative Hub
faced by much of the community limiting ability to	contributes to social inclusion and economic
afford and access creative/cultural provision	revitalisation.

On balance we believe that there is enthusiasm for and the potential to work towards the development of a significant new piece of creative and cultural infrastructure in Weston Mount Dennis. Notwithstanding the challenges faced by this community and the relatively limited cultural and creative infrastructure that currently exists, a Cultural/Creative Hub is feasible. With significant funding and community partnership it can play a role in stimulating local economic development and support community cultural development and engagement to enrich the lives of those who live and work in or close to this community.

We have identified that there is:

- Significant active support within this community for the project
- A willingness to explore a range of opportunities and project visions
- Receptiveness to attracting artists and creative businesses to the neighbourhood
- A strong and determined Project Champion in local Councillor Nunziata

A number of potential developable sites in appropriate locations

6.1 Weston Mount Dennis Cultural/Creative Hub:

Building on the model developed in section 4 (above) a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis will combine a ground floor Creative Convergence Centre offering a range of commercial uses with live/work accommodation for artists and creative professionals and their families above. Although there is some demand in the neighbourhood for commercial space – including workspace, retail and programmable space – there is limited capacity for individuals or small organisations to advance this on their own. There is significant demand across the city for live/work accommodation, and while this is less well understood in the neighbourhood, the combination of the two offers the potential to attract and retain creative capacity in the neighbourhood and to create a critical mass of creative activity and business opportunity.

6.2 Weston Mount Dennis Cultural/Creative Hub: Outline Uses

Based on the results of research in the neighbourhood a Cultural/Creative Hub in Weston Mount Dennis will require the development of space to support the following uses:

Creative Convergence Centre

The ground floor of the Hub will be developed as commercial space comprising a mix of uses. The exact mix of uses, and the balance between them will be identified as a result of market testing in the immediate neighbourhood and more widely across the City. However, based on our research to date this may include a combination of any or all of the following:

- Shared workspace and small-scale creative business incubator
 - Flexible, affordable, temporary and longer-term shared creative workspace with shared equipment / resources and business development support.
- Individual artists and creative business workspaces with retail / services
 - o i.e. Jewellery designer and direct from maker retail space.
 - o i.e. T shirt design business and retail outlet.
 - o Recording studio
- Arts and Cultural Organisation workspace with or without studio space
 - o i.e. Business location for not for profit arts and cultural organisations
 - B Current Urban Dance Crew, a not for profit Urban Dance organisation, has expressed an interest in a workspace and dance studio facility in Weston Mount Dennis.
- Programmable / Public Space

- There is a strong demand in the neighbourhood for a "place to go" and for a space to "showcase" the community's talent. We believe that the availability of publicly accessible, programmable space with community access and shared management with the community and tenants will be a critical component of the Weston Mount Dennis Creative/Cultural Hub. The spaces most often referenced through the research and engagement process were:
 - Flexible performance and event space
 - Café
 - Community meeting room.

Live Work

Affordable Live/Work accommodation for artists and creative professionals and their families based on an average square footage of 750 sq. ft. per unit. Further market testing will be required both within the Weston Mount Dennis community to test demand/ need for and within the community for these spaces. In addition Market Testing across the broader Toronto-wide Creative and Cultural Community to assess levels of demand will also be required.

The exact tenant mix may include both local and relocating creative and cultural sector start ups, individual artists and arts and cultural organisations. Further market testing will be required both within the Weston Mount Dennis community to test demand / need for and within the community for these spaces. In addition market testing across the broader Toronto-wide Creative and Cultural Community to assess levels of demand will also be required.

6.3 Potential Sites

A range of sites have been identified and explored through this study process and tested through the Community Open House and assessed against the Key Consideration for Site Selection set out in the Model for Cultural /Creative Hubs (see 4.2 above). Based on this assessment we are able to provide a shortlist of five sites for further study as follows:

	Weston Park Baptist Church	The Weston Park Baptist Church owns a large site located between their church and the new GO Station site. Its exposure to the street
1	Land	and walkability for residents in the densest section of the area make this an ideal location for a new Cultural/Creative Hub in the area.
		Furthermore, the introduction of a new commuter rail stop beside it will make the site heavily trafficked. The WPBC is a willing partner in
		developing a hub.
		Metrolinx is currently creating a masterplan for the Weston GO
		station which will be constructed on the vacant land on the east side of Weston Road just south of Lawrence Ave. The new Weston station
		offers the opportunity for a Cultural/Creative Hub to benefit from
2	New GO Station	and add to the activity and placemaking effects of a new train
		station. The site is also located in the centre of the Weston community
		and easily walkable for those in neighbouring tower buildings.
		This is a highly visible site with a willing and likeminded property owner in Metrolinx.
		The 'Price Chopper' site refers to the former discount grocery store
•		which has been purchased by Metrolinx to serve as a staging area
3	'Price Chopper'	and parking during construction of the upgraded tracks. The site is located in between Weston and Mount Dennis making it accessible to
		both communities. Furthermore, the site is large and highly visible.
		The large Weston Federal Building located on Weston road north of
		Lawrence was built in the early 20th Century. The building is rumoured
4	Weston Federal Building	to be made redundant imminently. Little is known about the current
	(CanadaPost)	status of the building beyond rumours that its sale is immanent. Transferring the site may be made easier by the fact that it is owned
		by another government agency.
5		The Green P Parking lot on John Street is currently half reserved for
		Metrolinx employees. Once the construction on the new line is
	Green P	completed it is understood that the site will be available for possible
		redevelopment. It is an ideal site as it is located in the heart of old
		Weston, and easily walkable for many residents. It should be more easily acquired because the site is owned by the City of Toronto.

Figure 14: Potential Sites



6.4 Financial Sustainability

A range of Capital and Operational Budget Pro Formas have been developed which reflect on a number of the key variables that will need to be considered in site selection and business plan development.

The overarching requirement is to achieve commercial workspace that is genuinely affordable in the context of the economic realities of Priority Neighbourhood communities and affordability thresholds in the creative and cultural sector and that space within the Cultural/ Creative Hub will be allocated proportionately 25% commercial and 75% RGI Live-Work. It is also expected that the convergence space will include the provision of public, programmable space. In order to achieve true affordability all scenarios will require substantial capital funding from three tiers of government and will need to employ a range of strategies to ensure operational affordability and stability – these have been set out in full in section 4.5 (above).

6.5 Elements for Successful Project Implementation

The following pages set out the key steps that will need to be undertaken to further the development of a major new piece of creative and cultural infrastructure in Weston Mount Dennis. The development of a project of this sort will require the long term commitment and support of the City of Toronto, the community of Weston Mount Dennis, and an ever expanding circle of supporters, partners and stakeholders. A project of this complexity also requires flexibility as it evolves and adapts in response to the availability of resources, site selection and the outcomes of market testing.

The key elements for successful project implementation are set out below and focus on 4 key areas of activity:

- select a project proponent/ consortium;
- engage community stakeholders;
- initiate project work;
- build capacity for sustainability.

Select a Project Proponent/ Consortium

It is strongly recommended that a project proponent/ consortium be selected, through a Request For Proposal (RFP), to take forward business planning, development, and eventual operation of a creative/ cultural hub in the neighbourhood.

The project proponent/ consortium shall demonstrate by way of the RFP, a demonstrated capacity and expertise to develop and operate a facility of the size and scope envisioned for the Cultural/ Creative Hub.

Engage Community Stakeholders

Successful Creative/Cultural hubs are built on a strong shared vision which reflects and engages local communities and ensures their active role in project development and stewardship. The Weston Mt. Dennis community should continue to be engaged (eg: consultative meetings, open houses, focus groups) as the project proceeds, especially at key milestones.

It is strongly recommended that a Community Advisory Group champion the project and that wide community engagement remain an ongoing feature of project development. Membership in the Community Advisory Group should reflect the diversity and diverse interests of the local community and the active engagement and involvement of young people working and or/living in the community should be a priority. A maximum of 5 community representatives generally ensures the effectiveness of Community Advisory Groups of this sort.

Local community representation might include:

- Urban Arts
- LEF
- A BIA representative
- Others to be determined.

Initiate Project Work

It is recommended that the project proponent/ consortium advance the project through business planning, development, and operation of the Cultural/Creative Hub.

Initially, the project proponent / consortium will be required to develop a business plan for a new Creative/Cultural Hub. To date research has focussed on mapping creative and cultural activity and understanding the broader community, cultural and economic context in the Weston Mount Dennis neighbourhood. Further research is required to test both local and city wide markets and to test and refine the project concept and viability.

Market Testing: Weston Mount Dennis

- Test and refine the model and develop the vision in the context of opportunities, demand and needs in the local community.
- Test the market for live/work, work /organisational and programmable space from local individuals / organisations.
- Market Testing: Toronto
 - Test the Toronto-wide market for Live/work, work / organisational and programmable space.

Capacity Building for Sustainability

In order to secure the success, sustainability and long term local impact of the project we recommend an approach be developed to:

- i) leverage existing creative and cultural activity; and,
- ii) build additional community capacity.

Initiatives which aim to build capacity and activity in the Weston Mount Dennis community may include:

Building on existing Cultural and Creative Activity

 Encourage the increased use of existing underutilized space (eg: warehouse, religious and community facilities) for cultural and creative activity and programming in the neighbourhood.

Supporting Skills Development

 Support business skill development for local culture workers/ those interested in working in culture. Build the capacity and management skills of local arts and culture providers with the aim to making them ready for residence in the new Hub.

In addition to these 4 key areas of activity, it is recommended that the findings of this report be taken into full consideration in future discussions regarding creative and cultural infrastructure development in Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Definition of 'Culture'

The following are the 48 categories from the National Occupation Classification supplied by the City of Toronto as a definition of culture for this report. This list was originally used in the 2010 report 'Mapping Artists and Cultural Workers in Canada's Large Cities' by Kelly Hill of Hill Strategies Research.

- 1. Architects
- 2. Architectural technologists and technicians
- 3. Artisans and craftspersons
- 4. Camera, platemaking and other pre-press occupations
- 5. Drafting technologists and technicians
- 6. Graphic arts technicians
- 7. Graphic designers and illustrators
- 8. Industrial designers
- 9. Interior designers
- 10. Landscape and horticultural technicians and specialists
- 11. Landscape architects
- 12. Painters, sculptors and other visual artists
- 13. Patternmakers, textile, leather and fur products
- 14. Photographers
- 15. Photographic and film processors
- 16. Theatre, fashion, exhibit and other creative designers
- 17. Archivists
- 18. Conservators and curators
- 19. Librarians
- 20. Library and archive technicians and assistants
- 21. Library clerks
- 22. Library, archive, museum and art gallery managers
- 23. Supervisors, library, correspondence and related information clerks
- 24. Technical occupations related to museums and galleries
- 25. Actors and comedians
- 26. Announcers and other broadcasters
- 27. Broadcast technicians
- 28. Dancers
- 29. Film and video camera operators
- 30. Managers in publishing, motion pictures, broadcasting and performing arts
- 31. Other performers
- 32. Other technical occupations in motion pictures, broadcasting and the performing arts
- 33. Producers, directors, choreographers and related occupations
- 34. Support occupations in motion pictures, broadcasting and the performing arts

- 35. Audio and video recording technicians
- 36. Conductors, composers and arrangers
- 37. Musicians and singers
- 38. Authors and writers
- 39. Binding and finishing machine operators
- 40. Correspondence, publication and related clerks
- 41. Desktop publishing operators and related occupations
- 42. Editors
- 43. Journalists
- 44. Printing machine operators
- 45. Printing press operators
- 46. Professional occupations in public relations and communications
- 47. Supervisors, printing and related occupations
- 48. Translators, terminologists and interpreters.

Appendix 2. Interviewees and Attendees

Local Area Interviews

- 1. Urban Arts
- 2. Artists to Artist Foundation
- 3. Action for Neighbourhood Change
- 4. York Youth Coalition
- 5. Learning Enrichment Foundation
- 6. Frontlines
- 7. Evergreen
- 8. Police Liaison:
- 9. Weston Park Baptist Church:
- 10. Mount Dennis United Church
- 11. Bourrent Dance Crew
- 12. Community Development Officer
- 13. Local Councilor
- 14. Mount Dennis Weston Network
- 15. Toronto Public Library
- 16. Mount Dennis Community Association

City Wide Organizations Interviewed

- 1. Toronto Employment Services
- 2. Toronto Arts Services
- 3. TAC
- 4. Artstarts
- 5. Metrolinx
- 6. George Brown

Artist Focus Group Attendees

- 1. Ars Musica: local black opera company
- 2. Artist in Residence at WPBC
- 3. Artists
- 4. Music producer
- 5. Artist

City Staff Information Exchange

- 1. Housing
- 2. Planning
- 3. Office of Partnership
- 4. EDCT
- 5. Metrolinx

Cherry Ann – Mendez Sharon Tiessen Erminoni Damolidi **Nivell Strachan** Lin Cheong

Arnie Rose Luisa Galli Bernard Oeltien Nina Gesa & Judy Dunstan Katharyn Hanford

Mary-Catherine Hudakoc Nadira Pattison Susan Wright, Andrew Suri & Skye Louis Katherine Earl Dina Graser, Robyn Connelly & Mark logna Eugene Harrigan

Marlene McKintosh & Patrice Njoh Jacklyn Thomas & Getachew Fantu **Cutty Duncan** Shadya Yasin Peter Frampton & Jean-Marie Boutot Kristy Opoku **Rebekka Hutton Barb Spyropoulos** John Frogleyrawson Louise Mahood Ahdri Zhina Mandiela Melody Brown Frances Nuziata Rick Ciccarelli & Mike Sullivan Ewa Piatkowski

Judith Hayes

Information Exchange Meeting Attendees

- 1. Weston Collective
- 2. Economic Development Officer
- 3. UrbanArts
- 4. (unclear)
- 5. Weston King Neighbourhood Center
- 6. Weston BIA
- 7. Weston BIA
- 8. City of Toronto
- 9. City of Toronto
- 10. City of Toronto
- 11. City of Toronto
- 12. City of Toronto
- 13. Toronto Public Library
- 14. Mount Dennis Community Association
- 15. (unclear)
- 16. Artscape
- 17. Artscape
- 18. Artscape
- 19. Artist
- 20. Mount Dennis Weston Network
- 21. Learning Enrichment Foundation

Germino Politi Frank Bedard Patrice Njoh George Galle Lang Moffat Laura Alderson Marion o'Sullivan Judy Dunstan Nina Gesa Frances Nunziata Jeniffer Ciccielli Elena Bird Ewa Piatkowski Judith hayes Sam Magdy Tim jones Pru Robey Edward Birnbaum Chris-Alade Zeagraht Marabelle McTavish Victor Beausoleil

Open House Attendees

- 1. Councillor Nunziata
- 2. Cherri Hurst
- 3. Andy Glinski
- 4. Sue Mitchell
- 5. Carl Wiese
- 6. Muse Kulow
- 7. Suri Wenberg-lindsay
- 8. Luisa Galli
- 9. Jacklyn Thomas
- 10. Getachew Fantu
- 11. Diana Stapleton
- 12. Matt Brubacher
- 13. Allan Sperling
- 14. Catherine White
- 15. Anna Babit
- 16. Patrice Njoh
- 17. Matt Armstrong
- 18. Jean Boutot
- 19. Nasrin Khadri-bouran
- 20. Ludmile Cibie
- 21. M. Hilowle
- 22. Marlene Mckintosh
- 23. Lousie Mahood
- 24. Masum Hossain
- 25. Fredrick Brobbey
- 26. Dahmra Galdek
- 27. Mohamed Maye
- 28. Kristy Opoku
- 29. Cherry Ann Mendez
- 30. Alan Pace-Larbi
- 31. Paulina Okeefe
- 32. Jason Strachan
- 33. Christina Inniss
- 34. Christina Morrison
- 35. Mary louise Ashbour
- 36. Soniph Neisson
- 37. Judith Hayes
- 38. Simon Chamberlain
- 39. Laura Albanese

Appendix 3. Building Manager and Tenant Representative Survey

The following report is the result of a series of interviews with local TCHC tenant representative and building managers. It was prepared by the local cultural Coordinator, Patrice Njoh.

TCHC Buildings

In the Study area

0	Eagle /	<u>Manor</u>	1901	Weston Rd.
				-

- <u>Weston Bellevue</u> 5 Bellevue Cres.
- <u>Weston Towers</u> 3101 Weston Rd.

TCHC Questionnaire

(From Artscape)

<u>NAME:</u> Title: Community: *Your connection to TCHC/the area:

- 1. What is the address of the building you represent?
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented in the building?
 - Ethnic:
 - Employment:
 - Age:
- 3. Is there a common room or facility that is shared?
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in the building?
- 5. Who runs it / who participates? N/A, No programming in the building
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had? / are the current facilities large enough?
- 7. What programming do they wish was offered?
- 8. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture?
- 9. Do artists/community members feel like they have enough space to work on projects?

TCHC Interview -1

<u>Frederick Brobbey</u> Youth Tenant Rep, Weston Towers

*He is well known throughout the building as well as in the community. He is well connected with senior members of the TCHC and can give insight into the status of the building at an organic level. "There hasn't been steady development for youth in the area with regards to arts, and leadership and these are the areas that Weston needs. They also need programs that take into account the unique cultural demographics."

- 1. What is the address of the building you represent?
 - 3101 Weston Rd Weston Towers
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented in the building?
 - Ethnic: Ghanaian, Jamaican, and small Arab and Caucasian population
 - Employment: Factor Jobs, Community Work, TCHC
 - Age: Youth population is the largest (8-19), then 28-50
- 3. Is there a common room or facility that is shared?
 - "Run-Down" Gym (un-open)
 - Party Room (Pay-per use, minimum \$400)
 - "We do our Regional (West Area) TCHC meetings at Eagle Manor"
 - "Participatory budget Meetings are at Columbus Center (Lawrence/Duffrin)
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in the building?
 - Nothing
- 5. Who runs it / who participates? N/A, No programming in the building!
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ are the current facilities large enough?
 - Music Studio
 - Art Facility
 - Sports and Recreation
- 7. What programming do they wish was offered?
 - Breakfast Program
 - Soccer, Yoga, Dance Teams
 - Business Programming for youth, but also for adults
 - Free or subsidized programs
- 8. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture?

There really is not place to go, most of us go outside of the community or downtown.

TCHC Interview -2

<u>Luis Eduardo Mejicano</u> Youth Engagement Coordinator (YEC) for TCH

- 1. What is the address of the building you represent?
 - 1901 Weston Road (Eagle Manor)
 - 5 Bellevue crescent http://www.torontohousing.ca/our_housing/weston_rexdale
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented in the building?
 - Ethnic: Caribbean, West African, Somali
 - Employment:
 - Age: in 1901 Weston Road it is mainly adults-senior aged with hardly any youth tenants
 - Age: in 5 Bellevue crescent, mainly adults-senior aged with a minimal population of youth
- 3. Is there a common room or facility that is shared? Yes, we have spaced in both buildings.
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in the building?
 - Eagle Manor has a community garden and both have programs for seniors and Bellevue has an early childhood program.
- 5. Who runs it / who participates? N/A, No programming in the building.
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants
 - iv.

*Community garden is tenant led, other programs are agency led Weekly in the evenings and daily after school.

- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ are the current facilities large enough? I believe this may not be an issue.
- 7. What programming do they wish was offered? Not sure
- 8. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture? Not sure

PLEASE NOTE: As a YEC, I have very limited contact with Eagle Manor due to the age population and have had a difficult time engaging youth at 5 Bellevue. I've attached a second survey to this based on two communities that I serve, which in my opinion should definitely be included in this project due to their proximity to area.

Community Interview-3

<u>Luis Eduardo Mejicano</u> Youth Engagement Coordinator (YEC) for TCHC

1. What is the address of the building you represent?

a. Scarlettwoods Court & 58 Waterton Road (SWC)
b. 1025 Scarlett Road. Scarlett Manor (SM)
http://www.torontohousing.ca/our_housing/weston_rexdale (both are just across the park from your Weston/Mount Dennis Project area.

- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented in the building?
 - a. Ethnic: SM (Somali, Ghanian and some Caribbean)
 - b. Ethnic: SWC (Somali, Caribbean and some Ghanian)
 - c. Employment: substantial segment of youth looking for part time & full time work. Many parents are employed.
 - d. Age: young population in both buildings
- 3. Is there a common room or facility that is shared? Yes to both buildings
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in the building?
 - a. Not enough, SWC does attend Kiddie's Carnival and has had a film program running in the community. SM has held many private cultural gatherings and a healthy children's program.
- 5. Who runs it / who participates?
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants

Many initiatives have been tenant led, children's program has been delivered by an agency and Kiddie's Carnival, film program have had some staff support.

- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ are the current facilities large enough? Computer Lab at SWC.
- 7. What programming do they wish was offered? Boys programming at SWC. Consistent recreation program using gym at SM (mainly basketball). Women specific programming for Somali women. Employment workshops (that lead to actual jobs) at both.
- 8. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture? Caribana SWC, much culture is tied into religion for the Somali community at both places. SOYAT is a great organization that youth from SM gravitate to naturally. Ghanaian parties for that community.
NAME: Kristy Opoku Title: Executive Director, Frontlines

*Your connection to the area: "I live, work and worship in the community of Weston"

- 1. Where in the neighbourhood do people go for culture?
 - Churches and places of worship hold events, the BIA and most of our non profits hold yearly events. These events usually centre around music or drama.
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented where you work?
 - The majority of our participants are Caribbean and Hispanic maybe about 50% are immigrants (between 1-10 years in Canada), The remainder are 2nd generation. Our other participants are multi generational Canadians.
 - Many of our teenagers are chronically unemployed or continuously quitting or being fired.
 - We work with kids between the ages of 6 and 26 the majority are between the ages of 10-18
- 3. Is there a common facility or space that the community often uses ?
 - Central United for funerals and concerts, Little avenue park for dramas
 - Lion's park for concerts and celebrations
 - Elm Park for yearly neighbours night out
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in Weston-Mt. Dennis?
 - Silver Band, Culture Shock, talent shows from time to time, amateur dramatics, plays at churches, etc
- 5. Who runs it / who participates?
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - 1. I assume mostly volunteers. CultureShock was run by UrbanArts and Canada Day celebrations were organized by the City Counsellor
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - 1. once a season? More during Christmas and Easter
 - iii. Number of participants
 - 1. range from 20 to 2000
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ Are the current facilities large enough?
 - A central location, large performance hall and rehearsal space
- 7. What programming do residents wish was offered?
 - More dance (of various styles) and vocal (various) as well as visual arts.
- 8. Do artists/community members feel like they have enough space to work on projects?

I believe not

NAME: Muse Kulow

Title: Publisher Immigrant Post Magazine * Your connection to the area: Writing and Publishing

- 1. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture?
 - Architecture, Design, Crafts and Visual Arts
- What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) in your community?
 Age Groups: Visible minorities, Youth, Immigrants, Seniors
- Is there a common facility or space that the community often uses?
 No
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in Weston-Mt. Dennis?
 - Art and Dancing
- 5. Who runs it / who participates in these events? Individual Cultural Groups
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ Are the current facilities large enough?
 No
- 7. What programming do they wish was offered?
 - Painters, sculptors and other visual artists
- 8. Do artists/community members feel like they have enough space to work on projects?
 No
- 9. How does immigrant post give some voice to the community?
 - The Immigrant Post is to link diverse issues that broadly cover immigrants' political, economic, cultural and social status in Canada, while actively seeking public discourse on issues that impact immigrants such as public policy, housing, employment, language.

<u>NAME:</u> Jerry McDonald & Vanessa Barratt Title: Building Manager, Office Assistant Community: 1775 and 1776 Weston rd (Twin Tower Buildings)

- 1. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture?
 - Weston BIA
 - Frontlines
 - Youth Settlement Services
 - Library
 - Lions Club
 - Skating Rink
 - Basketball Court
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented your community?
 - Our building is very diverse, with residents from all parts of the world. We have a good amount of students and young children. There isn't enough for them to do.
- 3. Is there a common facility or space that the community often uses?
 - No. Our recreational facility is for both buildings, but has been out of use for over 4-5 years. It is dark; there is nothing in there.
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in Weston-Mt. Dennis?
 - Nothing!
- 5. Who runs it / who participates in these programs? N/A
 - i. Status (i.e professional / voluntary / full time part time activity etc)
 - ii. How regular (every day / week / evenings / sometimes etc)
 - iii. Number of participants
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ Are the current facilities large enough?
 - We really need a recreational space! We really need a place for kids to burn some energy without vandalizing their community.
- 7. What programming do resident's wish was offered in their community?
 - Homework Club
 - Recreational Room
 - Art Studio
 - Music Studio
 - Something to incorporate little kids and families.
- 8. Do artists/community members feel like they have enough space to work on projects?
 - No, there is not enough space. We also need more supervised areas for youth to practice their art.

<u>NAME:</u> John Carlova Title: Superintendent, Non TCHC Building Community: Weston

*Your connection to the area: I have lived in this community since I moved to Canada from Romania.

- 1. Where in the neighborhood do people go for culture?
 - Parks
 - Humber River
 - BIA festivals and events
 - Yorkdale Silvercity
- 2. What are the largest groups (ethnic, age, employment, status etc.) represented your community?
 - The three major ethnic groups are Polish, Albanians and Nigerians. We have a lot of Canadians, as well as immigrants from other counties like Jamaica, Chile, Hungary and Pakistan. My community is very diverse.
- 3. Is there a common facility or space that the community often uses?
 - We don't have common spaces, and there aren't many in the community. People try to use the parks and go to Yorkdale. There isn't much to do right here in Weston for single people or families.
- 4. What sorts of cultural and creative activities take place in Weston-Mt. Dennis?
 - Things done by the BIA, but people tend to stick with things done by their own ethnic groups.
- 5. Who runs it / who participates in these programs? N/A
- 6. What facilities do the residents wish they had?/ Are the current facilities large enough?
 - I wish there were more monuments or things that are artistic and uniquely Weston. I would like people to take pride in the area. I have been all over the world, and seen some of the most beautiful an historic places. Since I moved to Canada in the past year I have only seen 1 thing I can recall, and it was downtown.
- 7. What programming do resident's wish was offered in their community?
 - Cultural Areas
 - Mentorship programs
 - Beautiful things
 - Safe spaces to congregate
 - Homework Club
- 8. Do artists/community members feel like they have enough space to work on projects?
 - No, there is not enough space to actual get constructive things done, so the kids end up getting into trouble.

Appendix 4. Confluence of Development

GO/Metrolinx

Metrolinx is currently expanding their service between Georgetown and Union Station in downtown Toronto. In the process the tracks are being twinned and a new station in Weston is being constructed. Metrolinx has acquired 1865 Weston Rd (immediately south of Lawrence St. W) which will house the new station and parking, and 1731 Weston Rd. (former Price Chopper grocery store) which will be used as a staging space while construction is ongoing. A station master plan is currently being created and Metrolinx is open to a continuing discussion of potential uses. The new station and tunnel will cause John Street to close; a new community designed pedestrian bridge will connect the street.

Jane Street Hub

A health-centred hub has just opened at 1541 Jane Street just north of Trethwey and just outside of the study area. The facility has six major tenants: Unison Health and Community Services, COSTI, Macaulay Child Development Centre, Midaynta Community Services, North York Community House, and Yorktown Child and Family Centre. The hub will also provide space for community meetings and a kitchen that can be used by the public. The project has been funded by the Ontario Government and the United Way. The hub is intended to become the service delivery center for the community, providing medical care, employment assistance child care and settlement services.

This facility will co-locate service providers that were already present in the area as well as some that were based further afield. Although it is very close to the Weston/Mount Dennis neighbourhoods, its location on the other side of the train tracks and bridge has been criticized by residents as too removed from their daily lives and inconvenient.

Recreation Centre

A proposed \$26.5 Million community center is to be constructed at the south-east corner of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Ave. It will be primarily focused on recreation and sports with a fitness centre and running track, several multi-purpose rooms and two swimming pools with a 200 seat viewing area. The project lies outside of the study area but will be the closest recreational facility to the Weston/Mt. Dennis neighbourhoods. The building is intended to open in 2013.

Weston Mount Dennis Youth Arts Hub

Urban Arts, a non-profit youth focused arts agency, has received a grant from the City of Toronto to develop a new larger space where they can offer state of the art music and digital arts programs. A staple of Weston's arts and culture life, Urban Arts is moving from their current home near Weston Road and Lawrence to Bartonville Street in Mount Dennis. The space will offer a media lab and program that was created in cooperation with Microsoft Canada and Humber College¹¹. The new hub is scheduled to open in the winter of 2010/2011.

Kodak Lands

¹¹ http;//ckc.tcf.ca/org/urbanarts

When the Kodak Canada factory closed in 2005 it was the final blow to the industrial base of the area. Since then there have been numerous proposals for development on the land. The 53 acre site has been envisioned as a green manufacturing centre by some resident groups and a shopping plaza with big box stores and residential uses by a developer.

Canada Post Distribution Centre

The Weston Federal building was used as a Canada Post distribution centre until a couple of months ago. Consolidation of distribution centres has forced the closure of this location. Details on the sale of the building are scant.

Mount Dennis Library Renovations

The Mount Dennis branch of the Toronto Public Library is scheduled to be completely renovated beginning in 2012. The new Library will offer new interior and exterior designs updating the nearly 60 year old structure. The renovations will coincide with an upgrade of the branch's computers terminals. G. Bruce Stratton Architects have been retained for the renovation which are scheduled to be completed in 2013.

George Brown College

George Brown College has indicated a possible interest in locating a campus in the neighbourhood and this is one of a number of potential projects identified in their 10 year development plan. Provincial funding decisions for the college and university sector will not be known until mid 2011 at the earliest and at this stage George Brown College has neither made a commitment to, nor identified a site for a campus in the neighbourhood. The College is seeking to develop a full campus environment of between 200,000 and 250,000 s.ft.

Appendix 5. Literature Review

A great deal of academic literature has dealt with the importance of culture and the arts in economic and social development (Florida, Landry, etc). However there have been few investigations into the impacts of cultural facilities specifically. For the purposes of this study our literature review focuses only on some of the most commonly cited and influential studies of the impacts of arts and cultural facilities on the economic and social environment. A body of literature exploring best practice with regard to the development / operation of Creative/Cultural Hubs has not been identified and this is addressed through detailed precedent work elsewhere in this report.

It is important to place cultural facilities in the broader context of arts and culture in communities. The Urban Institute's 2006 report 'Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators' notes that "a mix of non-profit, commercial, public, and informal venues and opportunities for cultural engagement is essential to create the continuum of participation that enables robust arts practice and consumption, both amateur and professional" (page, 14). Furthermore, cultural/creative hub facilities are only one part of a network of locations where arts and culture are consumed and produced:

'in addition to conventional cultural venues such as museums, theatres and concert halls and permanent facilities such as libraries, community centers, and parks where arts and culture happen often on a sustained basis, such as temporary venues and events as festivals, parades, arts markets, and even farmer's markets... are important aspects of a community's cultural landscape (page, 14).'

As with all other aspects of the academic study of culture, the study of cultural facilities' impacts is plagued with definitional problems. How we define, categorize and create causal relationships with the arts for individuals and communities is still up for debate. Guetzkow (2002) suggests that the dimensions of impacts (on whom are they realized, what specific activities have different levels of impacts) is rarely specifically defined, instead they are spoken about in a non-quantitative claim-based way. The results are often "easily inflated and over generalized (page, 13)." Without delving deeply into a debate on definitions, it can be said that culture positively impacts the lives of local and regional citizens socially and economically (Florida, 2002; Urban Institute, 2006; Annabel Jackson Associates, 2008; Markusen and Johnson, 2006).

The specific dimensions of these benefits and how cultural facilities act as agents in their delivery is less clear (Guetzkow, 2002). Hedonic analysis of the effect of these facilities on property values (Metris, 2010) revealed a causal link between the creation of creative

workspaces and an increase in property values; however, the impacts were greatest within a small radius of the facility in question. Annabel Jackson Associates (2008) in a study of cultural facilities in the UK also found a link between an increase in local economic conditions for businesses and the creation of a cultural facility. A survey of cultural facilities and spaces in Canadian cities (Shultz & Johnson, 2007) revealed a tendency for these projects to cluster together, and therefore produce most of their indirect economic benefits to specific communities.

Cultural facilities create economic benefits for tenants and the wider community in a variety of ways. For tenants of a specific building a more developed artistic practice and improvements in the quality of equipment, afforded through a collective model, lead to an increase in exposure and income (Annabel Jackson Associates, 2008). For the wider community, an increase in domestic and international tourism, a new market for local goods and services, and spin-offs from tenant created businesses all improve local economic conditions (Annabel Jackson Associates, 2008). Furthermore, cultural/ creative facilities can help both the creative community and the local economy simultaneously by creating a friendly and exciting environment that retains a talent pool of creative people for the regional economy (Markusen and Johnson, 2006).

Cultural/ creative hubs also improve the social conditions in their surroundings particularly in disadvantaged areas. Social impacts of hubs have been expressly and quantitatively studied however anecdotal evidence from Canadian and international studies suggest that they can improve the image of areas with bad reputations and generally promote neighbourhood regeneration (Annabel Jackson Associates, 2008). Some have argued that arts-based facilities can improve social cohesion in communities with programs that tie professional artists and disadvantaged communities (Guetzkow, 2002). When artists work in collective shared space facilities it tends to strengthen the 'weak ties' between creative entrepreneurs, artists and the local community (Markusen and Johnson, 2006).

Works Cited

Annabel Jackson Associates. (2008) 'Assessing the Value of Creative Workspaces: a Quantification of the Cultural, Economic and Social Impacts of Being in a Creative Workspace and their Mechanisms.'

Florida, Richard. (2002). 'Rise of the Creative Class.' Basic Books.

Guetzkow, Joshua. (2002) 'How the Arts Impact Communities: An introduction to the Literature on Arts Impact Studies.' Taking the Measure of Culture Confrence.

Jackson, Maria, Florence Kabwasa-Green & Joaquin Herranz. (2006). 'Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators'. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Markusen, Ann & Johnson, Amanda. (2006) 'Artists' Centres: Evolution and Impacts on Careers, neighbourhoods and Economies.' Project on Regional and Industrial Economics. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, university of Minnesota

Metris Arts Consulting. (2010). How Artist Space Matters: Impacts and Insights.' Metris Arts Consulting.

Sheppard, Stephen C. et al. (2006) 'Culture and Revitalization: The Economic Effects of MASS MoCA on its Community' Center for Creative Community Development.

Shultz, Erin & Johnson, Kelsey. (2007). 'Cultural Facilities and Spaces in Canada: Case Study Project'.Creative City Network of Canada/ SFU Centre of Experitise on Culture and Communties.

Appendix 6. Open House Notes

Questionnaire

The section contains the questionnaire given to facilitators to prompt participants to offer their views on the neighbourhood and the proposed Hub, and common responses collected.

Questionnaire:

1. What types of groups would you like to see in the hub?

-craft groups -new media (animation, web design etc) -pottery, metal working, wood working -dance, performing Arts

- 2. What types of businesses would you like to see in the hub?
 - -graphic design -café -restaurant -arts groups with classes -book stores -gallery -music studio

3. Do you think it should focus on a particular activity/group?

- -performance -music -fine Arts -crafts -youth -new immigrants
- 4. How would you feel about live/work space?

Responses:

1. Groups in the hub:

Something for all disciplines UrbanArts Galleries and artist run centres Performance space Community space Mass camp space Pottery and painting Yoga Childcare Dance/ Music studio Museum Activities that tap into the areas cultural diversity

2. Businesses in the Hub:

Café/restaurant

Greenhouses Arts supply stores Movie theatre Graphic design Book store

3. Focus on a particular group:

Elderly Youth Local groups Non-artists African/Caribbean culture

<u>4. live/work</u>

(Comments generally positive with few specifics)

Appendix 7: Local Cultural and Creative Assets and Resources

Cultural Institutions

Mt. Dennis United Church	71 Guestville Ave.
Learning Enrichment Foundation	1267 Weston Road
UrbanArts Community Arts Council	19 John St
For Youth Initiative	1652 Keele Street
Horizons for Youth	422 Gilbert Ave.
Learning Enrichment Foundation The	116 Industry St.
Artist to Artist Foundation	1634 Weston Rd
Frontlines	1844 Weston Rd.
Weston Ci	100 Pine Street
Weston Park Baptist Church	1871 Weston Rd.
Evergreen Community Garden	3601 Eglinton Avenue West
Legion Hall branch 31	1050 Weston road
Weston Library	2 King St.

Creative Businesses

Frank G Bandiera 43 Elm St. G&K Picture Frame Warehouse and Gallery Wishart Advertising and Graphic Design 27 John St. 89 graphics and printing Mt. Dennis Library Weston Library 2 King St. Palai Printing Itd Semana Spanish Newspaper Cador Textile Importing 49 Bertal Under the Rainbow New Photo Centre

2625 Weston Rd. 1379 Weston Rd. 1123 Weston Rd. 2011 Lawrence St. W. 2011 Lawrence St. W. 21 Bijou Walk 1901 Weston Rd.

Community Identified Assets (included:)

Parks **Festivals Barbershops** Hair Salons Restaurants

Appendix 8: Full Case Studies

Figure 15: Case Study Locations



Source: Artscape, 2010

1.	Wychwood Barns, Toronto, Ontario
Web address	http://www.torontoartscape.on.ca/places-spaces/artscape- wychwood-barns
Background	Artscape has transformed the historic Wychwood TTC streetcar repair barns located in Toronto's St. Clair and Christie neighbourhood into the Artscape Wychwood Barns – a 60,000 sq. ft. multifaceted community centre where arts and culture, environmental leadership, heritage preservation, urban agriculture and affordable housing are brought together to foster a strong sense of community. The Artscape Wychwood Barns is surrounded by a 127,000 sq. ft. new City park. There are 25 work space and 26 live/work, 11 organizations and a green house operated by a community food group.
Vision	The vision for the project is to transform a historically significant, industrial building into a beautiful, useful and accessible gathering place with an inviting design and character. Artscape undertook a feasibility study to determine neighbourhood needs, encourage dialogue & develop a shared vision. During the consultation process potential partner organizations, the entire non-profit sector across Toronto and the local community were interviewed and a long list of ideas was condensed into a single and shared vision. The vision was developed through the extensive feasibility study process and emerged from the ideas of local residents.
Capacity	To guide this project through the process of visioning and development, Artscape needed the staff, expertise and resources to endure the nearly 8 year process. The needs assessment and potential tenant selection identified groups that had the capacity to pay the rent that was being asked and to sustain their operations for a period of time. The local residents were also very active and organized helping to move the project forward.
Facilities	There are 25 work space and 26 live/work, 11 organizations and a green house operated by a community food group. As well as a large open space indoors that can be rented for events and holds a regular farmers market. The decision to include these facilities was made through the needs assessment and consultation process as well as a reflection of the economic necessities of the project and the integrity of the building.
Critical Mass	The creative community was surveyed as well as the environmental organizations in the city. Design charettes and consultations were conducted with the creative community. This helped to determine the correct mix of uses and unit sizes for the facility. Artscape revealed that there was demand and therefore a case for creating the Barns. The area had a high percentage of artists and culture workers at the

	time the project was proposed.
Diversity	There is a wide diversity in terms of activities that happen at the Barns and the groups that occupy space there. Everything from individual artists to retail shops and a green house use the facility. This has allowed a buzz of activity to animate the space. The diversity of tenants also brought in different streams of funding.
Partners/collabora tion	There were several partners involved in the development and funding of the facility including: the City of Toronto, Taddlewood heritage, the Stop Community Food Co-op and a community advisory group. A manager of development was hired to bring all the parties together and keep the development moving forward.
Programming/com munity engagement	There is a community board made up of ten active local residents that were originally tasked with booking the public space and the gallery. Today they have relinquished some of their responsibilities to Artscape however they still hold free community events in the gallery and the covered street barn regularly. There are some collectively programmed events such as in the gallery.
Financial sustainability	The Wychwood Barns is operated on a cost recovery basis. The rents do not pay for the capital budget, instead they are designed to cover the operating budget only. There is no operational funding received for the facility, tenant rents are the only revenue although there are some rent-geared-to-income units that have offered revenue for the facility through subsidy.
Site selection	The site was selected because the local community had pushed for a suitable use for a locally cherished space that was become derelict. That is was close to downtown and transit made it a suitable space to house both businesses and institutions. The area is also very safe and the building is located within a park space.
Governance model	There is a local board of residents that helps to program and manage the collective spaces. The building is managed by Artscape and the park space by the City of Toronto. Some tenants in Artscape buildings are on the board of Artscape however there is no requirement that tenants from the barns are on it. The building is managed and operated by Artscape.

2.	401 Richmond, Toronto, Ontario
Web address	http://www.401richmond.net/
Background	Located on the south side of downtown Toronto's Richmond Street West near Spadina Avenue, the building at 401 Richmond was originally built in five stages between 1899 and 1923 by Scottish immigrant David Macdonald for his lithography company. The building was purchased in 1994 by the Zeidler family, who understood the need for affordable space for artists, creative businesses, and community service innovators. Margie Zeidler spearheaded the building's adaptive reuse as an affordable cultural and commercial centre, which resulted in an award of Merit from Toronto Heritage in 1999. After 18 months of ownership the building's occupancy increased dramatically from 40% to nearly 100%. Tenants include art galleries, fashion designers, film makers, jewellers, architects, communication specialists, charitable organizations, and many more. Today there are over 200 people and organizations on the waiting list for space at 401 Richmond.
Vision	The most basic vision of the facility is the provision of affordable space for artists. Responding to the demand that was present in the creative community at the time, the vision was created when the building was identified and purchased. Creating a profitable business that did not require subsidy to exist was also an integral part of the vision and has been achieved by the project.
Capacity	UrbanSpace property group was created to operate the 401 Richmond building. Prior to this, the Ziedler family purchased the building with little experience or capacity but, with a great deal of social capital and knowledge of architecture and the creative community. The price of the building (less than 10\$/sq. ft.) allowed the project to proceed on private funds alone.
Facilities	 The building provides critical workspace to an array of non-profit and for-profit cultural producers and creative microenterprises, as well as fosters exchanges, relationships and collaboration among tenants through innovatively designed communal spaces and programs <u>Workspace:</u> The 200,000 sq ft, 5-storey building (basement included), provides space for 138 tenants. The former factories structure allows for a range of spaces, many of which have been designed to the

	 Interactive Space: The buildings corridors act as art exhibition space, while a rooftop garden, café, and courtyard further promote interaction among tenants and visitors alike.
	 <u>Eco-Restoration</u>: Several "green" elements include vertical gardens of perpendicular hydroponic planting systems and green roofs. Greening the indoors involves numerous plants that line corridors and common spaces, in addition to dedicated recycling that also includes composting.
	Soft Infrastructure
	Daycare Services - Studio 123: The building's Early Learning Centre is an arts-enriched, childcare environment that serves children aged three months to five years. Partnerships have formed between 401 Richmond Ltd, local businesses, and artists to develop culturally rich programming that expose children to a variety of arts. Priority for space in the centre is offered to tenants. However, members of the community can also access the daycare if space is available.
	 <u>Newsletter</u>: The Update Newsletter provides a communications vehicle and community builder that began in June 1994 to continually inform tenants and visitors of the activities, resources, accomplishments and opportunities at 401 Richmond and the broader community.
	^o <u>Technology and Tenant Lounge</u> : The building and its tenants are profiled on the 401 Richmond website, which also includes the 'Tenant Lounge,' a secure area for interactive online dialogue and resource-sharing among tenants. The entire building is wired with high-speed internet technology.
	 <u>Community Programming</u>: 401 Richmond extends its programming to the wider community through several exhibitions, guided tours, conferences and events including Doors Open Toronto, Artsweek, and the Holiday Marketplace that takes in December as an open-house involving artisans on all five floors .
Critical Mass	The demand for the space was assessed by Margie Ziedler
	during her time on the board of Artscape. No formal market testing was performed. At the time the area was zoned for commercial and offices and studios and there was a crash in

	the dot.com bubble which allowed affordable space to appear.
Diversity	The space is curated to have a mix of different activities. There are usually about 35% studios and the rest: galleries and small businesses. If there is gap in the make-up of the building, then priority is given to a group or individual that meets the criteria. The building is seen as a neighbourhood, and as such, UrbanSpace hopes to have a little bit of everything in it. The diversity in the building means that companies buy from each other and use the services of the other organizations.
Partners/collaboration	There are no formal partners with the project.
Programming/community engagement	UrbanSpace helps to curate art in the hallways and created a non-profit daycare. A rooftop garden for the tenants was also created. The public spaces of the building are always trying to be animated. The public is invited in to the building for <i>Nuit Blanche</i> and <i>Doors Open</i> . Any city wide arts or culture festival is incorporated into the buildings programming. UrbanSpace also offers tours for the public when asked. The public is also engaged through the independent organizations in the building that offer classes and workshops.
Financial sustainability	The site was purchased by the Zeidler family in 1994 for \$1.5 million. Renovation and restoration costs unknown. The building is self-sustaining through rent from tenants that average \$12/ square foot compared with \$18-\$20 in the surrounding area. Rents are charged according to criteria developed by UrbanSpace that uses cross-subsidies are developed between non-profit and for-profit tenants to keep units affordable. The building does not have financial supporters. It was fully leased in 18months following purchase.
Site selection	The building was selected because of its location in the city, its size and age, but predominantly for its price.
Governance model	In 1994 Margaret Zeidler purchased the 401 Richmond building with financial assistance from her parents Eb and Jane Zeidler, to form 401 Richmond Ltd. Margaret Zeidler is President of the holding company UrbanSpace Property Group, which also owns and operates the Gladstone Hotel and Robertson Building in Toronto. Although privately owned and operated, 401 Richmond operates in a 'value-based' and 'community-minded' way to provide a healthy relationship between tenants and landlord. While 401 Richmond is incorporated as a for-profit business, management charges below-market rent in order to provide

	affordable space for creative people and industries. There is no board, no funders and no stakeholders involved in decision making, 401 Richmond is a private building and is operated as such. Urban Space sees itself as a private landlord with a different set of values. Tenant input is solicited at lease reviews but not formally in a structured feedback or power sharing process. Originally there were town hall meeting among the tenants; the major issues were around safety. As safety concerns in the area have dissipated, the demand for neighbourhood watches and town meeting has lessened. No members of the community are involved in the governance process either.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	Outcomes have not been formerly measured.

3.	Imperial Cotton Centre for the Arts and the Cossart Exchange Hamilton, Ontario
Web address	http://www.imperialcottoncentre.com/
Background	The imperial cotton centre for the arts is a converted industrial building that houses artists' studios and has shared space in downtown Hamilton. It is located in an impoverished industrial area with a great deal of abandonment. The ICCA has become a centre for artistic activity in the city. It is the outgrowth of a substantial amount of research, most notably a needs assessment that formed the basis for the project's vision. The Cossart exchange is a newly opened facility run by the ICCA. It is a collaboration with academic and other institutional partners. Each of the projects has been championed and headed by Jeremy Freiberger.
Vision	The vision for the Imperial Cotton Centre is to be a co-location site with interaction between artists and a collective atmosphere. The facility aimed to ease the high demand for space in Hamilton's creative community. The vision was developed through a years worth of consultation and conversation with artists in the area. The project has changed over time as new road blocks and opportunities have emerged, however, the central vision of a place where artists could work and interact, and where costs could be kept low through economies of scale remained. The vision of the Cossart Exchange program is to help creative industry entrepreneurs, artists, and innovators in taking their projects from concept to fruition.
Capacity	Experts in multiple fields including finance, development and fundraising were retained to help refine and perfect the projects details. The most important, element according to Jeremy Freiberger, was having the best people with lots of experience working together on the project, it could not be done alone or with a skeleton crew of enthused but inexperienced people. Not everything can be done in-house as well, organizations in the area that tried to pursue projects with only their own staff have failed, outside experts are essential.
Facilities	 The cotton centre has 19 studios, shared kitchen and a ground floor café and gallery. "The Cossart Exchange is housed in a dynamic 1,700+ square foot administration & meeting space in the core of the city, plus a unique lounge and rooftop engagement space".
Critical Mass	After a year of research within the community it was revealed that there was little to no studio culture and a great desire

	among working artists in the city to have space where they could practice and interact with each other. The evidence that was revealed though this mapping and interview process led Jeremy and a few others to conclude that there was latent desire among the arts community. When asked, a large percentage of practicing artists in the city expressed a desire to take part in a new centre. Once a substantial number of potential tenants had come on board and there was a commitment for the provincial level Jeremy felt there was enough momentum to move forward. The Cossart Exchange represents a gap in the business skills of the creative community and hopes to improve the ability of creative entrepreneurs to succeed. The demonstrated lack of business knowledge among the creative community was the impetus for the project.
Diversity	The Imperial Cotton Centre has only practicing artists as tenants. No organizations, institutions or educational groups are part of the space. However, the Cossart Exchange has non- profit, institutional and educational partners. Having these groups aligned with the project has allowed the public to feel more comfortable with the hub and has helped the City to support it. The Cossart Exchange assists creative entrepreneurs of all stripes.
Partners/collaboration	Four local businessmen helped to purchase the cotton centre building. Building community support through a collaborative process is essential. Building consensus is a staged process where the community and partners are brought onside at one stage and then are asked to agree on the next. Jumping to the final stage too quickly can cause the general public and the creative community to reject the project. Working with property owners to secure a deal of the site involved selling the vision and trying to convince the buildings owners to come on side and donate the space.
Programming/community engagement	The Imperial Cotton Centre does not have programming, although the public is invited through for open studio tours. The Cossart Exchange, as an incubator, "offers participants shared administrative space and resources, access to technology, business and creative mentors, grant writing and business planning expertise, networking opportunities, and marketing. The centre provides knowledgeable and dedicated staff in order to assist each participant in reaching their goals."
Financial sustainability	The ICCA is supported by various levels of government and private sponsors including the City of Hamilton, the Trillium Foundation, Wellington Brewery and IKEA. The Cossart Exchange is supported by the City of Hamilton, the

	McMaster Innovation Park, small business Enterprise Centre and other corporate and public agencies.
Site selection	Each of the sites were selected because they were located in the centre of Hamilton and were affodicble within the budget. The ICCA is an industrial building that was converted into creative space by restoring the structure and keeping it raw.
Governance model	The ICCA is run as a non-profit with a board of governors. The Cossart Exchange is a program of the ICCA.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	The Cossart Exchange is specifically designed to improve the economic conditions of the local area by creating and sustaining local creative businesses.

4.	AS220, Providence, Rhode Island
Web address	http://www.as220.org/front/
Background	AS220 is a not for profit art space manager that operates three facilities in the city of Providence, Rhode Island. The project was initially born out of an artist-led "manifesto" issued in 1982 with the aim of challenging accepted notions of arts practice and professionalism. The project evolved into AS220 in 1985 first as artists' studios on Richmond street and, over time into as a multi dimensional project supporting live/work, work studios, a wide range program of events and performances and a commitment to engaging youth and youth at risk in arts and culture.
	The project has become one of the center pieces of the culture –led regeneration of Providence which, once struggling from the impact of the collapse of traditional industries, now describes itself as "The creative capital".
Vision	AS220 is a not for profit community art space. AS220 offers an 'uncensored and unjuried' forum for the arts. Through the provision of gallery space, living space and working space as well as art friendly retail and business space AS220 hopes to contribute to the 'cultural mulch' of the city. Initiated as an outcome of an artists' "Manifesto" the project started out as a "unjuried" gallery and workspace. The "Manifesto" authors were three local artists Umberto Crenca, Steven Emma and Martha Dempsterirst and the project started with \$800 and their commitment to providing an accessible space for creativity in the city.
	At the time Providence Rhode Island was experiencing significant economic revitalisation supported by local and national Community Development Funds invested in infrastructure developments designed to arrest dramatic population decline and address the challenges of post industrial economic restructuring.
	The development of AS220 as a major Creative and Cultural hub in the city was one of a number of significant arts and cultural projects developed in the 1980's in the City (incl. The Steelyard, Waterfire) which have played a central role in rebranding the city and contributing to new economic activity.
Capacity	The project Founder and Artistic Director, Umberto Crenca, is one of the original "manifesto" authors, a local resident and a passionate and determined visionary who has led the evolution of the project from the earliest days. Crenca has

	been a consistently effective advocate for the project and for its role in the wider regeneration agenda in the City, working closely with City Hall, City Mayors and the wider business community. Crenca has long been committed to the revitalization of Downtown Providence, and plays an important role in community efforts across the region serving on multiple Boards and Committees including Providence Mayor Cicilline's Arts Culture and Tourism Advisory Board, the steering committee for the department's Creative Providence cultural assessment and planning initiative. The board of Providence's Downtown Improvement District (DID). While the project started as an "artists-led" intervention it has grown into a multi-site, multi-dimensional project which now employs 35 staff in management, program, teaching and catering roles.
Facilities	AS220 has three buildings in Providence, RI. The Dreyfus hotel: originally built in 1890. it now houses the organization's main office, the community print shop, a art gallery, fourteen affordable live and four work rental studios and a restaurant. The Mercantile Block a recently purchased 50,000 square feet building that houses tenants of the former building (a locksmith and a bar) and restaurant, print shop and lab on the first floor. The higher floors have live work studios and organizational tenants.
	The Empire Street building's 21,000 s.f provides a home to AS220's Performance Space, <u>The AS220 Bar</u> , <u>AS220 Foo(d)</u> , AS220 Youth Studio, the Paul Krot B&W Community Darkrooms <u>3 of our 4 Gallery Spaces</u> , and twenty live/work studios for artists. Empire Street is also called home by some tenants and partners: <u>Perishable Theatre</u> , Roberto's Barber Shop and Muldowney's Pub.
Critical Mass	The Founders were practicing artists and residents who identified the importance of bringing artists and creative people together in a 'safe" environment to develop their work. Since the project's inception the creative and cultural sector across the city has grown substantially and the city is now attracting professional artists from across the country and further afield.
Diversity	AS220's buildings contain a mix of commercial, residential and presentation space. None of their facilities are dedicated solely to a particular art form, they are open to

	all the creative industries. In additional Gallery space, AS220's stage has long been one of the busiest and most consistently varied venues in Rhode Island. <u>The open booking</u> <u>policy</u> has been embraced by an astonishing array of performers with as many as 12 performances taking place every week at different AS220 facilities. These presentations include theatre, a wide variety of musical genres, spoken word etc.
	AS220 also focuses much of its programming activity to support young people, youth at risk and young offenders with a range of creative skills development through its community electronic lab, print studio etc. This commitment to creating and sustaining an open environment where anyone regardless of their background or practice can develop a creative practice is central to the vision of the project. It also reflects on the role that these diversity of uses have in creating a sense of life and real economic activity in and around the project sites. "Our whole purpose is to make the arts and creativity as accessible as possible and to recognize in our programs and our behaviour that we value the expressive potential of every single individual on the planet no matter what their situation or condition The way you ensure quality is by providing opportunity."
Partners/collaboration	AS220 projects have been achieved through partnership and collaboration with members of the arts and cultural and wider community in Providence, many of whom offered their sweat equity in the project's early days. In the early years, there was no payroll. AS220 relied entirely on volunteers, including the resident artists, to keep the doors open and the lights on. These roots have helped "make this organization unique. There was never any question about the motivation of people who worked here. They were here to participate in, to support, to promote the values and philosophy of this organization."
Programming/community engagement	Live/Work and workspace tenants of the third floor of Empire Street and the Dreyfus and the Mercantile Block studios are considered as a community of ideas rather than simply a community of tenants. AS220's goal is to create a cooperative living environment driven by the artistic energy of its inhabitants. On Empire Street, one live/work studio is reserved for a visiting artist in residence pursuing a focused project at AS220. Invited artists make use of our facilities and share their work, inspiring conversation and innovation throughout the larger community.

	Since 1998, Crenca has spearheaded efforts to bring more meaningful arts education programming to incarcerated youth. In 1999, Crenca established AS220's youth arts program, Broad Street Studio, which continues to serve and support youth transitioning out of state care with arts instruction and professional development at AS220's Empire St. location All areas of AS220 that are open to the public double as gallery spaces. The Empire Street site attracts about 50,000 people a year.
Financial sustainability	Live work and workspace is available at affordable (i.e. below market) rates for artists and members of the wider creative community. The project is supported by public and private sector funding sources alongside individual membership and donations. Recent Ford Foundation funding is designed to strengthen management systems, expand finance & development offices & create a diversity plan to address the sustainability of its new AS220 Mercantile Building as a live/work space for artists. AS220 pulls together diverse funding and financing sources to secure capital development with as limited financing as possible. For the Dreyfus this included a Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston contribution involving a \$300,000 grant and a subsidized advance making possible affordable permanent financing through member Bank Rhode Island. An acquisition loan from the city of Providence, predevelopment assistance from the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), a predevelopment loan from Bank of America, grants from Rhode Island Housing, and support from the City of Providence Affordable Housing Fund all played a role. The most significant single funding category has been state and federal Historic Tax Credits and New Markets Tax Credits. This funding allowed for a \$7.5 million project. AS220 will have about \$1.5 million in permanent financing supported by rent for the affordable housing, work studios, and the market-rate restaurant.
Site selection	In 1992, AS220 acquired a 21,000 square foot, three floor building on Empire Street that was severely blighted and almost totally abandoned. Within a year the site was 100% occupied and operational. This was accomplished with a very limited budget of \$1.2 million dollars, tremendous community support, fund-raising, and a lot of sweat equity. What was once an almost lifeless block in downtown Providence is today a thriving mixed-use arts complex and a destination for an estimated 50,000 people each year. This project was one of the first significant steps in the creation of the Providence Arts

	and Entertainment District. The Dreyfus Hotel was purchased by AS220 from Johnson & Wales University in April of 2005. Originally built in 1890, it was most recently used as a dormitory from 1975-2000 by JWU. The Dreyfus has a long history as a hotel, lounge, and restaurant that served the bustling downtown theatre district and weary travelers searching for lodging from the nearby train station. AS220's adaptive re-use of the historic Mercantile Block provides for a vibrant mix of live and work studios, arts related offices and one-of-a kind, local retail and commercial spaces. Especially noteworthy is the effort to revitalize Martha Street. Original building openings have been uncovered and restored, creating a beautiful and highly functional set of entrances, replete with glass sidelights, transoms and storefronts. Once regarded as a "back alley", Martha Street is being transformed into a vibrant pedestrian way, greatly animating the neighbourhood and enhancing safety.
Governance model	AS220 is a non-profit with a Board of Directors which includes members of the local community.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	AS220 has played – and continues to play – a significant role in the physical, social and economic regeneration of providence. The adaptive reuse of downtown buildings into vibrant, publically accessible creative and cultural hubs plays a major role in the City's Downtown Entertainment and Creative District while approaches to tenanting and programming reflect a consistent vision of supporting the cultural life of the City and creating economic opportunities for some of its more challenged communities.
Lessons	AS220 is a Vision-driven project and has successfully expanded the range and diversity of its activities while retaining clarity of purpose and direction. The passion and conviction of the project founder has played a key role in the success of the project. The project has successfully attracted an ever growing of supporters from a diverse range of sectors / agencies through effective partnership and collaboration.

5.	Arts Incubator of Kansas City, Missouri
Web address	http://artsincubatorkc.org/homepage/
Background	The Arts Incubator of Kansas City was designed to fill the gap between school and success for artists. The facility was envisioned and championed by Jeff Baker who saw potential in a warehouse building in an up and coming creative area. Having heard about incubators in the 90s while studying fine arts he hoped to make a facility that offered shared space and office for artists. The aim was to create a space that would help improve the business skills of the creative community and be a centre for the neighbourhood.
Vision	The vision for the AIKC is a hub for creative entrepreneurs, a place where they could start their business and improve their financial and marketing skills. Beyond that the space was designed to be a site for the creation of art and a place where people in the region can come to enjoy the arts. Seven months of planning and focus groups as well as conversations with local civic leaders and artists about what their interests and their vision was helped to assess the potential for the facility. The very positive responses helped to build support but, also changed some ideas of how to organize space and how much to charge.
Capacity	The centre of the AIKC's development and operation capacity is its entrepreneurial leader. Jeff is a business man and attacked the facility as an entrepreneur. Community and public support also helped to get the project moving forward. The success of the facility is its reliance on the hard work and vision of a few dedicated people.
Facilities	The AIKC has 47 artist studios, a large programmable or rentable space, classrooms. The facilities were designed through consultation with local artists.
Critical Mass	The facility is located in an area with older buildings with many artists and creators but that was lacking a culture of studios and galleries. The local art institute and universities with art programs provided a good supply of artists, however there was a need for spaces and programs to help their financial success.
Diversity	Tenants range from artists who are recent graduates to artists that have been engaged as professional artists for several years. There are some nonprofits that have offices there as well. The benefits of having a diverse group are that a mix of talents and experience feeds the tenants and their financial and creative lives are able to evolve organically.

Partners/collaboration	It was not a collaborative project. It was a business venture that evolved into a non-profit operation. We have good relationships with other organizations. We support more organizations then we are supported by.
Programming / community engagement	A new group of artists is accepted once a year for a two year program that has different phases of business development. Phase 1 developing a healthy studio practice and goals Phase 2 business planning process Other groups rent space from the facility, and some space is offered for free to charitable and professional associations. There is a curated public gallery with several exhibits a year and shows artists from the building and international artists. The general public comes to the 'First Friday's' night which has a studio tour. 3-4K people come to these events typically. There are also events every day organized by different tenants or public groups.
Financial sustainability	The AIKC relies on 2/3s earned income and 1/3 philanthropic support. It can maintain the core of the organization without philanthropic support. For instance, when hurricane Katrina struck all the philanthropic money that the incubator depended on disappeared. The AIKC has always had a balanced budget and never carried debt. The first 5 years the director took very little salary.
Site selection	The vision existed for several years before the space opened. Designs and plans were made without a space in mind. The building was selected because the whole place was for rent. It was a case of serendipity. It was the ideal neighbourhood for this type of facility to be in. The area was starting to be the focus for art, but the properties were still affordable. Artists were looking for spaces in one of the creative neighbourhoods and wanted a space that was amenable to art creation. The buildings on either side were mostly empty warehouses and there were lots of boarded up buildings in the area. There were some hip places that came and went, but the greater community did not know about the area yet. The mix of affordability and an identified creative area were the main drivers of the site selection.
Governance model	There isn't very much input from the community in the operation of the AIKC. The Incubator is organized as a non-profit with a board of directors that evenly divided between professionals and artists. The incubator occupants do not have a formal seat

	at the board table however, recently board meetings have been held in studios so that the board members have a chance to meet the artists and interview them. This informal process allows the individual artist a chance to give their input to the board.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	There is no direct measurement of the impact. There has been an incredible transformation of the local area. That is in some way related to the success of the AIKC.

6.	McAllen Chamber Creative Incubator, McAllen Texas
Web address	http://www.mcallenart.com/About
Background	McAllen, Texas is a small city near the Mexico/US border. To encourage economic development, and the arts in particular, the Chamber of Commerce created an arts-based incubator several years ago. The city has been growing at a rapid pace in recent years while the arts and culture of the community remained stagnant. The City manager, influenced by Richard Florida's book 'The Rise of the Creative Class', decided to develop strategies to reverse this trend. Consciously attempting to compete with larger centres, the incubator was conceived as a method by which the cultural profile of McAllen could be heightened, in turn making the city more attractive to outside business investment.
Vision	McA2 Creative Incubator is intended to help the prospects of self-employed artists. McAllen is not known for its artistic community therefore the incubator was designed to cluster the arts and cultural actors that were present and generate more interest and activity through art and performance classes. Its vision of increasing and concentrating the creative industries of the city together, responds to the dispersed and low-level of these activities in the city at the time of its inception. Increasing the business skills of arts professionals is the focus for the program of business support offered by the incubator.
Capacity	Pressure from the City manager and co-operation from the McAllen's chamber of commerce helped to create the project. The chamber of commerce runs the facility and has hired a program manager who works there full time.
Facilities	There are 12 low-rent studios (100-300\$, 125-300 sq. feet), a central classroom and a gallery. The incubator is housed in a former community college building owned by the city and leased to the Chamber of Commerce and the incubator. There are no specially designed facilities. This keeps the costs low and the barriers to entry low for prospective tenants.
Critical Mass	The specific needs and characteristics of the creative community were not measured before the creation of the project. There was little in the way of professional creative workers in the city; however there was an interest in amateur arts and creative activities.
Diversity	There is a mix of creative enterprises and not for profits and sole practitioners. Not for Profit organisations from across the creative and cultural sector are able to apply for tenancy at the incubator. For Profit business start ups in the creative and cultural sector are not eligible to apply. There is no

	concentration on a particular sub-sector of the creative economy. The facility has a diverse group of tenants which increases the exposure it receives and the dynamism in the shared spaces.
Partners/collaboration	There are two partners in the McAllen incubator, the City and the local Chamber of Commerce.
Programming/community engagement	The facility is first and foremost an incubator and as such, there are several services and courses that tenants have access to. Legal, technical and managerial services are offered to tenants at a reduced price as well as a compulsory management workshop which all tenants are required to take focussing on financial, accounting, managerial and marketing skills. Every tenant is required to have one show a year in the facilities gallery which is open to the public. The shared space in the facility is also used for classes and courses to which the public is invited.
Financial sustainability	The facility derives its operational funding from the rent of tenants, and from the chamber of commerce and city budgets. A hotel tax has largely been directed to the incubator and the rent from the tenants and non-tenants that temporarily use the space helps to fund the project. The facility was made available by the city and the chamber of commerce. Operational budget comes from the chamber of commerce and the City.
Site selection	The McAllen incubator is housed in a former community college building which has been refurbished to suit this new use. The choice of location had more to do with the specific buildings availability and City ownership, rather than the neighbourhood itself. Because the city was not known for its creative economy the facility was not chosen because it was in an existing cluster.
Governance model	The incubator is operated by the McAllen Chamber of Commerce. The chamber has a board of directors and is charged with improving the business environment in the city of McAllen.

7.	Hot House Creative Cluster, London, England
Web address	http://www.freeform.org.uk/hothouse.htm
Background	During the 1990s and early 2000s London experienced an unprecedented rise in property values as large banks and commercial operations began to expand beyond the core. The resulting gentrification forced artists and many others from their homes and workspaces in the boroughs to the east and north of the City. To fight against this forced migration, FreeForm, an artists' led initiative that provides training workshops and exposure to creative activities, applied for funds from the European Regional Development fund to construct a permanent space for the arts. Located in the borough of Hackney, Hot House provides spaces for creative businesses and has become a centre for the local and artistic community.
Vision	The vision for the facility was to create a space where artists and creative businesses could remain even if the surrounding property values rose. Creating a new building that appealed to green building principles and regenerated an environmentally degraded area. The vision was a facility that could be a venue, resource and a workplace for artists and the community. The vision that FreeForm created responded to the gentrification at the time and the need for clustering in the industry.
Capacity	FreeForm had existed for some time when they chose to develop the hothouse facility. The group had experience working with designers, developing projects and receiving grants. There were several granting partners but, only FreeForm developed the project.
Facilities	Hothouse is located in a newly built structure on a contaminated site along the London to Standstead train line. There was a demand for space in the sector and the area, but more importantly there was a demand for well designed space that was adaptable. In all there are 27 small business tenants in the facility and a large space that is available to the public for rentals. The space is also used for art and performance showcasing events. The roof of the building is used for art installations because the site is beside a commuter train tracks.
Critical Mass	Freeform completed 2 reports to build the case for the Hot House facility. The first resulted from presentations and consultations with local residents and the second from similar research with artists. Groups offered suggestions for what they wanted to see in the facility and how they would use it.

Diversity	There is a mix of tenants in the facility and there have been a diverse number of short term users and outside agencies that have rented the space for single events. This diversity has allowed cross sector collaborations between tenants to create some unique and successful projects.
Partners/collaboration	There were countless partners in the process of constructing and initiating the project. Roughly 10 government partners and development agencies were instrumental in Hothouses success. There is only one operator of the project.
Programming/community engagement	Hothouse is used by local residents and agencies from the Royal institute of British Architects to local schools and photography festivals. The site takes part in Doors Open, university classes are sometimes held there or taken for tours and there is an arts-for-commuters program which displays art on the side of the building that faces the train tracks. There are numerous training programs and workshops that tenants or FreeForm itself offers to the public that are held in the HotHouse facility.
Financial sustainability	The spaces in the Hothouse are provided at below market rate and at roughly the same level as other non-profit creative space provision facilities. The facility is now at the stage that it "washes its own face" a.k.a. it is financially sustainable. This balanced budget was achieved after only 18months from the completion of the final building stage.
Site selection	The site was selected because it was in a neighbourhood that had a number of artists and creative workers that were under pressure due to rising rents. The site also allowed freeform to enact its vision of a new building with green construction standards. The location allowed the new facility to be a centre for the neighbourhood and a locus for the neighbourhood.
Governance model	FreeForm is a non-profit with a board of governors and trustees. They are currently attempting to integrate tenants into the decision making process. Local community members are on the board as are artists and professionals from around the city.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	FreeForm has collected information on the jobs created and retained, space created and the economic impacts of the project.

8.	Artspace, various locations USA
Web address	www.artspace.org
Background	"Artspace's mission is to create, foster, and preserve affordable space for artists and arts organizations." The warehouse areas of Minneapolis went through a process of gentrification familiar to many large north American cities that saw the exodus of artists and creators that had resided there. Artspace was created in 1979 to respond to this reality by advocating for affordable space. In the mid-80s the organization began to develop spaces itself. Today, Artspace also aids in the planning and development of cultural and performing arts venues.
Vision	The vision for Artspace's facilities is the provision of affordable and sustainable studios and creative business space. Artspace works by invitation, helping to create facilities that are suited to specific areas/communities. Artspace feels that its work has to be done by invitation because the strength of local determination is the most important therefore, ensuring that the local community wants an arts facility is essential.
Capacity	Artspace has a large staff and a great deal of experience developing this type of project. Each project is the result of one or two people from the local area that are passionately supportive and determined.
Facilities	Artspace owns and operates 27 facilities in 17 cities, in 12 states. Some are exclusively live/work, others have commercial tenants as well and workspace. In all there are 846 residential units, several buildings have performance spaces and/or creative businesses.
Critical Mass	A series of focus groups are always conducted in a pre- feasibility stage. This helps to raise the profile of the project and to determine the need for different assets in proposed facilities. If there is demand, Artspace does a survey of all the creative community to determine the income levels, size and demand for affordable housing. If there is low support Artspace might just work as a consultant rather than develop the project itself. A need for 40-50 units of residential space should be identified for a project to be feasible. Creative businesses of non-profits are brought on board early to ensure that there will be tenants for the commercial space. Sometimes small projects work in big cities. But usually the size

	of any of Artspace's projects is more than 60,000 sq.ft.
Diversity	Diversity is a goal for all of Artspace's developments. The group creates a panel of local artists that represent a range of ethnicities and disciplines to guide the development of projects. Affordable housing rules mean that once an artist is on the list for space they cannot be cherry picked. Collaboration is often mentioned as one of the most attractive aspects of being in an Artspace building, therefore incorporating as many different types of tenants as possible is desirable.
Partners/collaboration	Every neighbourhood and community is different but, state and city staff and elected politicians are key. As is the local grassroots support and demand.
Programming/community engagement	Each of Artspace's projects is different, however, there are some similar programmes and/or engagement initiatives in many of its facilities. To help create an economically sustainable environment for residential tenants, Artspace has joined forces with local groups to train tenants in business and career development. Furthermore, these groups train tenants to train other tenants in each building, so that every building has a few resident experts in creative business. There are child care and babysitting co-ops in many of Artspace's buildings and the group has begun to encourage their development in new facilities. The general public is invited into Artspace's buildings through open houses for exhibits and gallery shows. Furthermore, some tenants have businesses and some buildings are just commercial and the public is constantly moving through the building.
Financial sustainability	Artspace's facilities are funded from some of the following organizations: "Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Historic Tax Credits, CDBG and HOME funds, Federal Home Loan Bank funds, Tax Increment Financing, city and state cultural facility grants, a conventional first mortgage, and philanthropic gifts. Artspace also utilizes federal state and local resources available through established funding programs that assist in the creation of affordable housing and economic development projects." Artspace's facilities are all self sufficient. Tenant rents pay for all the mortgage and tax costs from the beginning. This is achieved through a mix of federal, state, local and corporate
	funding before the project is completed. "In setting our rents, we adhere to affordable housing guidelines set by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban

	Development. HUD uses a complex formula based on the Area Median Income (AMI) of the city or county in which the project is located, the degree of affordability of any given unit (expressed as a percentage of the AMI), the number of bedrooms in the unit, and the number of people in the artist's household. While rents vary by community, Artspace buildings provide live/work spaces that are significantly larger and usually less expensive than other comparable spaces. And Artspace buildings remain affordable in perpetuity.
Site selection	The original Artspace facilities were constructed in the Minneapolis warehouse area because of the demand for affordable permanent Artspace of a certain quality. Today, Artspace chooses to develop properties if a municipality invites the organisation to complete a feasibility study of potential sites. Roughly 10% of these feasibility studies result in actual projects being developed.
Governance model	Artspace is a non-profit organization. Some buildings have special agreements such as a co- ownership with tenants or a co-operative model that allow tenants to have more of a say in the operation and financing of the building. Tenant associations are now more common than co-ops. Co-ops were too adversarial while associations are more co-operative. Within the tenant association there are committees that help to run specific aspects of the buildings.
Outcomes/regenerative effect	The goal of Artspace is to improve communities through art. This includes the wider economic conditions of an area which has been measured in a report entitled 'How Artist Space Matters: Impacts and Highlights'. This report quantitatively measures the economic impacts of three Artspace facilities and found that there was a clear career boost for those artists that resided in the projects and an increase in local property values caused by the developments.

Operating Budget

		1										
Toronto Artscape Inc. Toronto's Priority Neighbourhoods		-						-				
Creative/Cultural Hub - Scenarios		-						-				
Year One Operating Pro Forma												
SCENARIO NO.	L			<u>1</u>		<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>		<u>6</u>
				_								_
		1		RENOVATION		OVATION	RENOVATION	N	IEW BUILD	NEW BUILD		W BUILD
REVENUE	<u>Notes</u>	p	<u>).s.f.</u>	SMALL	IV.	IEDIUM	LARGE	1	SMALL	MEDIUM		ARGE
	bldg s.f.			28,000		48,000	64,000		28,000	48,000		64,000
GROUND FLOOR - WORKSPACE	ground s.f.			7,000		12,000	16,000		7,000	12,000		16,000
REVENUE												
Work space	s.f.			5,250		9,000	12,000		5,250	9,000		12,000
\$1 base rent; \$4.5 additional rent		\$	5.5	\$ 28,875	\$	49,500	\$ 66,000	\$	28,875	\$ 49,500	\$	66,000
Event space	s.f.	1		1,750	1	3,000	4,000		1,750	3,000	l	4,000
\$1 base rent; \$4.5 additional rent		\$	5.5		\$	16,500		\$	9,625		\$	22,000
Less Provision for Vacancy Loss			2%	-\$ 770	-\$	1,320	-\$ 1,760	-\$	770	-\$ 1,320	-\$	1,760
Net Programming Revenue and/or Operating Grant				\$ 34,166	\$	80,420	\$ 107,143	\$	47,427	\$ 80,562	\$	105,787
TOTAL WORKSPACE REVENUE				\$ 71,896	\$	145,100	\$ 193,383	\$	85,157	\$ 145,242	\$	192,027
EXPENSE								-				
Building Management												
Building Management		\$	1.25	\$ 8,750		15,000	\$ 20,000	\$	8,750	\$ 15,000	\$	20,000
Sub total Management		\$	1.25	\$ 8,750	\$	15,000	\$ 20,000	\$	8,750	\$ 15,000	\$	20,000
Operations												
Property Insurance			0.30	\$ 2,100	\$	3,600	\$ 4,800	\$	2,100	\$ 3,600	\$	4,800
Utilities			3.50	\$ 24,500	\$	42,000	\$ 56,000	\$	24,500	\$ 42,000	\$	56,000
Repair/Maintenance			3.00 1.50	\$ 21,000 \$ 10,500	\$ \$	36,000 18,000	\$ 48,000 \$ 24,000	\$ \$	21,000 10,500	\$ 36,000 \$ 18,000	\$ \$	48,000 24,000
Programming Property taxes			-	\$ 10,500	э \$	- 18,000	\$ <u>24,000</u> \$ -	э \$	-	\$ 18,000	э \$	- 24,000
Sub total Operations		\$	8.30	\$ 47,600		81,600	\$ 108,800	\$	47,600	\$ 81,600	\$	108,800
		•		A = 050	_		^ 10.000			^	•	
Capital Reserve per sq.ft.		\$	0.75	\$ 5,250	\$	9,000	\$ 12,000	\$	5,250	\$ 9,000	\$	12,000
TOTAL WORKSPACE EXPENSE		\$	10.30	\$ 61,600	\$	105,600	\$ 140,800	\$	61,600	\$ 105,600	\$	140,800
Workspace Operating Surplus (Deficit)				\$ 10,296	\$	39,500	\$ 52,583	\$	23,557	\$ 39,642	\$	51,227
Annual Long Term Debt Service (P+I)			6%	\$ 10,296	\$	39,500	\$ 52,583	\$	23,557	\$ 39,642	\$	51,227
Operating Surplus /(Deficit)		1		\$0	-\$	0	\$0	\$	0	-\$0	\$	0
UPPER FLOORS - RGI RESIDENTIAL	upper s.f.			21,000		36,000	48,000		21,000	36,000		48,000
REVENUE												
Live/Work studios	# units			28	1	48	64		28	48	1	64
[RGI subsidy for 750 s.f./ unit]	750	\$	750	\$ 252,000	\$	432,000	\$ 576,000	\$	252,000	\$ 432,000	\$	576,000
Less Vacancy			2%	-\$ 5,040	-\$	8,640	-\$ 11,520	-\$	5,040	-\$ 8,640	-\$	11,520
										,		
TOTAL LIVE/WORK REVENUE				\$ 246,960	\$	423,360	\$ 564,480	\$	246,960	\$ 423,360	\$	564,480
EXPENSE												
Building Management												
Building Management		\$	1.25	\$ 26,250	\$	45,000	\$ 60,000	\$	26,250	\$ 45,000	\$	60,000
Sub total Management		\$	1.25	\$ 26,250	\$	45,000	\$ 60,000	\$	26,250	\$ 45,000	\$	60,000
Operations												
Property Insurance		L	0.30	\$ 6,300	\$	10,800	\$ 14,400	\$	6,300	\$ 10,800	\$	14,400
Utilities			3.50	\$ 73,500	\$	126,000	\$ 168,000	\$	73,500	\$ 126,000	\$	168,000
Repair/Maintenance		-	3.00	\$ 63,000		108,000	\$ 144,000	\$	63,000	\$ 108,000	\$	144,000
Property taxes Sub total Operations		\$	- 6.80	\$ - \$ 142,800	\$ \$	- 244,800	\$ - \$ 326,400	\$ \$	- 142,800	\$ - \$ 244,800	\$ \$	- 326,400
		-				,200		-				,
Capital Reserve				\$ 52,517	\$	36,134	\$ 48,387	\$	19,808	\$ 35,784	\$	51,732
TOTAL WORKSPACE EXPENSE		\$	8.05	\$ 221,567	\$	325,934	\$ 434,787	\$	188,858	\$ 325,584	\$	438,132
		Ľ	2.00		Ĺ			Ĺ	100,000	- 020,004	–	.50,152
Live/Work Operating Surplus (Deficit)				\$ 25,393	\$	97,426	\$ 129,693	\$	58,102	\$ 97,776	\$	126,348
					-		A (AA AAA	-	50 400	* 07 770	¢	126,348
Annual Long Torm Dakt Comden (D. N												1/0 1/18
Annual Long Term Debt Service (P+I)			4%	\$ 25,393	\$	97,426	\$ 129,693	\$	58,102	\$ 97,776	Ψ	120,340

Capital Budget

Toronto Artscape Inc.								
. e. e								
Toronto's Priority Neighbourh	noods							
Creative/Cultural Hub - Scena	rios							
CAPITAL BUDGET								
SCENARIO NO.		1	1	2	3	4	5	6
COLINATIO NO.			•	-	Ŭ	-	Ű	Ŭ
		NOTES	RENOVATION	RENOVATION	RENOVATION	NEW BUILD	NEW BUILD	NEW BUILD
		NOTES	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE
		square feet:	28,000	48,000	64,000	28,000	48,000	64,000
SOURCE OF FUNDS								
Funding								
Government Grants								
Federal + Provincial			62%	57%	57%	55%	46%	44%
Canada Cultural Spaces Fund	33%	of non-residential	526,641	1,083,328	1,695,364	608,997	1,394,211	2,318,439
Affordable Housing Grant	70,000		1,960,000	3,360,000	4,480,000	1,960,000	3,360,000	4,480,000
Ontario Trillium Foundation	10,000		500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Other Federal + Provincial Funding			1,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000
Sub total Federal + Provincial			3,986,641	7,443,328	11,675,364	4,068,997	7,754,211	12,298,439
Municipal			21%	20%	20%	18%	18%	18%
Waive Municipal fees			25,000	45,000	65,000	25,000	45,000	65,000
Waive land transfer tax			10,500	35,000	70,000	10,500	35,000	70,000
City contribution of land			300,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	300,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Other Municipal contribution			750,000	1,100,000	1,500,000	750,000	1,500,000	2,250,000
Section 37 funds								
			250,000	400,000	500,000	250,000	500,000	750,000
Sub total Municipal Funding			1,335,500	2,580,000	4,135,000	1,335,500	3,080,000	5,135,000
Total Government Grants			5,322,141	10,023,328	15,810,364	5,404,497	10,834,211	17,433,439
			8%	8%	10%	10%	24%	28%
Private Fundraising		<u> </u>	525,000	1,050,000	2,000,000	750,000	4,000,000	8,000,000
i iivato i unaratoling			020,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	100,000	4,000,000	0,000,000
TOTAL REVENUE			5,847,141	11,073,328	17,810,364	6,154,497	14,834,211	25,433,439
EXPENSE								
EXPENSE								
		D.S.f.	\$ 150	\$ 175	\$ 200	\$ 175	\$ 225	\$ 275
Hard Costs		p.s.f.	\$ 150	\$ 175 8 400 000	\$ 200 12 800 000	\$ 175 4 900 000	\$ 225	\$ 275
Hard Costs Base building construction		p.s.f. incl tenant fit-up	4,200,000	8,400,000	12,800,000	4,900,000	10,800,000	17,600,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies		incl tenant fit-up	4,200,000 25,000	8,400,000 45,000	12,800,000 65,000	4,900,000 25,000	10,800,000 45,000	17,600,000 65,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency	10%		4,200,000 25,000 420,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies	10%	incl tenant fit-up	4,200,000 25,000	8,400,000 45,000	12,800,000 65,000	4,900,000 25,000	10,800,000 45,000	17,600,000 65,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency	10%	incl tenant fit-up	4,200,000 25,000 420,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency	10%	incl tenant fit-up	4,200,000 25,000 420,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs		incl tenant fit-up of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants	10%	of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 420,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management	10% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 420,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs	10%	of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management	10% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 420,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs	10% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs	10% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs	10% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 880,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 420,000 210,000 210,000 840,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000 980,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 490,000 245,000 245,000 980,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 420,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 840,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 980,000 348,934 17,447	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 798,834	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 980,000 348,934 17,447	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration:	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 1,080,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 1,760,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration	10% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 1,280,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns	10% 5% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency	10% 5% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of total budget	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 3,520,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns	10% 5% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration	10% 5% 5% 5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 3,520,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,334,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt	4,200,000 25,000 4,645,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 3,520,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,334,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,334,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,689	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,even Sub total Fund Raising	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,689	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 30,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 1112,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 19,425,000 880,000 3,520,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,328,384 66,419 1,334,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 18,900 20,000 160,680 1112,500 1112,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,328,384 66,419 1,3394,803 75,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 2,000,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,even Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 112,500 112,500 300,000 10,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 35,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 1,200,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 18,900 20,000 160,680 1112,500 1112,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,328,384 66,419 1,3394,803 75,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 2,000,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,even Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 112,500 112,500 300,000 10,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 35,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 2,000,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder ReIns Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,even Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20% 15% 3.5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 112,500 112,500 300,000 10,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 35,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 1,200,000 70,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax Subtotal Land TOTAL EXPENSE BEFORE INTERE	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20% 20% 3.5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations of land value of land value	4,200,000 25,000 4,20,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500 310,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000 1,035,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 300,000 3352,680 352,680 300,000 2,000,000 70,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 1112,500 112,500 300,000 310,500 310,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 1,000,000 1,003,000 1,035,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 1,200,000 2,000,000 2,000,000 2,070,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax Subtotal Land	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20% 20% 3.5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations	4,200,000 25,000 420,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 331,747 316,834 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500 310,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 300,000 300,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 1112,500 112,500 300,000 10,500 310,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 35,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 1,200,000 70,000 2,000,000
Hard Costs Base building construction Fees, Permits and Levies Contingency Subtotal Hard Costs Soft Costs Architecture + Consultants Construction management Other Soft Costs Subtotal Soft Costs Project Management Project team Contingency Subtotal Project Management Administration: Financing fees Legal Administration Insurance and Audit Communications/Stakeholder Reins Contingency Sub total Administration Fund Raising Campaign team;materials,signage,ever Sub total Fund Raising Land Land value Land transfer tax Subtotal Land TOTAL EXPENSE BEFORE INTERE	10% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 20% 20% 3.5% 5%	incl tenant fit-up of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of construction of total budget of project mgt of administration of administration of donations of land value of land value	4,200,000 25,000 4,20,000 4,645,000 210,000 210,000 840,000 301,747 15,087 316,834 316,834 35,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 78,750 78,750 78,750 300,000 10,500 310,500	8,400,000 45,000 840,000 9,285,000 420,000 420,000 420,000 1,680,000 620,709 31,035 651,744 55,000 50,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 157,500 157,500 1,000,000 35,000 1,035,000	12,800,000 65,000 1,280,000 14,145,000 640,000 640,000 2,560,000 971,384 48,569 1,019,953 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 300,000 3352,680 352,680 300,000 2,000,000 70,000 2,000,000 70,000	4,900,000 25,000 490,000 5,415,000 245,000 245,000 245,000 980,000 348,934 17,447 366,381 35,000 30,000 30,000 18,900 20,000 26,780 160,680 1112,500 112,500 300,000 310,500 310,500	10,800,000 45,000 1,080,000 11,925,000 540,000 540,000 2,160,000 2,160,000 798,834 39,942 838,776 55,000 50,000 50,000 50,000 18,900 40,000 42,780 256,680 600,000 600,000 600,000 1,000,000 1,000,000 1,003,000 1,035,000	17,600,000 65,000 1,760,000 19,425,000 880,000 880,000 3,520,000 1,328,384 66,419 1,394,803 75,000 70,000 70,000 70,000 18,900 60,000 58,780 352,680 1,200,000 1,200,000 2,000,000 2,000,000 2,070,000