

NO VACANCY

PART I

A Cultural Facilities Policy for the City of Toronto

PART II

An Overview of the Toronto Arts Community's Workspace Crisis

PART III

A Review of Specific Workspace Concerns Within Each Discipline

**Toronto Arts Council
27 Madison Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5R 2S2
(416) 392-6800**

© 1988

**Third Printing
Revised**

"Artists are the storm-troopers of gentrification"

Montreal graffiti, 1987

"I have said before and I repeat here 'The arts are not a cost in the community, but an investment; not a luxury, but a necessity; not something for a narrow elite but vitally important for the mainstream of life here.'"

Mayor Arthur Eggleton

(excerpt of speech given to the Arts and the
Cities Conference, January 1988)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

A CULTURAL FACILITIES POLICY FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

.....	9
Summary	11
Introduction	13
Background	15
Current City Cultural Support	15
The Need for a Cultural Facilities Policy	15
The Goals of a Cultural Facilities Policy	15
The Benefits of a Cultural Facilities Support Policy	16
Recommendations	16
Terms of Reference for Working Group	17
Policy Options	17
Policy Consensus Development	21
Policy Development Time Frame	22

PART II

WORKSPACE FOR THE ARTS IN TORONTO: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEMS

.....	23
The Crisis	25
A Brief Profile of the Arts	25
The Toronto Context	27
Clustering	28
The Impact of Gentrification and Rising Real Estate Values	29
Difficulties Encountered in Raising Capital Funds	31
Individual Artists' Workspace	33
Artists' Living Spaces	35

In Conclusion	36
Part II Notes	37
PART III	
A REVIEW OF SPECIFIC WORKSPACE CONCERNS WITHIN EACH DISCIPLINE	39
EXHIBITION ORGANIZATIONS	43
Physical Characteristics:	43
Location:	43
Cost:	44
Current Situation:	44
Exhibition Organizations Summary Table	47
SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	49
Physical Characteristics:	49
Location:	49
Cost:	50
Current Situation:	50
Service Organizations Summary Table	51
PERFORMING ARTS	53
OVERVIEW	53
DANCE ORGANIZATIONS	53
Performance Space:	54
Rehearsal Space:	56
Production Space (Set & Prop Construction/Wardrobe):	56
Storage:	56
Dance Organizations Summary Table	59

MUSIC ORGANIZATIONS	61
Performance Space:	61
Rehearsal Space:	62
Music Organizations Summary Table	65
THEATRE COMPANIES	67
Performance Space:	67
Rehearsal Space:	68
Production Space (Set & Prop Construction/Wardrobe):	69
Storage Space:	69
Office Space: Dance, Music, Theatre	70
Theatre Companies Summary Table	71
Notes to Part III	73
APPENDIX A	
PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTIONS AND REMISSIONS AND RENT FORGIVENESSES 1985 - 1988	75
APPENDIX B	
WORKSPACE CONCERNS IN THE LITERARY COMMUNITY	77
APPENDIX C	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

PART I

A CULTURAL FACILITIES POLICY FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

PART I

A CULTURAL FACILITIES POLICY FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

Summary

Introduction/Recommendations:

This Toronto Arts Council report addresses the work-space crisis affecting small and medium-sized non-profit Toronto arts and culture organizations and individual creative artists. It asks the City to accelerate the preparation of a cultural facilities support policy appropriate to the non-profit sector and it recommends immediate action to halt the crippling artistic drain.

The Report recommends that:

- * a working group be established in order to make recommendations to City Council for the timely development and implementation of a Cultural Facilities Policy for the City of Toronto according to terms of reference outlined in this Report;
- * the policy be developed for submission to City Council before the end of 1989 and be fully implemented by 1991;
- * pending full development of this policy, the City should ensure that workspace needs of the City's arts community are viewed as a priority concern in all planning undertaken and all decisions made regarding use, development or disposition of City-owned premises.
- * pending the full development of the policy, the City establish immediately a Cultural Facilities Support Grants Fund with a 1989 budget of \$2-million.

Background:

The crisis caused by re-development, gentrification and escalating space costs, is described in detail in Part II of this report, Workspace for the Arts in Toronto: An Overview of the Problems. In that section an extensive examination is made of the increasing pressures of rising rental rates, short term leases, and the exercising of landlords' sale and demolition clauses which has resulted in the disruption and dispersement of the vibrant neighbourhoods that artists have created. As a result many artists and arts organizations have been and continue to be forced to relocate, fragmenting one of the City's vital assets - its arts community.

Part III of this report, A Review of Specific Workspace Concerns Within Each Discipline, contains the results of a pilot study conducted by the Toronto Arts Council in 1986 and 1987 which surveyed the space needs and problems of arts organizations on a discipline by discipline basis. Key workspace-related problems encountered by artists and their organizations which are identified in Part III include:

- * rapidly increasing rental rates;
- * the brevity of available leases;
- * the threat posed by sale and demolition clauses;
- * physical deficiencies of the lowest-cost space available, combined with the problems associated with raising the capital for the retrofitting or other necessary improvements, given the brevity of leases offered;
- * the rapid turnaround of the real estate market and the problems this poses for those planning to purchase a building or share of a building, given the time required by funding bodies to consider capital grant requests;
- * the difficulties of securing both living and work space that is accessible, affordable and offers some degree of security for individual artists, particularly visual artists, who must provide their own workspace on the basis of average annual incomes that fall 37% below the average for the labour force population in general.

Introduction:

The pressures of residential and commercial gentrification and other redevelopment are inexorably forcing the small and medium-sized arts organizations and individual artists, whose creative clustering downtown gives Toronto its unique artistic texture and diversity, out of the city and into affordable suburban working venues - especially studio, rehearsal and construction spaces. The Danny Grossman Dance Company, internationally recognized as a Toronto dance fixture, is the latest to fall victim to rent increases, having been forced to move its studio facility to Etobicoke. Many of our promising, productive, Toronto creative artists have established their studios outside of our City, outside of Metro and outside of the province. Fragmentation of our developing creative "critical mass" is not in the best interest of Toronto as a centre of arts and culture. (See Part II and Part III of this report for a comprehensive description of this situation.)

The effects of this crisis are of particular concern to small and medium-sized organizations not housed in City-owned or otherwise secured premises, and to individual creative artists. These organizations and artists do not have the resources either to acquire their own premises or to roll with the repeated punches of rent increases of 50%, 100% or higher.

Bearing in mind the concerns of the Mayor, the Commissioner of Planning and Development and of Toronto's non-profit arts and culture community, Toronto Arts Council has prepared a range of policy options regarding a facilities policy for the City of Toronto. In addition, this report makes recommendations to immediately address the space needs and opportunities of small and medium-sized arts and culture organizations and of individual creative artists.

This report addresses the need for development of a Cultural Facilities Policy which pertains to all applicable non-profit arts and culture organizations in the City of Toronto. However, the recommendations respecting facilities support grants are only for application to small and medium-sized organizations, where the space crisis is most acute. In cases where the City may wish, from time to time, to make ad hoc facilities grants to organizations which do not meet the small and medium-sized definition (or other criteria), this should be done in addition to the program for the high priority area of small and medium-sized organizations.

It has been estimated that more than 125,000 persons earn some or all of their income in Toronto from the arts or arts-related work in industry. This wide range and high standard of arts activities attracts visitors from all over the world to Toronto, in addition to serving some 5-million persons resident in or near the City of Toronto. The activities of the arts/culture groups also serve to articulate the dreams and aspirations of Toronto's widely diversified ethnicity and, by means of festivals and other community manifestations, make the arts accessible to a broad range of residents.

The Toronto Cultural Facilities Policy should be formulated in the context of this highly-developed artist population, and in the awareness that a crisis has developed in the area of working space for our smaller and medium-sized arts groups and for individual creative artists. Any continuation or acceleration of this lamentable trend will result in irreparable weakening of Toronto's arts community, whose strength has in no small part derived from its past ability to "cluster" creatively in our city.

City Council in 1976 began the process of policy development respecting cultural facilities with the inclusion in the Central Area Plan of section 6.10, which states:

"To provide for public enjoyment of the arts, Council will encourage:

- i) Expansion of the St. Lawrence Centre to include suitable and adequate facilities for the performing arts and related functions;
- ii) A centre for the visual arts to be established conveniently to the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Ontario College of Art;
- iii) Provision of accommodation and facilities for such activities as concerts, theatrical performances, and exhibitions in public or private buildings located in district commerce centres; and
- iv) Location of the English speaking network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the Central Area."

Section 6.3 of the Plan states:

"It is the objective of Council that within the City there will be space and facilities for education, research and the arts to attract and hold the people needed for a prosperous city commanding a position of international leadership."

The recognition by the non-profit arts and culture community of the need for a comprehensive City cultural facilities policy was reflected in the 1985 TAC report Cultural Capital, which identified the community's two greatest needs: working capital and working space. Parts II and III of this report, which deal with arts workspace problems, update the crisis nature of the situation and document the consequences of continuing neglect due to the policy vacuum.

In his June 6, 1988 report, the Commissioner of Planning and Development has similarly called for a comprehensive City cultural facilities policy and is to be commended for drawing the attention of City Council to this area of policy vacuum.

Background:Current City Cultural Support:

Toronto City Council has for many years endorsed a policy of encouraging and supporting the arts and culture. In so doing, Council's aims have been:

- o to enhance the arts and culture in Toronto;
- o to increase access to and participation in the arts by Toronto residents, ratepayers and visitors.

In the past Toronto City Council has pursued these goals in the area of facilities support by offering various forms of assistance:

- (1) Rental grants on City-owned buildings (see Appendix A for list).
- (2) Tax remissions on certain facilities owned and operated by independent arts and culture organizations (see Appendix A for list).
- (3) Direct operation of facilities such as the Market Gallery.
- (4) Provision of City-owned facilities at less-than-market rental rates to certain arts groups.
- (5) Modest but infrequent capital support grants.

The Need For a Cultural Facilities Policy:

In its past actions, City Council has exhibited sensitivity and support in responding on a fundamentally ad hoc basis to cultural facilities support needs. The time has now come for an extension, on a consistent policy basis, of some of the remedies applied in the past to address specific needs of particular arts and culture groups, and for the implementation of new remedies called for by the gravity of the present arts accommodation crisis in Toronto, particularly as it applies to small and medium-sized arts organizations and to individual creative artists.

Such action should take place within a framework of policy in which the goals, benefits and parameters are clearly understood and in which implementation in practice involves all those who meet criteria for assistance.

The Goals of a Cultural Facilities Policy:

These may be summarized conveniently:

1. The maintenance of Toronto as the cultural capital of Canada by making it possible for artists to continue to live, work and create in the City;
2. The prevention of further loss or, where necessary, the replacement of cultural facilities;
3. The renovation and retrofitting of facilities in need of upgrading;
4. The addition of needed facilities.

The Benefits of A Cultural Facilities Policy

- o Cultural: Increase in stock of cultural facilities and increased accessibility of cultural facilities to citizens and others;
- o Economic: Commitment through leverage of federal/provincial/private facilities funding in Toronto;
- o Employment: Increase related to extent of activity levered by policy implementation;
- o Aesthetic: Increase in number of premises meeting accepted aesthetic standards; satisfaction of heritage goals;
- o Tourism: Increase in cultural facilities offered to visitors;
- o Political: Imaginative use of City's pump-priming ability, already well-demonstrated by success of cultural operating grants policy.

Development and implementation of a facilities support policy to complement the existing operating support policy will place Toronto in the ranks of progressive centres of arts and culture - such as New York, Montreal, Paris, Frankfurt, San Francisco and Seattle - which have recognized the need for a municipal/arts community partnership in support of facilities.

To say the very least, the policy will be hailed as vital and necessary by the arts and culture community. Properly and sensitively implemented, such a policy could serve as a means of developing existing municipal poise and expertise in this vital area of planning.

Recommendations:

- (1) Pending definition of and implementation of a Cultural Facilities Policy as called for herein, the City should establish immediately a Cultural Facilities Support Grants Fund, with a 1989 budget of \$2-million, to enable qualifying organizations and individuals to mitigate the worst effects of the crisis. Criteria for 1989 Cultural Facilities Support Grants are outlined in (1) of the Terms of Reference which follow.
- (2) The City should establish a working group, made up of professional artists, representatives of City-funded non-profit Toronto arts and culture organizations, Toronto Arts Council and appropriate political and departmental leadership at City Hall, in order to make recommendations to City Council for the timely development and implementation of a Cultural Facilities Policy for the City of Toronto. The Cultural Facilities Policy working group should be constituted and activated without delay and should have terms of reference as appended to this Report.
- (3) The Cultural Facilities Policy should be developed and submitted to City Council before the end of 1989 and should be fully implemented by the end of 1991.

- (4) Pending definition and implementation of a Cultural Facilities Policy as called for herein, the City should ensure that the workspace needs of the City's arts community are viewed as a priority concern and are considered as such in all planning undertaken and all decisions made regarding use, development or disposition of City-owned premises or sites.

Terms of Reference for Working Group:

The working group should further explore solutions to the growing crisis faced by the arts community in its quest for secure, affordable space and advise the City on the development of programs and policies to resolve the current space problem encountered in the arts.

In so doing, the working group should review, consider and make recommendations on the following Policy Options and should work within the parameters of the recommended Policy Consensus Development and Timeframe which are outlined in (B) and (C) of the Terms of Reference.

A. POLICY OPTIONS:

1. Facilities support grants.
2. Loan guarantees for private sector financing.
3. Tax remissions and tax grants.
4. Rental forgivenesses.
5. Access to and coordination of underused premises owned by the city or other levels of government.
6. Access to and coordination of available premises owned by the private sector.
7. Utilization of trade-offs/Section 36 Density Bonusing.
8. A City-supported body addressing specific space needs/arts space data base.
9. Amendment of regulations through licencing arrangements to permit legal occupancy of artists' live/work spaces generally in residential areas, but on a limited, carefully-regulated basis in industrial areas.
10. Development and Replacement.

1. Facilities Support Grants:

The City has a clear policy of providing necessary capital repairs and renovations to city-owned premises used for the arts, and sometimes operates in partnership with prime tenants in accomplishing this. In order to extend this policy to help defend and maintain the existing stock of privately-owned arts and culture premises, the City should provide similar grants to resident non-profit arts and culture organizations, as defined herein, for use in acquiring, constructing or improving arts and culture premises facilities, situated within the City of Toronto, on the basis of a Facilities Support Grants Budget to be determined annually by City Council and administered by Toronto Arts Council with the advice of Planning and Development and City Property Department. The working group should consider further practical criteria and guidelines but the following criteria should be used for the 1989 program:

- o Facilities support grants should be applicable to owned premises, or to premises on leases having at least 5 years remaining duration.
- o The City should satisfy itself when making grants for the purpose of renovations that there are no sale or demolition clauses in the lease or that a satisfactory written agreement has been reached with the landlord outlining terms for compensation pertaining to capital improvement should there be a sale or demolition.
- o All renovations grants to leased premises should be formulated on a sliding scale so as to permit more substantial monetary commitments in longer term lease situations.
- o Provision of grants should be subject to the applicant's ability to attract sufficient additional support to cover the complete cost of acquisition, construction or improvement.
- o Grants level should be a maximum of 1/3 of total costs contemplated.
- o Where several groups are working together these amounts should be applied on a per-organization basis to a maximum of 1/3 of total costs.
- o Grants should only be considered in the case of small and medium-sized applicants with a history of a minimum of three years successful Toronto operational residency and who are eligible for operating grants through the Toronto Arts Council. The working group should be asked to develop policy to allow for the provision of Facilities Support Grants involving workspace for collectives of individual artists.
- o To provide immediate credibility to potential purchasers of premises, a maximum of 20% of the total fund should be reserved for special offer-to-purchase deposit grants. Such grants should be subject to appropriate safeguards ensuring City recoupment in cases where the transaction funded does not proceed within one year.

2. Loan Guarantees:

Where the City is satisfied that financial arrangements are sound and where necessary in situations of last resort, the working group should consider making provision for municipal government loan guarantees for private sector financing to the arts community.

3. Tax Remissions and Tax Grants:

a) Tax Remissions

In the cases of resident arts and culture organizations, as defined herein and occupying owned premises, the working group should prepare policy recommendations requesting the support of the Province of Ontario and other affected jurisdictions in implementing provincial legislation enabling equitable remission of all taxes collected from the organization by the City of Toronto. The City should similarly

obtain remission of municipal taxes in the cases of all city-owned premises occupied by resident arts and culture groups.

b) Tax Grants

In the cases of resident arts and culture organizations, as defined herein and occupying premises leased for a period of 5 years or more, the working group should explore the potential for provision of annual grants equal to the amounts of taxes deemed to have been paid to the City of Toronto as portions of rental payments.

4. Rental Forgivenesses:

In the cases of resident arts and culture groups, as defined herein and occupying premises owned by the City of Toronto, the City, on the advice of Toronto Arts Council in consultation with Budget Review Group, should provide grants equal to all, or an equitable portion, of the market rental charged to the organizations by the City; such grants should be taken into account in determining the extent of the City's total support to the affected organizations.

5. Access to and Coordination of Available Premises Owned by the City or Other Levels of Government:

The working group should consider and recommend on means by which the City can assign arts use of appropriate available City-owned facilities. A high priority should be given to this use and the advice of organizations such as Toronto Artscape Inc. in consultation with City Property Department should be sought.

The City, on the advice of and at the request of organizations such as Toronto Artscape Inc., should also use its highest good offices to obtain arts use of appropriate available facilities owned by other levels of government.

6. Access to and Coordination of Available Premises Owned by the Private Sector:

The working group should recommend ways in which the business community can effectively enable arts use of underused or empty facilities owned by the private sector at low cost or no cost. The working group should consult with the private sector in order to establish a range of effective incentives.

7. Trade-Offs/Section 36 Bonusing:

The working group should recommend means by which the City could assign highest priority to arts use of appropriate premises received as trade-offs against density or other concessions.

In the case of premises provided rent-free to resident arts and culture organizations, as defined herein, the working group should recommend on the provision of special premises support grants equal to the difference in upkeep and security costs between those encountered

in the provided premises as compared with those customarily encountered, such grants to diminish by 20% yearly over the first five years of the tenancy, with the deficiency to be covered by increases in grants, earned revenues and fundraising sources. Further, particular "crisis" needs - such as affordable artists' studios - should be treated in the same manner as assisted and seniors' housing in the context of bonusing as an instrument of City social policy.

8. A City-Supported Body Addressing Specific Space Needs/Toronto Arts Space Data Base:

An organization such as Toronto Artscape Inc. has as its mission the provision of affordable downtown work-spaces for artists. With strong support, this type of organization can serve as a useful tool for implementation of City policy addressing the space needs of this particular, unique and valuable work force; this type of group can also serve as a channel of direct City initiative. The working group should make recommendations as to the optimal role of such an organization and on the creation and maintenance of a permanent City of Toronto data base documenting detailed information pertaining to the space occupied by all arts organizations including:

- (a) information regarding any space or facility available for rental to the arts community (performance, rehearsal, or exhibition venues, etc.) including particulars of seating capacity, ancillary space available, services available as part of the rental agreement, requirements of the rental agreement, etc.;
- (b) details of workspace or facilities needed in the City's arts community.

9. Licencing Arrangements:

Given the present and continuing crisis in accomodation, the working group should consider permitting artists on a vocation-specific, non-transferable basis, in appropriate districts, to legally occupy live/work spaces in areas in which affordable space is available. However, experience in this context in New York and elsewhere has demonstrated that without effective controls, artists become simply the stormtroopers of gentrification, with industrial land lost to high-market residential use. The working group should therefore be requested to report on ways and means of accomplishing these solutions in such a manner that the City's best interests are safeguarded. In this regard, we draw attention to the July 2, 1987 report of the City of Vancouver Planning Department extending Vancouver's live/work permission which is particularly useful in that it sets out detailed safeguards against abuse of this policy.

10. Development And Replacement:

- (a) The working group should recommend means by which the City of Toronto could act as a developer of last resort in the case of facilities

deemed necessary but unlikely to be developed by others. In such cases:

- i) the cost to the City should be minimal;
 - ii) the venue should be one which could not come into existence without public involvement;
 - iii) City involvement should act as a catalyst for the involvement of other parties; and
 - iv) community involvement should be extended by the arrangement.
- (b) The working group should recommend means by which City Council, in the case of any development involving the demolition of existing arts and culture premises, will not issue such a demolition permit until the applicant therefor has undertaken to replace such premises in the same or a substantially similar location. Such premises are defined as those having been occupied or operated for a period of three years as:

- (1) Arts performance spaces
- (2) Arts exhibition spaces
- (3) Arts publication spaces
- (4) Arts administration spaces
- (5) Arts construction spaces
- (6) Arts rehearsal/preparation spaces
- (7) Artists' studios
- (8) Other arts spaces as defined, from time to time, by the Toronto Arts Council

In this regard, it is hoped that the new St. Lawrence Housing Development will not eliminate hundreds of low-cost artists' studios and other work spaces without provision for replacement.

- (c) The working group should recommend means by which major developments - being those of more than \$10-million in anticipated costs - anywhere in Toronto, not be allowed to proceed before consideration has been given, in each case, to an arts and culture accommodation impact study, detailing the effects the development will have on Toronto's existing and potential stock of arts and culture facilities as defined in item (b) above.

B. POLICY CONSENSUS DEVELOPMENT:

- (a) The working group should meet with:
- i) Budget Review Group;
 - ii) Representatives of the arts and culture community, including professional artists;
 - iii) The general public, through well-publicized meetings, invitations of submissions, etc.
- (b) The working group should encourage the City of Toronto to initiate a program of active communication with:

- i) other levels of government (municipal, provincial and federal) to ensure that the particular needs of the City's arts community are well understood and to encourage the development of programs and policies which best meet these needs;
- ii) school boards, to encourage their development of policies making under-utilized or vacant facilities available to artists and non-profit arts organizations seeking such space;
- iii) private sector landlords, to enhance their rental of affordable space to the arts community.

C. POLICY DEVELOPMENT TIME FRAME:

- i) The working group should be constituted by February, 1989;
- ii) The policy should be developed for City Council consideration before the end of 1989;
- iii) The policy should be fully implemented by the end of 1991.

PART II

WORKSPACE FOR THE ARTS IN TORONTO

An Overview of the Problems

PART II

WORKSPACE FOR THE ARTS IN TORONTO

An Overview of the Problems

The Crisis

Enormous growth in size, population and diversity have brought to the City of Toronto numerous challenges and opportunities. We must once again address basic issues of what Toronto is, how it sees itself and what it hopes to become. This discussion raises questions of Toronto's identity, quality of life and status as a world city. Within this context the truly critical role of the arts comes to be recognized. But this recognition arises at a time when the level of real estate speculation and development in the City threatens further erosion of an already fragile cultural infrastructure.

Toronto's arts community faces enormous difficulties in trying to obtain or maintain access to secure, affordable facilities. As a result the life and growth of Toronto's arts organizations are threatened and Toronto artists are confronted by a crisis in their efforts to remain as cultural workers in the city core.

As the dimensions of this crisis grow, artists are leaving the City in growing numbers, and securing residency in other areas where they can afford to live and pursue their work. Some organizations are being forced to move away from the critical mass of the cultural community which has nurtured their existence--in some instances moving outside the City of Toronto, while others have been forced to cease operation.

This problem, clearly identified and reviewed at length in Cultural Capital: The care and feeding of Toronto's artistic assets published in 1985, and further documented in the completed, but as yet not publicly released, facilities needs study which Arthur Gelber conducted for the Minister of Culture and Communications, has steadily grown. As the crisis grows it is critical that we progress beyond simply reiterating and defining the problem and rapidly move on to creating solutions. The longer we take to respond effectively to the crisis, the more casualties we will witness--and those casualties represent a loss not to the arts community alone but to the City as a whole, its identity, its spirit and its well-being.

A Brief Profile of the Arts

When considering the arts and their role in the City, one must acknowledge the existence of an enormous, multi-faceted community -- one which includes the fine arts, commercial arts and cultural industries, operates on both the amateur and professional level and includes both conventional artforms and those that break with tradition.

Three recent Canada Council publications, provide a sense of the scale of the arts on a national level, in citing the following:

"These arts activities are intimately interrelated. The amateur arts, in actualizing the talents and abilities of the individual citizen, provide an educated audience and initial training for the fine and commercial arts. The fine arts, in pursuit of artistic excellence as an end in and of itself, provide research and development for the commercial arts. The commercial arts, in pursuit of profit, provide the means to market and distribute the best of the amateur and fine arts to an audience large enough and in a form suited to earn a profit.

"Collectively, the fine arts, the commercial arts and the amateur arts make up the arts industry including advertising, broadcasting, crafts, motion pictures, performing and visual arts, publishing, sound and video recording. Compared to all manufacturing industries the arts industry is the largest with respect to employment, the 5th largest with respect to salaries and wages and the 9th largest with revenue in 1984 of \$10.1 billion or 2.4% of GNP.

"Between 1971 and 1981 the Canadian labour force increased 39% while the arts labour force, i.e. individuals using arts-related skills in their day to day jobs, increased 74%...And contrary to popular myth, in 1981 Canadian artists (Occupational Classification 33) had a 6% unemployment rate compared to 7% for the labour force as a whole." ¹

"There are two distinct arts-related employment populations - the arts labour force and the arts industry labour force. Together they included 414,000 workers or 4% of the Canadian labour force in 1981 (Research and Evaluation 1984). In fact, arts-related employment was as large as the agricultural labour force and federal government employment including crown corporations." ²

"The arts are an extremely employment efficient sector of the economy. A 1983 comparison between all manufacturing industry and the performing arts reveals that of every revenue dollar earned by manufacturing companies, only 20% were spent on salaries and wages. In the performing arts, on the other hand, \$0.66 of every revenue dollar were spent on salaries and wages. Given that wages in the arts are less than half those in manufacturing, the employment advantage is at least six-to-one." ³

"Artists are what is called the talent upon which all artistic endeavours ultimately rest. On a comparative 1971 basis, between 1971 and 1981 the number of Canadian artists increased 102% from 65,445 to 131,930...In addition, the number of Canadian artists increased more than two-and-a-half times faster in relative terms than the total Canadian labour force. As a per cent of the total labour force artists increased from 0.8% in 1971 to 1.1% in 1981." ⁴

Similarly, the recently released study entitled The Importance of the Arts in Britain, authored by John Myerscough of London's Policy Studies Institute, reveals that the arts in Britain are a booming £10 billion industry and as such equal the motor-vehicle industry.⁵

The arts are a major force within Canada and within Toronto, its cultural capital, contributing substantially to the quality of life and to the economic base. This sector is described in the Toronto Arts Council's 1988 publication entitled City of Toronto Arts and Culture Community: Financial Trends 1981 - 1987 With Projections to 1999 as follows:

"During the period 1981 - 1987, the total arts and culture community grew on average about 10% per year, as measured in 1981 constant dollars of revenue, increasing its revenues from \$72-million to \$120-million (1981 dollars) or about \$150-million in 1987 actual dollars...Toronto employment in the arts and arts-related work in industry will probably total about 125,000 in 1988."⁶

The vitality of the arts as a whole relies upon the health of the various components comprising the overall arts community. In Toronto, with its growing emphasis and investment in the design and film sectors, it is of critical importance to have a dynamic community of fine artists which will, in turn, nurture those in affiliated areas of commercial enterprise. Threats to the health and well being of the fine arts community will have a negative impact upon the commercial and applied arts and arts industries.

This report addresses specifically the facilities needs and concerns of professional fine artists working both within the context of non-profit arts organizations and as individual artists and producers in the City of Toronto. This segment of the report provides an overview of the space problem as it affects the arts community as a whole.

The Toronto Context

In Toronto, as in New York and Paris, artists have moved into run-down, post-industrial areas, inexpensively renovated derelict premises to acceptable use levels, and made formerly undesirable districts highly desirable while carrying on their activities in the arts. As a result, numerous organizations have clustered in the downtown area. That location, having initially provided the necessary low-cost space, was and is readily accessible to public audiences as well as the artistic community itself, much of which, by economic necessity, travels by public transit, on bicycle and on foot. Arts organizations located in close proximity to one another and to the various goods and services upon which they rely, have been able to accomplish their programs more efficiently and within their typically modest budgets.

We live in a period in which artists' income generated from their work as artists is often insufficient to support them. As reported in the Continental Bank's article "The Corporate Gift Horse" contained in their annual report of 1984:

"...the greatest supporter of the arts in Canada is not government, business nor the paying public; it is the artists themselves through their willingness to remain underpaid. Self-employed artists rank immediately behind pensioners as the lowest paid occupational group in the country. No painter, musician, dancer or singer earning an average wage for his craft in Canada could keep a family of four above the poverty line."⁷

Clustering

As a result many artists supplement their income with secondary employment.⁸ Frequently that work, be it teaching, provision of technical support within the media industry, waiting on tables, carpentry, bar-tending or something else, has been concentrated in the downtown core, as has artists' housing.

Close proximity of the arts community's base to the locations at which artists earn the balance of their income, helps artists to manage this busy regime: generating the income they need to survive and allowing time in which to pursue their work as professional artists.

By ensuring the proximity of artists' living and working spaces, the City can support this fragile economic balance and promote the continued life of the arts in this City.

"In a business sense we view our support of the arts as a positive force that encourages creative and fresh ways of thinking, reflects concerns about society, and contributes to developing an appealing community that will attract individuals to live and work."⁹

D.G. Vice,
President of Northern Telecom
Limited

Clustering of the arts has been enormously beneficial to the community at large. It has created a vibrant, highly visible downtown arts community--one which has supported not only the existence of the arts and their resulting enhancement of the quality of community life, but in addition has made the downtown core a lively community by day and night. It has contributed to the growth of the arts industry, the city's tourist industry, urban revitalization and overall economic development in the downtown core. The visible and lively presence of a community of artists and their organizations comprises a vital component within any lively and healthy urban context.

"Cities are always centers of banking, insurance, advertising, publishing, law, medicine, education, culture, entertainment and tourism. Today's newcomer to the city tends to be young, educated and middle class and wants to work in a white-collar occupation by day and enjoy the cultural and entertainment resources of the city by night." 10

Michael Pittas,
Director, Design Arts Program,
National Endowment for the Arts

The arts are one of the important amenities considered when companies contemplate sites for situation of their corporate headquarters. Thus, in numerous ways, the positive impact of our "clustered" arts community extends well beyond both the arts community itself and the neighbourhood adjacent to its physical facilities.

"Men come together in the city to live; they remain there to live the good life."

Aristotle

The Impact of Gentrification, Rising Real Estate Values and Downtown Development

Toronto's real estate market has seen a frenzied level of activity in recent years. With increasing competition for property in the City of Toronto, land and building prices have been driven up dramatically and building ownerships have turned over rapidly. As a result of this active real estate market and continuing gentrification of many of the City's downtown neighbourhoods, rental rates have steadily increased. Industrial leasing rates were documented in the Royal LePage data base as having increased from 10% to 25% during 1987 alone.¹¹ Such increases are devastating to arts organizations whose budgets have not grown at a commensurate rate. (In addition, any revenue increases arts organizations achieve must address not only rising rental rates or real estate costs, but also increased wages, in this highly labour intensive field.)

Review of rental rates in the City as a whole compared to those paid by the arts community reveals that many arts organizations have been remarkably successful in finding and utilizing low-cost facilities. This has arisen of necessity as many arts organizations' budgets could absorb nothing more than minimal rents. Some organizations have been able to absorb the rental increases implemented during their tenancies. However, as reflected in Part III, with substantial redevelopment of downtown Toronto, many areas which have, until recently, offered low-cost facilities to the arts, have been, or soon will be torn down and developed or totally renovated and priced far beyond the reach of the arts. The "art zone", an area radiating from Queen and Spadina, south to King Street, east almost to University and spreading west past Bathurst is a case in point.

As noted in Canadian Real Estate -- 1988: The Royal LePage Market Survey:

"In the future, the development requirements of the downtown market increasingly will be fulfilled by the area west of the financial office core. Several large developments such as the CN convention centre and the World Centre for Automated Banking have extended office development well to the west of the University Avenue area. Development of the CBC lands between John and Simcoe Streets south of Wellington Street and a large office development in the block immediately north of the CBC site will accelerate this trend..."¹²

This area and the adjacent neighbourhoods to the north and west have provided a home for many artists and arts organizations in recent years. Many exhibition-oriented organizations and experimental performance groups, comprising the research and development component of the fine arts, have established their home here, and they, perhaps the most financially-fragile component of the arts community, face the forthcoming development of their neighbourhood with enormous trepidation.

Owners of buildings that have not yet been renovated or redeveloped, are watching market activities carefully, awaiting the right time and environment in which to launch sale or redevelopment of their property. In an effort to keep their options open they are frequently choosing to sign only very short leases, or no leases at all, leaving tenants with no security of tenure and making tenants' investment of significant capital for renovations imprudent. Most landlords ensure that leases provide for notice and eviction of tenants upon sale or intended demolition of the building. As a result, even a lease for five years or more (and it should be noted that even leases of that duration are often difficult to negotiate in the low-cost spaces accessible to the arts) may offer little actual security. Some landlords are reluctant to renew leases until just before the existing lease expires, or on occasion, until sometime after an existing lease has expired. As a result, those buildings which may currently provide low-cost space for the arts, often provide little or no security of tenure.

Arts organizations are frequently given very little time in which to carry out their relocation. Many organizations have found themselves having to locate and move into new premises within a few short months or even a matter of weeks, whether as a result of sale of their building or a landlord's unwillingness to complete lease negotiations in advance of expiry of an existing lease. That, in turn, activates a scenario of crisis planning. Organizations report that a number of serious and negative consequences ensue in light of these circumstances. For some, their entire program is drawn to a halt at least temporarily, either because they have no facilities in which to present their programming or alternatively no space in which to rehearse or otherwise prepare. For others it means absorbing dramatically increased rental costs in order to access adequate space, compromising artistic integrity in an effort to house programs in inappropriate spaces, or perhaps relocating on an interim basis only to move again a short while later. While interim premises may seem to provide a sensible solution, this is an enormously costly and difficult proposition.

The drain of time, work and money invested in an emergency effort to find and move into new premises can take necessary resources away from organizational programming and the quality therein. Beyond the resulting expenses of the move itself, any necessary renovations and often higher rents mean organizations must invest substantial time and money in promotion of their new location. Additional efforts are also required to draw their past audience to their new address. Until this is successfully accomplished, their self-generated revenues may be jeopardized. Thus it becomes clear how frequent moves can have disastrous effects.

Difficulties Encountered in Raising Capital Funds

The funding of building purchases or renovations also can be extremely problematic. While the administrative operations of many organizations have accommodated themselves within a variety of available, and often inadequate spaces (one of the organizations surveyed had its office in a former elevator shaft), there are far more rigid physical specifications for program space--be it for exhibition, performance or provision of other services. As a result, capital improvements are inevitably required in new premises. Such improvements are typically funded with a combination of public and private sector monies. The Ministry of Culture and Communications (provincially) and The Department of Communications (federally) are the prime public sector funding agencies involved. While raising funds is always a difficult job, the time required for processing of applications submitted to either of these government ministries can add enormous complications.

Before applying to the government for funds, an organization's staff and Board must complete their own planning process. Depending upon the scale of the project, planning may be handled internally by organizational staff and volunteers or with paid professional assistance from facility planners, architects etc. If the project is extensive enough to require completion of a formal feasibility study, then substantially more time is added to the process to accommodate application for study funding along with private sector fundraising for the same purpose.

Once the planning stage is complete and a viable project has been identified, the next step is to secure the required funds for the project itself--again, typically drawing upon both the private and public sectors. Given the high level of competition for capital funding for the arts, capital funding program budgets are so over-subscribed that funds are often committed well into the future, limiting funding agencies' abilities to fund projects as they are initiated.

Not only will substantial time be required for an organization's capital funding application to proceed through the process of bureaucratic review and political input, but following project approval, should it be granted, there may be a lengthy wait until committed funds can actually be released.

Progress on projects relying upon substantial funding from both the provincial and federal governments as well as the private sector, will generally be limited

to the pace of the project contributor with the slowest decision-making capabilities. While an organization may be able to raise the private sector funds and get approval from one level of government within months, they may experience an 18 month (or longer) waiting period with another, which in turn delays the whole project and potentially jeopardizes its viability.

Toronto faces particularly difficult circumstances within this competition for capital funding from government. Housing Canada's largest and most important concentration of artists and arts organizations, Toronto also generates a larger proportion of facilities' needs. The operations of many of the City's organizations are supported by funding entities (Canada Council, Ontario Arts Council, Metro Cultural Affairs and the Toronto Arts Council) whose grants are premised upon support of excellence in the arts. Capital funding, however, is administered directly by government at the federal and provincial levels and is pressured by intense competition on a regional basis. As a result there is fierce conflict between those supporting politically expedient regional distribution of capital funds and those arguing in support of capital funding for arts facilities being directed into major centres of artistic excellence. When pressure for the former prevails, leading to a seeming "anywhere but Toronto" predisposition in funding decisions, it only adds to the already difficult existence of Toronto's arts community.

Thus the questions and obstacles facing arts organizations as they contemplate a move, or are forced to move, are numerous:

- * Can they find affordable premises?
- * What security of tenure can be assured?
- * Can sale and demolition clauses be deleted from lease agreements?
- * What kind of renovations are required and what are the associated costs?
- * Given the available lease, does it make sense to invest this level of capital in the premises?
- * Is the proposed funding of these improvements viable?

These are all questions that must be addressed in any sensible facilities planning process.

Timing is often a critical problem. The fast pace, on the one hand, at which real estate transactions proceed, and, on the other hand, the pace at which organizational planning and decisions can be made, and funding applications can be reviewed and approved, are totally disparate. You may find an ideal building on the market today, but capital funding applications can take from a bare (and uncommon) minimum of three months to well over a year to be processed, making the likelihood of retaining the option to purchase the building until you have the required funds in hand (or at least committed), negligible, even if a benefactor intervenes to ensure that a building will be held for a period of time. One recent example demonstrates that having a building held even for a one-year period does not solve the timing problem. Organizations choosing merely to lease premises but under pressure to continue programming without interruption, may be driven to commence renovations to the leased premises before they have any idea what funds can be made available to them for that purpose and in a classic Catch-22, by commencing work before funds are available, they may jeopardize their eligibility for funding. As a result, organizations facing a sudden move may be

left with both increased operating expenses and unplanned deficits arising from the renovations and may, as well, have to cease operation for a period of time--any one of which may jeopardize their continued operations.

The facilities planning process is more difficult in those organizations that do not have, within their Board or staff, a contingent of individuals knowledgeable about or able to facilitate contacts with real estate and facilities planning expertise. There are many organizations which fall into this category. As a result these organizations either take additional time to establish such links or, on occasion, are forced to proceed without extensive expertise.

Among Toronto's arts organizations are very few that own their space. Of the 39 surveyed by the Toronto Arts Council (see Part III of this report), only three own part or all of the facilities required for their operation. Of the balance, only a few have enjoyed long term, low-cost tenancies, due to the support of sympathetic landlords or of developers who are merely putting in time while the neighbourhood housing their property is in a transitional phase. However, given the current real estate market, increasing rental rates, land and building costs, and plans for future development, the number of affordable, accessible spaces offering any security of tenure to the arts, is diminishing. As a result, most of the organizations interviewed for this report expressed substantial concern about their organization's present and future needs for space.

The City's arts community clearly reiterated its concerns in the course of the Toronto Arts Council's six consultative sessions with client groups, as reflected in The Let's Talk Report: "The two main priorities facing the Toronto arts community are insufficient funding and lack of proper living and working space."¹³

Individual Artists' Workspace

The primary focus of this report thus far, has been on space for arts organizations. Equally significant are the needs of individual artists--the creators of dance, music, theatre, visual and literary works.

Most self-employed artists work or rehearse in a studio space they rent or, on occasion, own. Writers frequently work at home. Often, but not always, performing artists rehearse in a facility provided by the organization with which they perform. However some performance venues, available for use by independent producers, make rehearsal space the producer's responsibility. As a result there are numerous individual producers, dancers, choreographers, musicians etc. seeking space in which to pursue their work.

Individual artists' needs in this regard are very similar to those of their counterpart organizations and thus are covered in the second half of this report. Individual artists' incomes must be factored carefully into consideration of this aspect of the workspace problem. As reiterated in the Status of the Artist: Report of the Task Force, written in 1986 "... not one discipline in the Arts in

Canada earns an average income above the poverty line..." Data drawn from the 1981 census and set out in the report produced by the Task Force on Funding of the Arts indicates that the average incomes of musicians and dancers fell 30% and 38%, respectively, below the average for the total labour force and in addition more than 50% of artists earned less than \$10,000 per year while in the whole labour force population only 30% earn less than \$10,000.¹⁴ It is clear that individual artists have little money with which to rent the space they need or keep up with ever-increasing rental rates.

In the visual arts, virtually every artist requires workspace of his or her own. But financing separate workspace is problematic if not impossible for many. The Task Force on Funding of the Arts reported, the average annual income for visual artists reflected in the 1981 census data was \$9,300--37% lower than the average for the labour-force population in general.¹⁵ It is important to acknowledge that visual arts organizations generally provide their artists with exhibition space but not workspace. Despite falling at the low end of the income scale, visual artists must individually shoulder all the expenses incurred in production of their work--space, materials etc. The nature and scale of an artist's work along with individual budgetary constraints greatly determine the kind of studio space that artists can have.

This situation creates a variety of problems. On the one hand, the now-identified health hazards associated with many artists' materials, suggest the benefits of maintaining well-ventilated workspace which is entirely separate from an artist's living quarters. The Status of the Artist Task Force report noted that "during the task force hearings it became apparent that artists in general suffer in their workplace (studios, educational institutions) from lack of proper ventilation, lighting, protective clothing, materials and equipment. The number of complaints regarding respiratory and visual ailments were numerous, ranging from minor discomfort to symptoms and illness causing the interruption, cessation or change of artistic activity."¹⁶

Some artists report that they themselves are prepared to face the potential health hazards inherent in their materials and encountered more intensely as a consequence of combining their living and working spaces, but are concerned about subjecting their children to these potential health hazards. Psychological benefits lead other artists to prefer separate living and working spaces.

Some artists do not consider the materials with which they work to be excessively harmful, and feel that given enormous pressures on their time (as they persevere with their work as an artist while also pursuing other part-time work in order to pay the rent) they need to accommodate living and working in the same space--in part to save money but as well to preserve valuable time. For some it creates additional blocks of time for work, when children are asleep, without adding further childcare expenses. However, with visual artists' remarkably low average annual income, financial constraints make it virtually impossible for some to consider maintaining separate living and working quarters despite their personal preferences or health concerns.

Choosing to work in spaces designed and operated for residential purposes creates certain limitations. There are numerous artists who, unable to afford separate living and work spaces, combine the two in residential premises and are thwarted

in their work by the restricting dimensions of traditional residential space. Other artists solve this through illegal habitation of industrial premises, the scale of which better accommodates their work. However this alternative is enormously problem-ridden as commercial leases do not afford tenants the more substantial benefits and protection provided by residential leases, and further complications are caused, on occasion, by proximity to other industry with its associated noise and noxious fumes. Some artists have simply stopped working due to lack of access to suitable space, and a growing number of artists are choosing to leave the city in favour of smaller centres where secure space and other amenities of day-to-day life are less expensive.

The solution to this problem is the provision of two kinds of well-ventilated, affordable space and these must be addressed through the provision of: a) no cost or low-cost workspace of suitable scale; and b) appropriate licencing, permitting artists' combined studio and living accomodation in affordable premises of suitable scale, in close proximity to the core of the clustered arts community.

Municipal support is clearly needed on these fronts. Beyond support in the form of financial assistance to these projects, the City must also play an active role in achieving the changes required to better accommodate artists' living and working space needs. The City must as well pursue the necessary amendments to provincial legislation and guidelines so that the City can fulfill a responsible role in helping artists access secure affordable workspace which operates with municipal assistance. For example, current provincial legislation, designed to meet the needs of other sectors of the community, prevents the City from financially supporting artists' workspace projects which provide more than three years tenure at lower-than-market rental rates. While projects initiated with municipal support under existing legislation can offer artists affordable space, they can provide no long-term security of tenure.

Artists' Living Spaces

"Arcadia" is the first and largest Toronto facility designed to meet the need for live-in work space. While numerous occupants see it as very successful, it is perceived as too expensive for many artists to afford, and the CMHC requirements for interior partitioning of the space have been problematic for others. "Beaver Hall", another artists' housing co-op and created with the City's assistance, is responding to a similar need and has been designed to address the identified problems of Arcadia. Now nearing completion, Beaver Hall has met with an enthusiastic response in the community. As commendable as these projects are, they are only a beginning--the number of artists they house is far smaller than the number of artists articulating the need for affordable space in which to live and work. Far more work must be done to familiarize housing authorities with the special combined living and workspace needs of artists and to foster change in existing legislation and policies to ensure that these needs are met.

The City's objective must be to create more affordable work and live-in/work spaces for artists so they can indeed remain rooted in the Toronto community and there pursue their work.

"...we find that artists can act as frontiersmen in opening up abandoned or deprived areas of the city to redevelopment. In exchange for inexpensive large spaces in which to live and work, artists will put up with cold and dirt and hardships. In their wake they bring a new middle class, along with boutiques, condominiums, French restaurants, exposed brick, outdoor sculpture, and all the other elements of the good life -- urban style. The only problem is that once gentrification has set in, the artist typically can no longer afford to live in the neighbourhood. Few cities have developed protection for the pioneers...We must find ways to safeguard the housing/working space of artists through zoning variances and through a degree of subsidy. Half entrepreneurs, half workers, they are like few others in our society and because of their contributions they must be provided for. Such programs will mean intervention in the free play of the market--but we do that for the elderly, for farmers, for schools and churches, for Chrysler. Why not for those who extend the frontiers?"¹⁷

Michael Newton,
President of the
Performing Arts Council of the
Music Centre of Los Angeles County

In Conclusion

It is critical that the City acknowledge the artistic community's living and work space crisis and provide leadership in its resolution. Work to resolve this problem must commence immediately and must focus upon creating solutions and not merely refining definitions of the problem.

The artistic community's workspace problem is a complex one--its resolution will rely upon whole-hearted participation by all levels of government, led by the City of Toronto, and working in tandem with the arts community and the private sector. It will require the development of new policies, new programs and in some instances new or modified legislation. Only through such an active and comprehensive approach to resolving the arts community's workspace and living space problems can we ensure the continued, dynamic life of the arts in the heart of Toronto.

NOTES TO PART II

1. Harry Hillman Chartrand, Arts Education and the Bottom Line in a Post Modern Economy: Two Variations on a Theme, Research and Evaluation Section, Canada Council, 1987, p. 13.
2. Claire McCaughey, Arts Education in Canada: An Exploratory Study, Research and Evaluation Section, Canada Council, 1987, p. 35.
3. Arts Education and the Bottom Line In a Post-Modern Economy: Two Variations on a Theme, p. 13.
4. Harry Hillman Chartrand, Private Financing of Cultural Activities in Canada: A Data Quality Assessment, Research and Evaluation Section, The Canada Council, 1988, p. 50.
5. John Meyerscough, as reported in "Arts a Booming Industry, British Report Shows": Globe and Mail, September 2, 1988, p. C9.
6. Toronto Arts Council, City of Toronto Arts and Culture Community: Financial Trends 1981 - 1987 with Projections to 1999, Toronto Arts Council, 1988, p. 1.
7. Continental Bank of Canada, "The Corporate Gift Horse: An Essay on Corporate Giving", 1984 Annual Report, The Continental Bank of Canada, 1984, p. 15.
8. Paul Siren and Gratien Gelinias, The Status of the Artist: Report of the Task Force, Minister of Supply and Services, August 1986, p. 26.
9. As cited in Edmund C. Bovey, Joan Chalmers and Michel Theroux, Funding of the Arts in Canada to the year 2000: The Report of the Task Force on Funding of the Arts, Minister of Supply and Services, Government of Canada, June 1986, p. 25.
10. Michael J. Pittas, Director, Design Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts, "Planning for the Arts" in The Arts and City Planning, 1980, p. 19.
11. Royal LePage Limited, Canadian Real Estate - 1988: The Royal LePage Market Survey, Royal LePage Limited, 1987, p. 13.
12. Canadian Real Estate - 1988: The Royal LePage Market Survey, p. 12.
13. Toronto Arts Council, The Let's Talk Report, Toronto Arts Council, 1988. p. 27.
14. The Status of the Artist: Report of the Task Force, p. 45.
15. Funding of the Arts in Canada to the Year 2,000: Report of the Task Force on Funding of the Arts, p. 46.
16. The Status of the Artist: Report of the Task Force, p. 51.

17. Michael Newton, President, The Performing Arts Council for the Music Centre of Los Angeles County, "What Arts Organizations and Artists Can Offer City Planning" in The Arts and City Planning, American Council for the Arts, 1980, p. 11.

PART III

A REVIEW OF SPECIFIC WORKSPACE CONCERNS WITHIN EACH DISCIPLINE

PART III

A REVIEW OF SPECIFIC WORKSPACE CONCERNS WITHIN EACH DISCIPLINE

This segment of the report describes the nature of the space required by each discipline and the particular facilities-related problems each encounters.

In December 1986 and early 1987 the Toronto Arts Council undertook a pilot study of the space held and required by arts organizations located within the City of Toronto.

A sample of City of Toronto funded organizations from within each discipline was surveyed. Organizations were grouped according to their discipline and/or the nature or the function of the organization. For example, organizations that are mainly service-oriented are grouped together rather than being included with other organizations in their discipline. An effort was also made to choose, within each category, a selection of organizations which would reflect a range of sizes and budgets in order to provide a diverse view of the situation.

The workspace concerns of the literary community have not been portrayed in a separate, discipline-specific section within this study. This reflects the fact that organizations surveyed were drawn from the list of organizations funded by the Toronto Arts Council in 1986. It would appear that while Toronto houses numerous literary organizations, many are in fact national service organizations eligible for Toronto Arts Council funding only for their Toronto activities. Recognizing that the concerns of the literary community should be noted, Appendix B entitled "Workspace Concerns in The Literary Community" has been appended.

Part III also includes specially noted comments reflecting facilities concerns and recommendations which arose in the course of the Toronto Arts Council's six consultative sessions (entitled Let's Talk) held in 1987, with participation by 97 client groups.

A total of thirty nine organizations were surveyed:

9	Exhibition Organizations
6	Service Organizations
5	Dance Companies
7	Music Organizations
<u>12</u>	Theatre Companies
39	TOTAL

Statistical Summary:

Only 15 organizations (38.5% of those surveyed) had occupied the same location for the full five years preceding the survey. Included in this group were two that owned their own space throughout that period, one that has space donated by

a staff member who maintains the space for other purposes and one group with special government subsidies, allowing them to access their space for \$1.00/year). Of those renting:

- * one has been forced to move since the time of the survey
- * one has lost its space and been forced to close down operations for almost a year as it tries to address this crisis
- * one is now planning a move
- * one has now purchased the building it previously rented

15 organizations (38.5% of those surveyed) have been forced to move their entire operation, or a significant portion thereof, once during the course of the five years preceding the survey. One organization in this group received an exceptional government subsidy for their facility expenses. Of this group:

- * three have moved since the time of the survey
- * one has lost its space and ceased operation primarily as a result of the loss of space

9 organizations (23% of those surveyed) had to move either their entire operation or a significant portion thereof at least twice during the five years preceding the survey. Of that group one has been forced to move once again since the time of the survey.

(These statistics do not take into account changes in venue with respect to performance venues rented on an "as required" basis.)

EXHIBITION ORGANIZATIONS

Nine of a possible sixteen exhibition-oriented organizations, with operating budgets ranging in size from \$183,000 to \$1,500,000, were surveyed. The term "exhibition" in this case refers to both visual and media arts.

The areas of operation of these organizations include exhibition (gallery or film/video screening facility), administration and in some cases production (film editing, print-making, etc). Such an organization generally houses all aspects of its operation in a single building for purposes of administrative efficiency and convenience.

Although only one of these organizations stated in December 1986 that it expected to lose its space in the near future, by February 1987 two more groups were planning to move. Six of the nine organizations surveyed have been at their present location for less than five years. In most cases the moves have been prompted by a need for more space due to program expansion. Because all organizations predict further growth in the next few years, it seems safe to assume that many if not all of these groups will be looking for new space as their leases expire.

They report that finding space that is both suitable and affordable is extremely difficult.

Visual arts organizations participating in the Toronto Arts Council's Let's Talk consultative sessions reiterated that "the City can and should play a key role in stabilizing space and resource needs of the visual arts community."¹

Physical Characteristics:

Facilities requirements for an exhibition-oriented facility include: a large unobstructed area (no pillars), minimum ceiling height of 12 feet (although 14 ft is preferable), loading access, environmental control (temperature, humidity, lighting), separate office and storage areas and no windows in the exhibition areas.

Location:

Beyond the physical characteristics of the space, the most important single factor in determining the suitability of a space is its location.

All exhibition-oriented organizations surveyed indicated the need to be located in a central, downtown location. This results from the organization's need to be accessible to its audience and to the artists whom it serves.

Proximity to other, similar facilities is critical particularly when one considers the nature of a visit to an art exhibition. Such visits are relatively short, when compared, for example, to a visit to a performing arts event. As a result, organizations must be sensitive to the amount of time spent on public transit or driving to their location, finding parking etc., relative to time spent at the event itself. In the exhibition context, organizations benefit

enormously from proximity to one another, in that audience members, once in the neighbourhood, are inclined to travel from one exhibition to the next. A public perception of a particular area of the city as an arts or artists' neighbourhood is created. This in turn raises the profile of individual organizations and facilitates visits to each.

Location in close proximity to other organizations also facilitates beneficial "networking" amongst organizations. The resources within the community are better shared and on occasion groups are able to collaborate on special promotional events--four or five organizations may jointly promote a special evening of exhibition openings in their area. Collaborative educational programs can be initiated as can group mailings. Expertise held by others in one's community can easily be shared as can specialized equipment--postage metering machines, xerox equipment, computers etc. as now happens amongst a group of exhibition and service organizations housed in a building near Queen and Bathurst.

Seven of the nine organizations interviewed are located in what one organization referred to as the "art zone," an area radiating from Queen and Spadina, south to King, east almost to University and spreading west past Bathurst. One of these organizations recently accepted a 100% rent increase to avoid moving out of the area, a move which they felt would threaten the continued existence of the organization. Of the organizations surveyed, the only one which will remain outside the defined "art zone" is the Power Plant at Harbourfront. Significantly they are located in the unique Harbourfront complex with special federal subsidy of their space and access to far greater resources for promotion of the programs than the majority of exhibition-oriented organizations in the city.

The "art zone" area offers buildings which can meet the physical space requirements of the exhibition-oriented organizations, convenient access by public transit and an established public profile as an artists' neighbourhood. Despite any drawbacks which their space might have, every organization located within the "art zone" noted location as a positive attribute of their space.

Cost:

The answer to what is "affordable" varies according to the size and circumstances of the organization. The Power Plant at Harbourfront occupies property with a market value, they estimated, of approximately \$25 per square foot. (It should be noted that throughout this report rental costs recorded on the basis of \$/square foot reflect annual cost.) Naturally they would be unable to afford this without the heavy subsidy given them by the Harbourfront Corporation.

Our research indicated that surveyed organizations located in the 'art zone' were paying from \$5.70 per square foot to \$14.13 per square foot. Some of the organizations surveyed were stretching their budgets uncomfortably to pay for their space.

Current Situation:

What does an organization get for its money when it does find space? Some organizations are faced with pillars in their exhibition area, inadequate

ventilation in their office, and most complain about inadequate environmental control (climate and lighting) in their exhibition areas. This can, in turn, lead to degeneration of, or damage to, works of art on the premises and as a result may restrict what works can be made available to them for exhibition. A number of organizations noted security problems with regard to their exhibition and storage facilities. Several entities noted that spaces available had not met fire code standards.

Lack of storage space seems to be a problem for everyone and what storage space there is seems woefully inadequate for a variety of reasons. Climate control is necessary when you are storing works of art and few organizations have this. Access to a freight elevator and loading dock are important to organizations exhibiting large-scale works. Only half of the organizations have loading access to their storage area. One organization which in theory does have loading access finds it of little use because the elevator is usually out of order.

Beyond initial renovations to make their space suitable, exhibition-oriented organizations regularly need to create temporary partitions and build special supporting structures for specific installations and exhibitions. However, seven of nine organizations stated that they found it necessary to discard reusable building material because they lacked sufficient space to store it.

Seven of nine organizations surveyed had made capital improvements to leased property. Four of these had spent over \$30,000. This would suggest that you certainly don't get what you want or need when you rent--you have to improve what you get.

Indicative of the fact that this community's basic needs are not met in current spaces, is the answer to the survey question designed to encourage organizations to "dream" a little. "What facilities, not yet in existence, would you use if they were there?" On the "wish list" of one organization appeared "proper washroom facilities." They were not alone in that need. Another organization, providing production facilities to approximately 35 artists per month has only one washroom, and it contains a single toilet and nothing else. A sink is available in the adjacent production facilities.

EXHIBITION ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations have not been individually identified by name.
Instead an identification code (e.g. E1) has been used.

Organization	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9
Number of Years at previous location	3yrs	0	2.5yrs	0	2yrs	2-3yrs	1.5yrs	5yrs	3yrs
Number of years at current location	2yrs	10yrs	.5yrs	7yrs	5yrs	14yrs	1yr	2yrs	4yrs
Current lease signed	'87	0	'86	'84	'86	'86	'82	'82	'82
Expires	'90		'91	'90	'88	'91	'90	'89	'87
Length of lease	3yrs		5yrs	6yrs	2yrs	5yrs	4+5yrs	5yrs	5yrs
Cost per sq. ft.	\$14.13 gross	\$26.65 gross	\$7.75 gross	\$5.30 gross	\$9.67 net	\$5.81 net	\$7.75 net	\$5.70 net	\$11.45 net
		note 1		note 2					note 3

NOTES:

1. Have moved since the time of the survey and receive special governmental subsidy for their space.
2. Have moved since the time of the survey and operations now in hiatus due to financial pressures rising from the shortage of affordable space.
3. Have moved since the time of the survey.

SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Six of a possible fifteen service-oriented organizations, with operating budgets ranging in size from \$140,000 to \$1,600,000, were surveyed. The term "service-oriented" is used in this case to describe organizations whose primary purpose is to provide services to, or on behalf of, a particular group of professional artists or arts organizations (i.e. to writers, visual artists, playwrights, filmmakers, theatre organizations, etc.)

Because the operation of a service organization is mainly administrative, office space is the primary kind of space required, although the nature of the service provided in some cases may require special facilities (library, screening room, ticket booths, etc).

When surveyed in December 1986 only two of the six organizations anticipated moving within the next two years but, by February 1987, another organization had already moved. Four of the six organizations had been at their current location for three years or less. In many cases, the moves have been prompted by a need for more and better space, but in some, rising rental rates have driven tenants out of existing spaces. Two of the six organizations were in need of more space immediately and the other four anticipated program expansion which would, in turn, necessitate access to more space in the coming years.

Most organizations express some trepidation at the thought of searching for new space. One, whose lease expired in July 1987, had been searching for six months with no success. All noted that finding suitable and affordable space was very difficult.

Physical Characteristics:

As a group, service organizations are not looking for space with particular structural characteristics. Needs vary according to the size and nature of the organization but in most cases they are fairly simple. As with other types of organizations though, they place most emphasis on location in determining the suitability of a particular space.

Location:

All organizations surveyed stated that it was necessary for their offices to be located in a central/downtown location in order that they might be accessible to, and effectively provide services to their clients or members. Because the downtown area is easily accessible by public transit and because the galleries and theatres, to which the work of their clients is connected, are located there, it makes sense that the arts service organizations should also be located in this area. Additionally these organizations need convenient access to other facilities (eg. Canada Customs, film production houses, etc.) directly related to the service they provide. However these centrally located spaces generally command higher rents than their more peripherally located counterparts.

Despite the other drawbacks of their particular space, three of the four organizations located in the downtown area noted "location" as a significant, positive attribute of the space.

Cost:

Apart from one organization that pays a very reasonable \$5.75 per square foot (and remarks on this being the most positive attribute of the space), the other five organizations surveyed pay from \$7 to \$14 per square foot. (It may be significant to note that most of those at the lower end of the range signed leases prior to 1985, while those in the upper end signed in 1986.)

All organizations noted that cost was a key factor in determining the suitability of any space and more than one noted that they would be interested in cooperative space in a multi-disciplinary arts building, were it available.

The prevailing problem is the high cost of the space which is available in districts where the arts community is concentrated and where organizations need to be located in order to function effectively.

Current Situation:

Unlike other types of organizations, there is no significant complaint about the physical characteristics of spaces currently occupied by service organizations. Most do not have parking and find this situation unsatisfactory. Significant capital investments are not generally made to property leased by this group due to their relatively simple facility needs. There is one notable exception to this trend--one in which renovations were required.

One organization recognized the need for a location more accessible to its membership, observed higher rents in the central locations and having ascertained that the more space one leased, the better one's negotiating power, chose to rent a space far larger than they required. In turn, they subdivided the space, and sublet individual offices to each of three other arts organizations. That group, initially just leasing space together, have now gone on to utilize their individual resources more effectively by sharing meeting facilities, photocopy equipment, postage meters etc. While this arrangement has effectively addressed the provision of lower cost space for all the entities involved, it has added the additional administrative burden of 'landlord' to the already taxed schedule of the initiating organization which has a permanent staff of only one full-time employee.

SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations have not been individually identified by name, instead an identification code (e.g. S1) has been used.

(Office Space)

Organization	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
No. of years at prior space	5-6yrs	?	1yr	N/A	2yrs	1.5yrs
No. of years at current location	6yrs	2yrs	2yrs	3yrs	10yrs	3yrs
Current lease signed	'83	'84	'86	'86	'86	'86
Expires	'87	'89	'87	'88	'88	'87
Lease Length	4yrs	5yrs	1yr	2yrs	2yrs	1yr
Cost per sq. ft.	\$7. gross	\$9. gross	\$5.75 gross	\$14.0 gross	\$12.75 gross	\$12. gross
	note 1		note 2		note 3	note 4

NOTES:

1. Has, since the time of the initial survey, moved, due to rental increase imposed at the termination of their lease.
2. Planning to move at the time of the survey due to need for more space.
3. Planning to move at the time of the survey.
4. Has, since the time of the survey, moved following eviction due to the owner's intention to change the use of the building.

PERFORMING ARTS

OVERVIEW

When reviewing arts organizations' facilities needs, music, theatre and dance are related in that they have a common need for several kinds of spaces. Performance-oriented music organizations may require space for performance, rehearsal, administration and storage. Theatre and dance organizations will require not only these but generally will also need production spaces in which to create sets, props and costumes. In many instances the various kinds of space required by one organization are distributed over a range of locations. Many do not have the benefit of a permanent location for their performances, but instead, rent performance space on a 'per performance' basis.

All but one performance-oriented organization interviewed expressed a strong preference for having all aspects of their operations located in a single building. Perceived benefits of a single location included more effective and efficient management, better internal communications, improved public profile and elimination of the substantial amount of time and money wasted as individuals travel from one site to another to conduct their work. For example, many referred to the problems encountered when performers are heavily involved in rehearsal schedules and are called upon to travel to other sites for the regularly required costume fittings.

With the exception of a couple of very experimental performance groups who identify theirs as an alternative and very dedicated audience who would follow them anywhere, most performance organizations expressed a strong preference for a downtown location. In their view a central location provides for better access by audience members, performers and visiting school groups, and offers the additional support and profile of a dynamic performing arts community in the heart of the city.

Within this category of performance organizations 24 out of 98 Toronto Arts Council-funded organizations were surveyed.

DANCE ORGANIZATIONS

Five of a possible thirteen performance-oriented dance organizations with operating budgets ranging from \$135,000 to \$850,000 were surveyed. Within the limits of the survey sample, we included a broad spectrum of dance organizations in terms of their size and included both producing and presenter companies.

A performance-oriented dance organization may require space for performance, rehearsal, administration, storage and production requirements such as set and prop construction and wardrobe. Although each organization stated a preference for having all aspects of their operation located in a single building, only one organization surveyed actually experienced this situation. That organization has, since the time of our survey, come to the end of its fifteen-year lease, and lost its space due to its inability to pay the substantially increased rent. They have temporarily halted operation in order to address the space problem. Other organizations strive to at least keep office, rehearsal studios, storage

space and production facilities together even though they may all be located separate from performance space. Even this cannot always be achieved.

Dance organizations stated that it is exceedingly difficult to gain access to space that meets their special requirements but is also within their budget. The search for space is a time-consuming, anxiety-ridden process dreaded by all except the small minority of organizations that own their own space.

Several organizations suggested the creation of a cooperative dance facility - several rehearsal studios with an attached theatre (such as the one operating in Vancouver) - to alleviate the space shortage. Cost would be the key factor in determining whether an organization could make use of such facilities.

Representatives of dance companies participating in the Toronto Arts Council's "Let's Talk" consultative sessions reiterated that more facilities are required as follows:

"Three facilities were identified as necessary for the Toronto dance community to best serve and expand its audiences.

- * a 200 - 250 seat performance space to complement the Winchester Street Theatre; this is especially required for performances of work by independent choreographers.
- * a 425 - 500 seat performance space for use by larger Toronto companies (e.g. Danny Grossman, Desrosiers); Premiere Dance Theatre was meant to fill this need but Toronto dance companies report that high rental fees, booking difficulties and other matters make this venue problematic.
- * a 1,000 seat space for special performances."²

Performance Space:

Dance organizations noted that a suitable performing facility must have a wide, open stage area with a sprung-wood floor, high ceiling, adequate wing area off the stage, temperature control features (for the health and well-being of the dancers) and dressing room facilities with showers. The venue must be large enough to accommodate their audience and should be centrally located and easily accessible by public transit. Cost is a major factor in determining whether a company can utilize a particular facility.

Most dance organizations rent performance space on a per performance basis, as required. Among the many factors that are considered when a dance organization is booking performance space, cost and size are noted as the two key criteria. When you talk about dance venues in Toronto, the names mentioned most often are Premiere Dance Theatre, the 450-seat facility at Harbourfront (currently the most 'upmarket' dance theatre in the city) and Winchester Street Theatre, the 116-seat theatre located near Carleton and Parliament in the building owned and operated by Toronto Dance Theatre.

Some local companies have the opportunity to perform at the Premiere Dance Theatre through the subscription series which are programmed for that venue. The series book the facility and the companies are paid a flat fee plus box office percentage. Because the alternative, rental of the Premiere Dance Theatre by an individual company, can cost \$1,000 per day (factors such as number of performances and length of run will determine actual rent) the subscription series provides the only financially viable opportunity to perform in a high profile theatre of this size. (In some cases the series also allows a company to access a much larger audience than they would be able to draw on their own as a single ticket item.)

One disadvantage for a dance company performing as part of a subscription series is that they must commit themselves to dates so far in advance of booking their tours that they sometimes lose the flexibility required to take advantage of touring opportunities as they present themselves. Touring is important to a company in order to build and maintain a national and international reputation. On the other hand, appearing as part of a series allows a company to broaden and strengthen the home base support which not only provides it with an audience, but also attracts private and corporate donations.

The dates which are not taken by the series are in high demand by local dance companies because Premiere Dance Theatre is the largest and most luxurious dance venue in the city. Therefore, even for those companies that can afford the rent, competition for booking is great, and there is virtually no possibility of extending the run of a successful show.

Bookings are normally made at least a year in advance. There is no alternative dance facility of this size and if a company is unable to obtain a slot in the Premiere Dance Theatre schedule or if it requires a larger venue, it must look to other performance spaces. One dance organization contacted the Ryerson Theatre in an effort to book that facility sixteen months in advance. Even with that much advance notice, they found the dates they requested were already taken and they had to choose alternate dates further in the future.

Winchester Street Theatre is in the same high demand by dance organizations requiring a smaller venue. Those organizations that either cannot afford or could not fill the Premiere Dance Theatre, compete for bookings of this 116-seat dance facility. Toronto Dance Theatre, although it owns the building and houses its offices, rehearsal studios and workshop here, seldom uses the performance space because it simply is not large enough to accommodate the company's audience. Instead they rent the facility to organizations that attract a smaller audience. Toronto Dance Theatre rents Premiere Dance Theatre for their own Toronto performances.

Winchester Street Theatre is a less luxurious venue than Premiere Dance Theatre, but does have an established public profile as a dance facility. It can cost \$300 to \$400 per day to rent (factors such as length of run and number of performances will determine the actual cost) and bookings are normally made at least six months in advance. If the dates requested by an organization are not available, the organization must either change their proposed performance dates or look for an alternate venue. Mindful of this, most organizations try to book as far in advance as possible and to be flexible as to their preferred dates.

The fact that Winchester Street Theatre has only minimal dressing room facilities, inadequate wing area off the stage for "flying" entrances and exits and inadequate acoustics, does not diminish its popularity as a venue with companies looking for a small theatre because there is little else available.

Toronto lacks a mid-range 200 to 300 seat dance theatre available to the organizations that want to develop an audience larger than can be accommodated at Winchester Street but too small to be suitable for Premiere Dance Theatre.

Rehearsal Space:

Most dance organizations maintain one or more rehearsal studios, although one organization surveyed requires that artists make their own rehearsal arrangements. Among the organizations surveyed, available rehearsal area ranges from 2500 square feet to 3000 square feet. Rates vary from \$3.25 per square foot to \$11.60 per square foot, though it should be pointed out that the organization that pays \$3.25 per square foot negotiated an exceptional deal (and has since lost that space) and the more common rate is from \$10 to \$12 per square foot.

The features deemed necessary for a rehearsal studio are that it be a large, open area with a sprung-wood floor and high ceilings. Temperature control of the space is important because the dancers must be kept warm, and there should be dressing room and shower facilities.

Three of the four organizations surveyed find their present rehearsal space inadequate, some citing poor ventilation and sporadic heating and most stating that the space is just too small for their needs.

Production Space (Set & Prop Construction/Wardrobe):

One dance organization surveyed has a 310 square foot workshop on-site, but deems this insufficient to accommodate their needs. The other organizations use their rehearsal space as a workshop when required. Although production space was not noted to be of high priority when an organization is looking for space, those that presently do without it indicated that production space would be utilized if it were available.

Four of the five organizations surveyed anticipate program expansion which will generate a need for more space in the next few years. For some this means more office and storage space will be required and for others it means increased access to performance space will be necessary.

Two organizations indicated that they might lose space in the near future.

Storage:

Four of the five dance organizations surveyed have storage space on-site, although in only two cases is this a specific area set aside exclusively for storage. Two of the organizations make use of whatever space is available-- hallways, under the stage, etc. Three of the four expressed dissatisfaction with their present shortage of storage space, one citing occasions when fire regulations were contravened because it was necessary to use the hallways for

temporary storage. All, though, adopt a "make-do" attitude towards the situation because storage space, although necessary, is not the key criteria in judging the suitability of a space and it hence becomes one of the areas in which an organization can compromise on its requirements when looking for space.

One organization rents 2000 square feet of storage space in Scarborough at \$4 per square foot. Lacking sufficient on-site storage makes rental of this separate storage facility necessary. The inconvenience of having the storage area located so far away (taking anything out of storage now requires advance planning) is offset by the low cost. To make a situation like this practical, someone in the organization must have a vehicle suitable for transporting material to and from the storage facility. Not all organizations are in this position.

Abbreviations Used:

RAR = Rent as required R = On-going rental DNR = Do not require

Organizations have not been individually indentified by name, instead an indentification code (e.g. D1 has been used).

Organization	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
PERFORMANCE	RAR	RAR	R	RAR	RAR
OFFICE	R	R	R	OWN	R
No. of years at prior location	2yrs	?	N/A	1yr	6yrs
No. of years at current location	.5yrs	1.5yrs	16yrs	9yrs	.5yr
Current lease signed	'86	'85	'72	N/A	'86
Expires	'89	'87	'87	N/A	'87
Lease length	3yrs	2yrs	15yrs	N/A	1yr
Cost per sq. ft.	\$23.50 gross	\$7.15 gross	\$3.75 net	\$11.60 gross	\$3.25 gross
REHEARSAL	DNR	R	R	R	R
STORAGE	R	R	none	R	R
PRODUCTION SET/WARDROBE	none			R	R
CONDUCT BUSINESS AT THIS MANY LOCATIONS	2	2	1	3	2
	note 1		note 2		note 3

NOTES:

1. Artists working with this dance company are required to rent any necessary rehearsal space themselves.
2. This organization, having reached the end of its lease, encountered rental rates beyond its financial capabilities. As a result they had to give up the space and have had to close down operations temporarily to address this problem.
3. Office, storage, rehearsal and production activities are all carried out in one location which is not designed to house all these functions and does not have separate areas delineated for each.

MUSIC ORGANIZATIONS

Seven of a possible thirty music organizations were surveyed with operating budgets ranging in size from \$115,000 to \$750,000. A performance-oriented music organization may require space for performance, rehearsal, administration and storage.

While every organization surveyed stated a preference for having all aspects of its operation located in a single building, only one of the seven actually enjoys this situation.

Six of the seven music organizations surveyed rent office space. (The administrative work of the seventh is done by the director from his own office which is maintained for other business.) Three have rehearsal and storage space in the same building. Two rent rehearsal space by the week as required and storage space by the month when required. Two do not require either rehearsal or storage space because the rehearsal is the responsibility of the musicians and there is nothing to store. Six of the seven organizations rent performance space on a per performance basis as required.

Despite the fact that all but one organization have been at their present locations for more than three years, all expect to lose space (either office, performance, rehearsal or some combination of the three) within eighteen months.

While their situations vary - one group is looking for office space, another only for performance space, and others will be looking for office and rehearsal space in the same building - all state that the search for suitable space, be it daily or monthly rental, is extremely difficult.

Music organization representatives participating in the Toronto Arts Council's "Let's Talk" consultative sessions stated that: "Concert Halls for music are also required in the 500 - 1,200 seat range."³

Performance Space:

Only one music organization surveyed has its own performance space. Three of the remaining six each use a particular concert venue, renting on a per performance basis. The other three organizations rent whatever space they can afford and find available.

Music organizations are looking for a venue of sufficient size to accommodate their audience (the average audience of organizations surveyed ranges in size from 120 to 700), with good acoustics, a box office and lighting and audio facilities. Performance space should be conveniently located in a central/downtown location for easy public access and must be affordable.

Due to high demand on the facilities, most music organizations find it necessary to book concert venues six months to one year in advance. Even then, if an organization does not have an established association with a particular concert hall (as, for example, CentreStage Music, now Music Toronto, has with the Jane

Mallet Theatre) it can find its first choice of venue booked and be forced to search for an alternative. As many organizations pointed out, there is little available.

Seldom do smaller organizations have the opportunity to perform in a facility specifically designed for music. Instead they must vie with the dance and theatre organizations trying to book other performance facilities, sometimes even looking to schools or churches as possible concert locations. One organization performed in an amphitheatre at the Guild Inn in Scarborough last summer. Although the space was rent-free, it cost \$3,000 to rent seating and lighting for the week, which is the same price they would have paid for the fully staffed and equipped 285-seat theatre at Toronto Workshop Productions in downtown Toronto, had it been available.

All organizations lamented the lack of concert facilities in Toronto, noting particularly the need for both a 400 to 600 seat and an 800 to 1000 seat concert hall. All noted that cost would be the key factor in determining whether or not they could utilize such facilities if they were made available.

Rehearsal Space:

Two of the organizations surveyed do not require rehearsal space. (In these cases it is the responsibility of the individual musician or group to find their own rehearsal space, not that of the organization.) Three organizations have their own rehearsal space in the building in which their office is located. Two organizations rent rehearsal space on a weekly basis as required.

The key criteria for rehearsal space are that it be: soundproof (so as not to disturb those in adjacent areas); large enough to be comfortable; located close to office and performance space; and affordable.

Of course the scale required is relative to the number of performers it must accommodate. Rehearsal space used by the organizations surveyed ranged from 800 to 2400 square feet. Given that it must be located close to the performance and office space and because it has already been established that these must be located in the downtown area for reasons of accessibility, so too must the rehearsal space.

For those music organizations which have rehearsal space on-site, the cost is built into the rent of the whole facility. The average rent paid by the organizations surveyed is \$12 to \$15 per square foot. The organizations that rent rehearsal space by the week pay an average of \$10 per square foot for that space but do not have the advantage of an on-site operation and have the added expense of the time spent looking for space each time they need it. Some organizations that have their own rehearsal space have the added benefit of being able to sublet their space to other organizations, thereby subsidizing their own operations.

All organizations that have their own rehearsal space are very satisfied with it. Those groups that rent as required find the search itself a chore and also find there is a limited amount of suitable rehearsal space available. It is necessary

to book rehearsal space at least six months in advance to ensure getting a space. If your first choice is not available you run down the list until you find some place that is. Prices range from \$150 per week, for space in a church which is also used by a daycare group and hence is available only on a limited schedule, to \$300 per week for space in another church which is considered so desirable because of its location, size and general ambience that it is difficult to book because so many performing groups--theatre, dance, music--use it.

MUSIC

Abbreviations Used:

RAR = Rent as required R = On-going rental DNR = Do not require

Organizations have not been individually identified by name, instead an identification code (e.g. M1) has been used.

ORGANIZATION	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7
PERFORMANCE	RAR	RAR	RAR	RAR	R	RAR	RAR
OFFICE	R	R	R	none	R	R	R
No. of years at prior location	N/A	N/A	3yrs	N/A	N/A	4-5yrs	N/A
No. of years at current location	6yrs	3yrs	8yrs		7yrs	1mth	5yrs
Current lease signed	'85		'85		'85	'86	?
Expires	'87		'88		'87	'91	'87
Length	2		3		2	5	?
Cost per sq. ft. net	\$12	\$15	\$6.75			\$14	\$12.3
		net	gross			net	gross
REHEARSAL	R	none	R	RAR	Use perf.	RAR	none
STORAGE	R	none	R	none	R	RAR	none
PRODUCTION SET/WARDROBE	DNR	DNR	need	DNR	DNR	need	DNR
CONDUCT BUSINESS AT THIS MANY LOCATIONS	2	2	2	2	1	4	2
Notes		note 1	note 2	note 3	note 4		note 5

NOTES:

1. This organization was sub-leasing space from an organization with which they were affiliated. They then separated the two entities, and this organization has since found new space and separate office space.
2. Have ceased operation since the time of the survey.
3. The director handles all business for the organization from his own office leased for other purposes.
4. Rental paid covers office space and all access to the performance facility.
5. Have moved since the time of the survey.

THEATRE COMPANIES

Twelve of a possible fifty-five production-oriented theatre organizations were surveyed. For the purposes of the survey a wide spectrum of organizations were chosen, with operating budgets ranging from \$85,000 to \$4,000,000.

A theatre organization may require space for performance, rehearsal, administration, storage and production requirements such as set and props construction and wardrobe.

All but one organization surveyed stated a preference for having all aspects of their operation located in one building rather than being spread over several locations. The reality of the situation though, is that most organizations lease space in anywhere from one to four locations to accommodate administrative, production and storage functions and then rent performance and rehearsal space on a daily or weekly basis as required.

Beyond the scarcity of space available, many groups commented on the inadequacy of the space they can afford, a point reiterated by the Toronto Theatre Alliance in its report Facilities for Small Theatres: The Other Housing Crisis, when it stated that small theatres are "...often faced with poorly equipped or marginal spaces making the job of building an audience or reputation that much harder."

Performance Space:

Virtually all the theatres surveyed require that performance space be flexible in terms of both seating and staging. Loading access to backstage is also cited as a necessary requirement, though only three of the companies surveyed felt the performance venues they used were adequate in this regard. Companies that rent space on an ad hoc basis are faced with the added problem of maintaining their own identity when performing in a rented space which the public associates with a resident theatre company. For example, a company producing adult fare at the Nathan Cohen Studio at Young People's Theatre is working against the public perception of the theatre as a venue for children's theatre.

Eight of twelve theatre companies surveyed either manage their own theatre space or have the status of 'resident company' at a particular theatre venue. In effect, what this means is that these eight organizations are guaranteed a performance space and do not have to 'compete' with other companies for bookings. (Although a resident company would still only rent the facility on a weekly basis as required, they would be given priority in booking the space and their entire season would be presented from this one venue.) The four remaining companies have no affiliation to a particular theatre venue and simply book performance space on a per performance basis as required. (Conceivably each play in their season could be presented from a different venue.) Only one of these four operates in this manner by choice. The others all expressed a desire to have their own performance space or regular, assured access to one particular performance space, not only to eliminate the frustrating and time-consuming search for space, but also to help establish a public profile for the company.

Nine of the twelve theatre organizations surveyed stated that it is extremely difficult to find appropriate performance venues. Needs vary, of course,

according to the company and the production. While some companies are looking for an intimate 100-seat theatre, others are seeking a much larger 900-seat venue. Currently rates range from \$600 per week for a 154-seat theatre to \$6,500 per week for a 900-seat theatre complete with union (IATSE) crew.

Most companies try to book a performance venue six months to one year in advance in order to obtain the dates they want. In one case though, a company trying to book a venue two years in advance found their preferred time-slot was already filled. Finding the facility of one's choice booked for the proposed time slot, theatre companies are then faced with the problems of juggling the balance of their schedule to accommodate a different time, paying higher rates for a more expensive venue, compromising the artistic integrity of their piece in order to house it within an unsuitable facility, or performing in a venue whose usual audience is not compatible with the work of the rental company. Further, if a theatre company cannot book space for their performance, their very existence may be threatened, as funders, in making their decisions, will carefully consider whether a group has access to a performance venue. Hence a circular and very frustrating problem emerges.

Strongly voiced within the theatre community is the critical need to ensure the on-going operation of a number of theatre facilities for 'homeless' theatres--entities such as the Theatre Centre and the Poor Alex.

Rehearsal Space:

Finding adequate rehearsal space for theatre was identified by the administrator of one theatre company as her worst headache. Only four of the twelve companies surveyed have their own rehearsal facility, and of these, only two have rehearsal space on-site. A further two have regular rehearsal facilities which they rent by the season. The remaining six rent rehearsal space on an ad hoc basis as required.

Location, size and cost are the major considerations when determining the suitability of rehearsal space. Ideally it should be located close to the company's office to facilitate communication and should be easily accessible by public transit for the convenience of performers. It must have a large, flexible, working area, equal in size to the stage on which the actors will be performing and preferably with a wooden floor for the safety of the actors. Washrooms are necessary. A phone, secure storage for props, kitchen facilities (however minimal), privacy from others using the building and 24 hour access are desirable features.

The cost of renting rehearsal space can vary according to many factors, including the financial circumstances of the organization. Many theatre companies in Toronto rent rehearsal space in church halls and the church organizations will often scale the rent to accommodate the budget of a smaller company. For this reason it is more useful to look at the budget allocations for rental of rehearsal space rather than the rents charged by the various facilities. Of the companies surveyed, budget allocations for rental of rehearsal space ranged from \$125-\$150 per week to \$750-\$1000 per week. The average though is closer to \$200 per week. Innumerable factors can override cost as a key factor which will determine the suitability of space for rehearsal purposes. For example, one

company that normally budgets \$300 per week for rental of rehearsal space has paid up to \$600 per week because they were 'desperate.' In another instance a company was forced to turn down the offer of free rehearsal space because the space was located in North York, and required a two hour transit ride from downtown. It was simply not cost effective given the amount of time that would have been required for travel to and from the site, in addition to that required for travel to the other locations at which that organization's work was carried out.

Production Space (Set & Prop Construction/Wardrobe):

Six of the twelve theatre companies surveyed maintain designated construction space. Three have space on-site and three rent separate facilities. Another company uses its on-site space for construction, when necessary, but does not have a workshop set up. For example, sets are built in the theatre and the storage area doubles as a wardrobe when necessary. Five of the companies surveyed have no construction facilities at all, using the donated basement workshops and garages of friends or renting as required.

Construction space should be large, well-ventilated and have good lighting. Ideally it is located in the same building as the theatre but in any case it should be very convenient to it. Ongoing consultation between production personnel, the director and cast is vital prior to opening a show and there is little time available to travel from one location to another. Loading access and security are also desirable features.

Storage Space:

Three of the twelve theatre companies surveyed have on-site storage (though one of these has no particular area designated for storage and maintains that the quick recycling of set material dispenses with the need for such an area). Four companies rent separate storage facilities on an ongoing basis and one company rents storage space as required. Four companies have no storage space, relying on friends to donate space in garages and basements when necessary. All but two companies admit that they are forced to destroy reusable material due to lack of storage space.

Ideally the location of storage space should be convenient to both the performance space and to the production workshop. It should be dry, of a size large enough to accommodate the needs of the organization, and have loading access. Security is also an important feature.

Storage spaces used by the companies surveyed ranged from 200 square feet to 3000 square feet. Rental rates average around \$3 per square foot.

Production and storage spaces must be extremely inexpensive to be affordable to organizations surveyed. In many instances, organizations can barely afford the taxes and heating expenses incurred in maintaining production and storage spaces, let alone rental charges.

Office Space: Dance, Music, Theatre

There are no particular structural requirements for office space required by the performing arts community. Most simply seek space that is relatively clean, large enough to accommodate their operation, located close to the organization's performance and rehearsal spaces (if not in the same building) and affordable.

In scale, the performing arts organizations surveyed use office spaces ranging from 90 sq.ft. to 16,000 sq.ft. Costs appear to vary inversely to size of space leased. Music organizations, apart from one that pays \$6.75 per sq.ft. are all paying \$12 - \$15 per sq.ft. for offices. Dance organizations surveyed were paying from \$3.25 (that group subsequently lost its space) to \$23 per sq.ft. In theatre, office space costs from \$5.65 to \$30 per sq.ft. with most paying in the \$10 - \$15 per sq.ft. range.

All organizations noted the necessity for their office and rehearsal spaces to be downtown. The reasons? Convenience for audience, staff and performers; easy access to service facilities located downtown; and, for those organizations that include a teaching component as part of their mandate, accessibility to students. One organization also mentioned, as a prime reason for requiring a downtown location, the need to be located in close proximity to other arts organizations in order to facilitate cross-disciplinary communications.

THEATRE

71

Abbreviations Used: R = On-going rental DNR = Do not require Don. = Donated
RAR = Rent as required

ORGANIZATION	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12
PERFORMANCE	R	RAR	RAR	R	R	RAR	R	R	RAR	OWN	RAR	R
No. of years at prior location	note 1	R 9yrs	N/A	?	note 1	N/A	N/A	8-9yrs	note 1	N/A	N/A	10yrs
No. of years at current location	12yrs	N/A	N/A	7yrs	2mths	N/A	15yrs	8yrs	N/A	10yrs	N/A	10yrs
Current lease signed	note 2 '86	N/A	N/A	?	no lease	N/A	note 3 '83	note 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	'76
Expires	'96	N/A	N/A	?	"	N/A	'88	note 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	2000
Length of lease	10yrs	N/A	N/A	?	"	N/A	5yrs	note 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	24yrs
OFFICE SPACE												
No. of years at prior location	?	9yrs	6mths	?	2yrs	3yrs	N/A	8-9yrs	6yrs	?	?	10yrs
No. of years at current location	1mth	2mth	4mth	4yrs	1.5yrs	3mth	15yrs	8yrs	1.5yrs	note 5 8yrs	4 yrs	2 sites 10 yrs 6 yrs
Current lease signed	'86	'86	'86	'86	none	'86	'83	none	'85	'84	'82	'76
Expires	'96	'88	'87	'92	"	'87	'88	"	'88	'89	'88	2000
Length of lease	10yrs	2yrs	1yr	10yrs	"	1yr	5yrs	"	3yrs	5+5yrs	6yrs	24yrs
Cost	\$10.56 net	\$10.80 gross	\$17.15 gross	\$15.0 net	\$30.0 gross	\$1/yr	\$5.65 net	\$12.75 net	\$8.08 net	\$7.30 gross	\$20.40 net	\$1/yr
REHEARSAL SPACE	Use Perf.	none	RAR	RAR	RAR note 6	RAR	on site	R	RAR	Use Perf.	RAR	RAR
Length of lease								1yr				
STORAGE	R	none	Don.	?	none	DNR	on site	\$4.50/ sq.ft.	RAR	\$3.00/ sq.ft.	\$3.00/ sq.ft.	on site
PRODUCTION WARDROBE/SET CONSTRUCTION	note 7	none	none	?	Don. & outdoor	RAR & Don.	on site	R	RAR & office	on site	R	same as storage
Additional Notes		note 8										

NOTES:

- Had rented at numerous locations briefly prior to current location.
- While terms of the lease have been discussed, an actual lease had not been signed at the time of the survey.
- In the process of purchasing their building at the time of the survey. The organization has since completed that purchase.
- This organization had been notified, just prior to the survey, that they would be forced to relocate. They have since relocated to temporary premises while negotiating for long term tenancy at another site.
- Office and shop/production facilities combined at this site.
- Although offered free rehearsal space in the northern extreme of Metro, this group was unable to accept the offer as the space available would have necessitated an additional two-hours transit from downtown Toronto and this would not have proven practical for the individuals involved in the productions.
- This organization incorporates wardrobe in their storage space and workshop functions are carried out in the performance space itself.
- This organization has ceased operation since the time of the survey.

NOTES TO PART III

1. Toronto Arts Council, The Let's Talk Report, Toronto Arts Council, 1988, p. 20.
2. The Let's Talk Report, p. 18-19.
3. The Let's Talk Report, p. 28.

Property Tax Exemptions and Remissions 1985-1988

Name	Exempt Assessment	1985 Toronto	1985 Metro	1986 Toronto	1986 Metro	1987 Toronto	1987 Metro	1988 Toronto	1988 Metro	Principal Beneficiaries
Roy Thomson Hall	5,500,000	346,428	398,825	358,215	414,095	372,898	435,525	387,200	446,710	Toronto Symphony
Massey Hall	222,900	14,040	16,163	14,517	16,782	15,113	17,651	15,692	18,104	Sundry
O'Keefe Centre	2,970,000	187,071	215,365	193,436	223,611	201,365	235,184	209,088	241,223	COC/National Ballet
St. Lawrence Centre	2,129,000	134,099	154,381	138,662	160,292	144,346	168,588	149,882	172,917	Theatre Plus/CentreStage
Art Gallery of Ontario	3,643,500	229,493	264,203	237,301	274,319	247,023	288,516	256,502	295,925	AGO
Royal Ontario Museum	5,320,000	335,090	385,772	346,492	400,543	360,694	421,272	374,528	432,090	ROM
National Ballet School	538,339	33,908	39,037	35,062	40,532	36,499	42,629	37,899	43,724	National Ballet School
Alumnae Theatre	61,400	3,867	4,452	3,999	4,623	4,163	4,862	4,323	4,987	Alumnae Theatre
Ontario College of Art	1,716,176	108,097	124,446	111,775	129,211	116,356	135,898	120,819	139,388	OCA
Ontario Heritage Found.	181,850	11,454	13,187	11,844	13,691	12,329	14,400	12,802	14,770	Ontario Heritage Foundation
Eaton Auditorium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Opera Centre (Front Street)*	191,795	11,055	12,726	12,492	14,440	13,004	15,188	13,502	15,578	Canadian Opera Company
Totals	22,283,165	1,403,548	1,615,832	1,451,303	1,677,699	1,510,792	1,764,525	1,568,735	1,809,839	

*The 1985 property tax value is based on 335 days

Rent Forgivenesses 1985-1988

Young People's Theatre	51,748	54,335	57,380	62,615
Alumni Theatre	38,123	40,029	42,275	46,100
National Ballet	194,335	204,400	493,950	496,816

APPENDIX B

WORKSPACE CONCERNS IN THE LITERARY COMMUNITY

The segment of the literary community addressed here includes non-profit writers' and publishers' organizations as well as non-profit writer support groups.

As noted previously, only one literary organization was included in the pilot survey. This reflects the fact that organizations surveyed were drawn from the list of organizations funded by the Toronto Arts Council in 1986. It would appear that while Toronto houses numerous literary organizations, many are in fact national service organizations eligible for Toronto Arts Council funding only for their Toronto activities. Because this aspect of the arts community did not receive significant coverage in the pilot survey, this appendix has been added.

Information reflected herein is thus not the result of the survey, but rather a reflection of ideas and concerns raised in formal and informal meetings and discussions of the literary community in recent years, many of which arose in the context of new proposals being initiated for the development of facilities housing numerous literary organizations.

Many groups note that their leases are short or are unlikely to be renewed due to substantial increases in rent. One in particular noted that they exist with only 90-day leases. Some have leases that extend for up to five years, but recognize that rental pressures will force them to move immediately thereafter.

Many literary organizations note the need for additional facilities beyond those currently housed within their premises. Included are the need for meeting facilities, seminar and reading/performance space. The search for this kind of space, available for rental on an hourly or daily basis, is often frustrating or unproductive, and creates scheduling problems for many groups.

For some, premises currently used do not provide adequately for the security of staff and the general public, particularly in light of the number of evening programs and activities offered. Others commented on the inadequacy of maintenance of their building, noting dirty bathrooms and halls, burned out lights in common areas, etc.

Lack of access for the disabled is a problem as well. One organization commented on the problems posed by the four-flight climb to their offices and lack of elevator access.

Throughout all discussions of the community, the need for literary organizations to be in close proximity to one another was stressed, and this arose for many reasons.

Many literary organizations serve a national membership and regularly have members travelling to Toronto on business. Given that context, it is important for those visiting members to have easy and efficient access to a variety of

organizations within the literary community. This is best accomplished when those organizations are in close proximity to one another and easily reached by transit.

The literary community has also had to work hard to secure and protect various intellectual and economic rights of its constituents (copyright, censorship, second class mailing privileges). This has necessitated the commitment of enormous amounts of time and work to lobbying and has required coordinated efforts on the part of all concerned parties. This too has underscored the need for clustering of the literary community in order that it can serve its writers and organizations well.

While literary organizations coordinate their efforts in many areas, significant interest in sharing of further information, equipment and resources has been voiced. Discussions in this vein have referred to sharing of:

- * computers and desktop publishing facilities
- * information data bases
- * graphic design and layout services
- * secretarial/reception and office management staff
- * accounting and bookkeeping services
- * library
- * board/meeting rooms
- * auditorium space (for launchings, readings, meetings and seminars)
- * library facilities

It has also been suggested, by some, that it would be desirable to include workspace for individual writers along with a pub or restaurant in shared literary facilities, in order to encourage informal contact amongst writers and others in their community. Some proposals have alluded to the merit of including small commercial publishers within shared facility complexes, others have been restricted only to non-profit literary organizations and individual writers.

Beyond the enhanced productivity and efficiency that shared literary facilities would provide, many feel strongly that the focus provided by such a centre would also be very helpful to the extent that it would help develop an enhanced profile for Canadian writers and literary works.

APPENDIX C

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part I of this report was written by Tom Hendry in collaboration with Rita Davies.

Part II was written by Judith Stephens-Wells.

Part III was written by Beth Johnson and Judith Stephens-Wells with research assistance from Betty Anne Coulter.

This report was prepared with the participation of the Priorities and Planning Committee of the Toronto Arts Council: J.P.S. Mackenzie (Chair), Douglas Barrett, Rita Davies, Jim Garrard, Tom Hendry, William Kilbourn, Montague Larkin, Harry Malcolmson, Ian Murray.

The entire report was made possible by the cooperation of the non-profit arts and culture community of Toronto and the time and work invested by the organizations responding to the survey. The Toronto Arts Council specifically wishes to thank the following organizations and individuals for their assistance in reviewing drafts and developing this report:

ANNPAC Toronto - Gary Hall; Black Creek Foundation - John Buttrick; CARO - Garry Conway; CCMC Music Gallery - Jim Montgomery; Danny Grossman Dance Company - Jane Marsland; Desrosiers Dance Theatre - Janis Orenstein; Factory Theatre - Dian English; Gallery 44 - April Hickox; Mercer Union - Steve Pozel; Randy Glynn Dance Project - Randy Glynn; Tafelmusik - Ottie Lockie; Tarragon Theatre - Mallory Gilbert; The Theatre Centre - Sarah Meurling; Toronto Dance Theatre - Ken Pierson; Toronto Theatre Alliance - Jini Stolk; Trinity Square Video - Gwen MacGregor; V/Tape - Kim Tomczak.

"We must all begin to view the arts...as a basic city service like police, fire protection, garbage collection or street paving...if we are to survive with our humanism intact."

Mayor Wes Uhlman
Seattle, 1970

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Cora Beth. "The Right Premises: New Ideas in Artists' Housing" Boston Review. Volume X, No. 6. Boston. December, 1985.
- Allemang, John. "Room for a Rembrandt? Harbourfront Co-op Designed to Meet Artistic Needs" Globe and Mail. Toronto. February 2, 1985.
- American Council for the Arts. The Arts and City Planning. Edited by Robert Porter. New York. American Council for the Arts. 1980
- ArtHouse. Live/work: Form & Function. San Francisco. ArtHouse. 1989.
- Artists Certification Committee. Regulations and Criteria for Certification. New York, New York. Artists Certification Committee.
- Artists Equity Association Inc. Artists Live/Work Space: Changing Public Policy. Artists Equity Association, Inc., Northern California Chapter. 1981.
- Artists for Environment Foundation. Walpack Center, New Jersey -An Art Town. Walpak: Artists for Environment Foundation. 1979.
- The Artists Housing Coalition. "Materials, Worksheets and Commentary" prepared for the Artists Housing Conference, November 3, 1979 (Sponsored by the Foundation for the Community of Artists and Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts.)
- Artspace Inc. Project Proposal. Winnipeg, Manitoba. September 7, 1984.
- Artspace Projects Inc. Imagination Needs a Roof Over Its Head (Information Brochure). Minneapolis, Minnesota. Artspace Projects Inc.
- Bovey, Edmund C., Chalmers, Joan and Theroux, Michel. Funding of the Arts in Canada to the Year 2000: The Report of the Task Force on Funding of the Arts. Ottawa. Department of Communications and Department of Finance. 1986.
- Brannigan-Lorelli Associates, et al. San Antonio Performing Arts District (Interim Report 1). San Antonio: Arts Council of San Antonio. 1979.
- Briskin, Larry. Arts and the States: A Report of the Arts Task Force National Conference of State Legislatures. Washington, D.C., National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Buckhurst Fish Hutton Katz, Planners and Architects. Artist Housing at Snug Harbour: A Preliminary Report. New York, New York. Department of Housing Preservation and Development. May 18, 1983.
- Buffalo Dept. of Community Development. The Entertainment District Project Report: Buffalo, New York, July 1978. Buffalo. City of Buffalo. 1978.
- Chartrand, Harry Hillman. The Arts Consumption Skills in the Post-Modern Economy. Ottawa. Canada Council. 1986.

Chartrand, Harry Hillman. Arts Education and the Bottom Line in a Post-Modern Economy: Two Variations on a Theme. Ottawa. Canada Council. 1987.

City of New York Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Office of Special Housing. Artists' Housing: A New York City Live/Work Program: Request for Proposals. New York, New York. 1984.

City of New York. Artists' Housing: A New York City Live/Work Program. Released under the joint auspices of: The Mayor of the City of New York, and the Commissioners of the Departments of Housing Preservation and Development, General Services and Cultural Affairs. New York City. January, 1984.

City of New York Planning Department and The School of Architecture, Pratt Institute. Artists in Metropolis: an exploration for planners. City of New York Planning Department and The School of Architecture, Pratt Institute. 1964.

City of Toronto Land Use Committee. Clause 36 contained in Report No. 5 of the Land Use Committee, entitled Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning -- 222, 226, 230 and 232 Bay Street, The Old Stock Exchange; 55 and 77 King Street West; And 100 Wellington Street West. City of Toronto Land Use Committee. 1988.

City of Toronto Legal Department. Report to the Land Use Committee Part II Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning for the Block Bounded by Yonge Street, Front Street West, Bay Street and Wellington Street West: Application No. 1986 - BCE Place. City of Toronto Legal Department. December 9, 1987.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Assisted Housing: Options for Private Sector Involvement and Section 36 Guidelines. City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. November, 1987.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Report to the Land Use Committee entitled Final Report on Part II Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning for the Yonge, Front, Bay and Wellington Lands: Application No. 1986 - BCE Place (Ward 6). City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. November 12, 1987.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Density Transfer: Policy Review and Recommendations. City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. June, 1986.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department (prepared by Berridge, Lewinberg Associates). Density Transfers: A comparative analysis of density transfer policies in several North American cities. City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. June, 1986.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Section 36 Guidelines: Further Report on Guidelines for Bonusing Pursuant to Section 36 of the Planning Act. City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. June 6, 1988.

City of Vancouver Planning Department. Report to Council. Subject: Artists' Live/Work Studios. City of Vancouver Planning Department. July 2, 1987.

Cowan, C. Lynn. "Second Homes: Multiple Bases for Performing Arts Organizations": The Journal of Arts Management and Law, Volume 17, No. 1, Spring 1987.

The Cultural Policy Institute, Baltimore, Maryland; David Cwi Director. How Cities Support the Arts. United States Conference of Mayors. Washington, D.C.

Czarnecki, Mark. "Homeless Theatre Lost in High Prices": Metropolis. August 25, 1988.

de Ville, Barry and Kinsley, Brian. Cultural Facilities: Oversupply or Undersupply - Guidelines for Increasing Participation. Ottawa. Department of Communications. 1981.

Diamonstein, Barbaralee. Buildings Reborn: New Uses, Old Places. New York. Harper and Row. 1978.

M. M. Dillion Ltd. The Re-use of Public Buildings. Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Research and Special Projects Branch. Toronto. 1984.

Donegan, Rosemary. "What Ever Happened to Queen Street West?": Fuse. Fall 1986, (Volume No. 42.)

Dunlap, David W. "Fact is Reached On Skyscraper Built Too High: New York Developer to Add Rehearsal Space": New York, New York. New York Times. April 20, 1988.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. The Arts in Found Places. New York. Educational Facilities Laboratories. 1976.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Planning and Cooperative Use of Resources for the Arts. New York. Educational Facilities Laboratories. 1978.

Ekos Research Associates Inc. Arts in Search of an Audience: Linking Stages and Publics. Final Report on the Analysis of the Integrated CIPIS Database. Ottawa. Department of Communications. 1986.

Ekos Research Associates Inc. Final Report for the Study of Support for Cultural Infrastructure in the Metro Toronto Area. Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, Planning and Project Management Division. Toronto. 1987.

Ekos Research Associates Inc. Rethinking the Status of the Artist: A Celebration of Excellence. Ottawa. Department of Communications, Arts Policy Directorate. 1987.

Elder, Eldon. Will It Make a Theatre: A Guide to Finding, Renovating, Financing, Bringing Up-to-Code the Non-traditional Performing Space. New York. Off Off Broadway Alliance. 1979.

Fairbridge, Kingsley and Kowal, Jane. Loft Living: Recycling Warehouse Space for Residential Use. New York and Toronto. Saturday Review Press and Clarke Irwin. 1976.

Financial Post Special Report. "Big Issue: What to Do With Surplus Schools: in Financial Post Special Report - Property. July 2, 1983.

Fleming, Louis K. "Financing Cultural Initiatives in the 1980's": Arts Scarborough. Volume 9. No. 8. September, 1987.

Fleming, Louis K. "New Ways for the Future": Performing Arts in Canada. November 1987.

Freedman, Adele. "Developer Makes Toronto a No-Lose Proposition": The Globe and Mail. Toronto. January 4, 1986.

Freiberg, Peter. "New Lease on Loft Bill" in The SoHo News. New York, New York. January 19, 1982.

Globe and Mail. "A Home for Culture". August 1, 1988.

Goss, Andrew. "Living and Working in the Same Place" Ontario Craft. Summer 1983.

Gouin, Judy. The Cost of Earning as a Visual Artist. Toronto, Ontario. Canadian Artists' Representation Ontario. 1980.

Green, Kevin, editor. The City as Stage: Strategies for the Arts in Urban Economics. Washington, D.C. Partners for Livable Places. 1983.

Harvard Business School, Real Property Field Study. City Comparisons of Cultural Rehabilitation Projects. St. Louis: City Center Redevelopment Corporation. 1981.

Hendon, William, ed. The Arts and Urban Development: Critical Comment and Discussion. Akron, Ohio. Center for Urban Studies, University of Akron: Monograph Series in Public and International Affairs, No. 12, 1980.

Hendry, Tom. Cultural Capital: The care and feeding of Toronto's artistic assets. Toronto. Toronto Arts Council. 1985.

Hollis, Susan Moring. "The Arts and Center-City Revitalization: A Case Study of Winston-Salem": The Journal of Arts Management and Law, Volume 13, no. 2, Summer, 1983.

Hudson, James R. The Unanticipated City: Loft Conversions in Lower Manhattan. Amherst. University of Massachusetts Press. 1987.

Jeffri, Joan. "Making Money: Real Estate Strategies for the Arts": The Journal of Arts Management and Law, Volume 12, no. 3, Fall 1982.

Johnson, Eve. "Artists With No Place to Go": Vancouver Sun. October 18, 1986.

- Jordan, Betty Ann. An Investigation into the Nature of the Toronto Arts Community's Contribution to the Cultural and Commercial Growth of the Queen Street West Area: The Queen Street West "Phenomenon". prepared for the National Association of Non-profit Artist-run Centres (ANNPAC). Toronto. 1980.
- Lydiate, Henry. "Lofty Ideals": Art Monthly. Great Britain. October, 1981.
- Kahn, Vivian and Mortimer, Larry. Seattle Artists' Housing Handbook: Creating and Controlling Living/Working Space Through Building Conversion. City of Seattle, Dept. of Community Development and Arts Commission. 1980.
- Kelly, Deirdre. "Funnel Looks for New Home": Globe and Mail. July 28, 1988.
- Kennedy, Shawn. "About Real Estate: Nonprofit Groups' Answer to High Manhattan Rents": The New York Times. New York. October 9, 1985.
- Kosanovic, Georgina. "A Place to Live": Arts Scarborough. Volume 9 No. 8. September 1987.
- Kuitenbrouwer, Peter. "Density Deal Settles Artists": Now Toronto. October 29 - November 4, 1987.
- Laventhol & Horwath. Market Potential for Artist Housing in the Historic Warehouse District. Cleveland, Ohio. Laventhol & Horwath. June 1985.
- Leonard, Paul and Stolk, Jini. A Bold Step Forward: The Case for Increased Funding to Theatres in Ontario. Toronto Theatre Alliance. Toronto. 1987.
- Lowertown Redevelopment Corporation. Lowertown: A Report of the Lowertown Redevelopment Corporation. Lowertown Redevelopment Corporation. Saint Paul, Minnesota. 1986
- McCaughey, Claire. Arts Education in Canada: An Exploratory Study. Ottawa. Canada Council. 1988.
- McKinney. "Title H-Living Quarters for Artists" in McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York. St. Paul, Minnesota.
- McNulty, Robert H., Jacobson, Dorothy R., Penne, R. Leo. The Economics of Amenity: Community Futures and Quality of Life: A Policy Guide to Urban Economic Development. Washington, D.C. Partners for Livable Spaces. 1985.
- Minneapolis Arts Commission. Minneapolis Warehouse: Artist Living/Working Space Project. Minneapolis. Minneapolis Arts Commission. 1979.
- Ministry of Citizenship and Culture. Theatre Spaces: An Inventory of Performing Arts Facilities in Ontario. Toronto, Ontario. Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture. 1986.

Ministry of Culture and Recreation. Places to Grow: A report on capital investment made by the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation 1975-1979, Toronto. 1980.

Municipal Art Society. The Livable City. June 1981, Volume 8, No. 1. New York: Municipal Art Society. (issue re: South Street Seaport, Manhattan)

Munk, Erika. "New York to the Arts: Drop Dead. How the Real Estate Boom is Wrecking the Cultural Capital of the World": The Village Voice. New York. May 13, 1986.

National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division. Economic Impact of the Arts and Cultural Institutions: Case Studies in Columbus, Minneapolis, St. Paul, St. Louis, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Springfield. National Endowment for the Arts. Washington D.C. 1981.

Nesson, Jero. Artists In Space: A Handbook for Developing Artists' Studio Space. Fort Points Arts Community Inc, Inc. of South Boston. Boston. 1987.

Noon, Michael. The Need for Facilities for the Performing Arts in the Province of Ontario: A Preliminary Report. Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Toronto. 1974.

Pachter, Charles. "Ye Must Be Born Again: New Bohemia Rising West of Queen Street W.": The Toronto Star. January 2, 1988.

Petherbridge. "Drawing on the Strength of a Community": Financial Times. London, England. August 18, 1988.

Porter, Robert, editor. The Arts and City Planning. American Council for the Arts. New York. 1980.

Project for Public Places. Museum Mile: A Cooperative Plan to Increase Public Awareness and Use of Ten Museums on Fifth Avenue, New York. New York. Project for Public Spaces. 1979.

Purdie, James. "Sewell Alert to Problems of Studio Space for Artists": Globe and Mail. Toronto. September 1, 1984.

Rafelman, Rachel. "A Space of One's Own: The Studio Dilemma in Toronto": Artviews Magazine, Summer, 1986.

Reedfield, Robert. "The Cultural Role of Cities", Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. 1969.

Rochon, Lisa. "Ten Years Later, Ballet Opera House Is Still Just a Dream": Globe and Mail. June 13, 1987.

Royal LePage. Toronto Office Leasing Directory Spring 1987. Royal LePage Limited. Toronto. 1987.

- Royal LePage. 1987 Royal LePage Industrial Property Mart: Toronto and Suburbs. Toronto. Royal LePage Limited. 1987.
- Royal LePage. Canadian Real Estate - 1988: The Royal LePage Market Survey. Toronto. Royal LePage Limited. 1988.
- Scott, D.B. "Space Invaders: The Shadowy Existence of the Loft People": Quest. Toronto. June/July/August 1982.
- Silcox, David. Metropolitan Toronto's Support of the Arts: A Study of the Problems and Recommendations for Future Policies and Procedures. Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Cultural Affairs Division. Toronto. 1974.
- Simmel, George. "The Metropolis and Mental Life" Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969.
- Simpson, Charles. SoHo: The Artist in the City. Chicago and London. University of Chicago Press. 1981.
- Siren, Paul and Gelinas, Gratien. The status of the artist: Report of the Task Force. Canada. Department of Communications. Ottawa. 1986.
- Smith, Tim. "Artist Hotline: A Loft Rap-Up": Art & Artists. New York. November, 1982.
- Snedcof, Harold. Cultural Facilities in Mixed Use Development. Washington, D.C. Urban Land Institute.
- Stratton, Jim. Pioneering in the Urban Wilderness: All About Lofts. New York. Urizen Books. 1977.
- The Theatre Centre. From Crisis to Opportunity. Toronto. The Theatre Centre. August 1986.
- Toronto Artscape Inc. (Comments presented to the Land Use Committee) Regarding the Planning and Development Department's Report Entitled Assisted Housing: Options for Private Sector Involvement. Toronto. Toronto Artscape Inc. February 24, 1988.
- Toronto Arts Council. The Let's Talk Report. Toronto. Toronto Arts Council. 1988.
- Toronto Office Guide Volume 2, no. 4, Fall 1987 and Volume 3, no. 2, Spring 1988. Toronto.
- Toronto Theatre Alliance (Small Theatres Caucus). Facilities for Small Theatres: The Other Housing Crisis. Toronto. Toronto Theatre Alliance. July 29, 1986.
- Urban Innovations Group, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles, Harvey S. Perloff, Director. The Arts in the Economic Life of the City. New York. American Council for the Arts. 1979.

- Urban Land Institute. Adaptive Use: Development Economics, Process and Profiles. Washington, D.C. Urban Land Institute. 1978.
- Valerio, Joseph M and Friedman, Daniel. Movie Palaces: Renaissance and Reuse. New York. Educational Facilities Laboratories. 1982.
- Wall, G., and Purdan, M. The Economic Impact of the Arts in Ontario. Ontario Arts Council. Toronto. 1987.
- Wilder, A. Tappan, ed. "Urban Amenities and Economic Development." Livability Digest, Volume 2, Number 1. Washington, D.C.: Partners for Livable Places. Spring, 1982.
- Wilkie Farr & Gallagher. Special Space: A Guide to Artists Housing and Loft Living. Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts. New York. 1981.
- Woods, Gordon, Management Consultants. City of Toronto: A Review of the Proposed Economic Development Corporation. City of Toronto. 1984.
- Zukin, Sharon. Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change. Baltimore. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1982.