

REPORT

Developing and Sustaining Cultural Infrastructure:

A Brief Survey on Municipal Mechanisms of Support

Suzie Lanteigne and Steven R. Dang

June 2007

Creative City Network of Canada



Developing and Sustaining Cultural Infrastructure: A Brief Survey on Municipal Mechanisms of Support

Suzie Lanteigne and Steven R. Dang

JUNE 2007

1. Introduction

Improving and sustaining public cultural infrastructure has been a growing subject of many municipal planning discussions in recent years. In late 2006, the City of Ottawa and the Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities jointly conducted a brief survey of Canadian municipalities to investigate how cultural infrastructure is locally supported and funded by Canadian local governments.

The survey addressed three areas of interest:

1. Municipal sources of funding
2. Municipal incentives to promoters and developers
3. Municipal mechanisms to support community organizations

2. Methodology

A comprehensive list of potential mechanisms available to municipalities to support cultural infrastructure development was compiled from *InfraGuide: The National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure*. This list then informed the development of survey sections 1 and 2. Section 3 was compiled based on options previously discussed by Canadian municipalities and professional experience. (The survey is presented in Appendix B.)

The survey included brief definitions of each of the various municipal mechanisms identified by Infrastructure Canada so that respondents would be informed of possible options available (i.e., the survey could be used as an educational reference), and to help ensure responses were accurately classified. Most of the definition and descriptions presented in the three tables were extracted or adapted from documents such as the *National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure* or other municipal policy framework documents. These definitions are presented in the next section.

Respondents were asked to indicate (a) the options used by their municipality to support *infrastructure* (generally) and (b) which were being applied to support *cultural infrastructure development*.

In the autumn of 2006, the surveys were distributed to Canadian municipalities via email and in printed form at the Creative City Network of Canada pre-conference session on Planning for Cultural Infrastructure. All members of the Creative City Network of Canada were invited to participate, as well as a selected number of additional non-member municipalities. Municipalities received a follow-up email reminder.

Twelve municipalities responded: Powell River (BC), Vancouver (BC), Edmonton (AB), Grande-Prairie (AB), Red Deer (AB), Burlington (ON), London (ON), Markham (ON), Ottawa (ON), Port Hope (ON), Saguenay (QC) and Trois-Rivières (QC).¹

¹ The low response rate may be an indication of the relative underdevelopment of systematic municipal mechanisms for cultural infrastructure development.

3. Potential municipal sources, incentives, and mechanisms to support cultural infrastructure

Section 1: Potential municipal sources of funding

Sources	Description
Government service partnerships	Governmental partnerships can take place in the form of inter-municipal partnerships, provincial–municipal partnerships or federal–municipal partnerships. Inter-municipal partnerships, also known as “regionalization” of services, are viewed as an alternative form of service delivery.
Development fees	A tool linked to municipal planning processes for the delivery of infrastructure that meets the community’s needs. It ensures municipalities have a revenue source to fund the municipal infrastructure. Development charges are not particularly new or unique; however, they can be used innovatively by municipalities to influence/align development in accordance with the strategic planning and economic goals of a community.
Strategic budget allocation	This method entails strategically setting aside certain moneys collected from a portion of the tax bill or a portion of a rate bill into a special fund. The special fund is invested, and interest earned is reinvested with the goal of having a special fund for certain types of capital for future needs. Strategic budget allocations ensure a secure source of revenue so there is improved security for certain categories of infrastructure.
Special taxes	This strategy is based on the implementation of special targeted taxes such as a hotel or visitor’s tax or lotteries
Special levies	This method is a distinct fund established separately from the general tax levy by the municipality to manage the special levy revenues
Utility models (user fees)	This approach involves the management of capital assets, operations, and maintenance on a cost-recovery basis through fees for service. The user fee is a specific charge for a certain service that is clearly separate from general taxes. This is a cost-recovery mechanism for a service separated from other municipal services.
Sponsorships	Corporate sponsorships allow private companies to get some form of public recognition through advertising, signage or monuments, for example, in exchange for significant donations or strategic funding arrangements to cities to pay for the operating and maintenance of facilities or recreational areas.

Section 2: Potential municipal incentives to promoters and developers

Incentives	Description
Land transfer	The City owns land that can be used to leverage a partnership agreement with potential developers.
Funding partnerships (P3s, P4s, etc)	A private company or non-governmental organization forms a partnership with a municipality, often, but not necessarily, following an open competitive bid process. The partnership could be a specific infrastructure project or for a package of services, or even an exchange of services. The method typically involves private sector capital financing, often including private operation and maintenance services for a set period.
Innovative incentives & Zoning incentives and programs	Flexible and enabling zoning bylaws, density transfers, and/or density bonuses to encourage private sector participation in cultural asset development. Examples: Community Amenity Bonus Program; Arts and Heritage District
Development policies	This strategy involves the implementation of criteria and guidelines requiring civic/cultural contributions for all developers in a particular area (For example, Boston’s new waterfront plan requires that 25% of ground-floor space in all new construction be designated for cultural or civic purposes.)
Endowment incentives	This component invites active involvement of the private sector in the cultural affairs of the community by providing matching funds for moneys raised from private donors, to create endowment funds or to increase existing ones.

Section 3: Potential municipal mechanisms to support community organizations

Mechanisms	Description
Rental subsidies	This method refers to space-use agreements or reduced rental rates for community partners who use space in City facilities
Purchase of service, Service agreement, or Operating grant	<p>This method refers to City investment of sustaining operational and/or capital funding to not-for-profit, locally based arts and heritage agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To cultural organizations that own or lease their own facilities ▪ To a not-for profit agency to lease facilities owned by City major partners such as schools ▪ Contracts with non-profit organization to operate a civic-owned public facility <p>Or to private sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing internal expertise in capital maintenance and management and other services/expertise such as utilities, building maintenance, janitorial, security and ground.
Loan programs	This approach allows organisations to obtain up-front working capital for specific projects. It requires repayment of a portion of the funder’s investment, based upon formulas that consider the applicant’s operating budget and the project’s earned revenue. This repayment replenishes the fund, enabling the funder to invest in further projects.
Capital grant program	This program supports not-for-profit organizations to purchase facilities or renovate and refurbish facilities not owned by the City
Property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes	Cultural municipal and community non-profit facilities, if not owned by the City, will be taxed at the preferential residential tax rate if the provision of the Assessment and Municipal Acts are met. Facilities owned by the City and those being transferred to the City may be exempt from property tax if the provisions of the Assessment and Municipal Acts are met.
In-kind services/support	<p>In-kind services/support offered to community organizations, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City support systems – e.g., IT services, purchasing, training, input into City policy and planning documents, financing accounting, and payroll services and expertises ▪ City staff expertise – e.g., planning related to feasibility study, business plan and design plan development ▪ Promotional support – e.g., City website, calendars of events, free space in Activity guides, etc. which include assistance with joint promotions and marketing ▪ Use of civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at reduced cost ▪ Support to fundraising activities
Advocacy	Municipal support of approaches by arts and heritage organizations to other levels of government

4. Survey results

This section presents an overview of the most frequently reported mechanisms. Complete survey results are presented in Appendix A.

4.1. Municipal sources of funding to support (cultural) infrastructure

Infrastructure

The most frequently reported sources of funding for *infrastructure* currently used by responding municipalities were:

- Government partnerships (92%)
- Sponsorships (92%)
- User fees (75%)
- Development fees (58%)
- Strategic budget allocations (58%)
- Special levies for infrastructure development (42%)

Cultural infrastructure

The most frequently reported sources of funding for *cultural infrastructure* were:

- Government partnerships (50%)
- Sponsorships (50%)
- Strategic budget allocations (25%)
- User fees (25%)

Only the City of Grande Prairie reported currently using *development fees* and *special levies* as sources of municipal funding for cultural infrastructure. None of the responding municipalities reported currently using *special taxes* for funding cultural infrastructure.

4.2. Municipal incentives to promoters and developers

Infrastructure

The most frequently reported municipal incentives for *infrastructure* development were:

- Land transfers (75%)
- Innovative incentives and zoning incentives and programs (58%)
- Funding partnerships such as P3s, P4s, etc. (42%)

Very few (17%) municipal respondents reported the use of *development policies* and *endowment incentives* as incentives for infrastructure development.

Cultural infrastructure

The most frequently reported municipal incentives for *cultural infrastructure* development were:

- Innovative incentives and zoning incentives and programs (33%)
- Land transfers (25%)
- Funding partnerships such as P3s, P4s, etc. (25%)

None of the respondents reported the use of *development policies* and only the City of Port Hope reported the use of *endowment incentives* for cultural infrastructure development.

4.3. Municipal mechanisms to support community organizations

The most frequently reported municipal mechanisms to support community organizations were:

- In-kind services and supports (100%)
- Advocacy supports (100%)
- Rental subsidies (83%)
- Purchases of service, Service agreements, or Operating grants (83%)
- Property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes (75%)

Cultural infrastructure

The five most frequently reported municipal mechanisms to support community organizations related to *cultural infrastructure* were:

- In-kind services and supports (92%)
- Advocacy supports (92%)
- Purchases of service, service agreements, or operating grants (83%)
- Rental subsidies (67%)
- Property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes (50%)

In terms of *in-kind supports* to community organizations related to cultural infrastructure, the majority of responding municipalities reported that they provide the following to cultural infrastructure development projects:

- Promotional support (75%)
- Use of civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at reduced cost (75%)
- City staff expertise (planning, feasibility studies, business planning and design, etc.) (67%)

5. Analysis of findings

The results of this survey of a small sample of Canadian municipalities suggest that many municipal funding sources and incentives employed in the development of local infrastructure in other sectors are relatively untapped in support of development of *cultural* infrastructure. Although municipalities commonly own and operate cultural facilities, the results suggest that municipalities also tend to offer various means of *support to community organizations* to develop cultural facilities and spaces.

Among respondent municipalities, *government service partnerships* and *sponsorships* were the most frequently cited sources of municipal funding for cultural infrastructure development. Still, these were only reported in use by only half of the municipalities surveyed. Other municipal incentives for cultural infrastructure development were reported by much fewer municipalities. Only a quarter of respondents reported the use of *land transfers* and *funding partnerships*, and only a third reported the use of *zoning and other special incentives*.

Although *government service partnerships*, *user fees*, *development fees*, *strategic budget allocations*, and *sponsorships* were reported as sources of infrastructure funding in other sectors by the majority of municipalities, only half or less reported these as funding mechanisms for *cultural* infrastructure. This was also the case for common incentives such as *land transfers*, *funding partnerships*, and *innovative incentives and zoning incentives*.

Most notably, *development fees* (used by 7 of the 12 municipalities to fund municipal infrastructure) were only currently used by the City of Grande Prairie (AB) to fund *cultural* infrastructure development.² Similarly, *land transfers* (used as an incentive by 8 municipalities for infrastructure development) were used by only 3 municipalities to develop *cultural* infrastructure; and *innovative incentives and zoning incentives* (employed by 7 municipalities for infrastructure development) were only enlisted by 4 municipalities in the *cultural* infrastructure development.

In Ontario, the legislation concerning development fees does not allow use of this mechanism for cultural infrastructure. Further research is required to compare this legislative situation with that of other provinces. In addition, further research is required to help us understand why all mechanisms listed are not exploited for cultural infrastructure development.

Government service partnerships were a reported funding source for many of the smaller surveyed communities – perhaps a result of recent Federal-Provincial Infrastructure funding programmes. *Sponsorships* were reported by all four respondent municipalities in Ontario as a funding source for municipal cultural infrastructure development.

Most of the respondent municipalities reported the practice of supporting cultural infrastructure development through the provision of a diverse range of supports to community organizations – in particular: *rental subsidies; purchase of services, service agreements and/or operating grants; advocacy; and in-kind supports.*

Reference

Infrastructure Canada. *InfraGuide: The National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure*. InfraGuide operated from 2001 to 2007 as a partnership between the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the National Research Council, and Infrastructure Canada.
<http://sustainablecommunities.fcm.ca/InfraGuide>

² The City of Powell River (BC) reported that the use of Development Fees as a funding source for cultural infrastructure was in development.

Appendix A: Detailed survey results

	used for infrastructure	%	used for cultural infrastructure	%	in development for cult. infra.	%	Vancouver	Grande Prairie	Ottawa	Powell River	Red Deer	Burlington	Markham	Port Hope	Edmonton	Trois-Rivieres	Seguency	London	
SOURCES OF FUNDING																			
* The City of Markham also notes Foundations as a municipal funding source mechanism for cultural infrastructure.																			
Government service partnerships	11	92%	6	50%	0	0%				X	X		X	X	X	X			
Sponsorships	11	92%	6	50%	1	8%		X		x	X	X	X	X			X		
Strategic budget allocation	7	58%	3	25%	1	8%		X	x		X	X							
Utility models (user fees)	9	75%	3	25%	0	0%		X	X			X							
Development fees	7	58%	1	8%	1	8%		X	x										
Special levies	5	42%	1	8%	0	0%		X											
Special taxes	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%													
INCENTIVES																			
Innovative incentives & Zoning incentives and programs	7	58%	4	33%	0	0%	X				X	X					X		
Land transfer	9	75%	3	25%	1	8%		X	X	x					X				
Funding partnerships (P3s, P4s, etc)	5	42%	3	25%	1	8%	X		X	x					X				
Endowment incentives	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%							X						
Development policies	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%			x										
SUPPORTS																			
* The City of Powell River also notes One-time Funding as a municipal support mechanism for cultural infrastructure.																			
In-kind services/support	12	100%	11	92%	0	0%	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Advocacy	12	100%	11	92%	0	0%	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Purchase of service, Service agreement, or Operating grant	10	83%	10	83%	0	0%	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Rental subsidies	10	83%	8	67%	0	0%	X	X	X		X			X	X	X			X
Property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes	9	75%	6	50%	0	0%	X		X		X			X	X				X
Capital grant program	5	42%	5	42%	0	0%	X		X						X	X			X
Loan programs	5	42%	4	33%	0	0%	X		X		X								X
IN KIND																			
* Municipalities were <i>not</i> surveyed as to whether they offered these <i>specific</i> In-kind supports & services for infrastructure in other sectors.																			
Promotional support – e.g., City website, calendars of events, free space in Activity guides, etc. which include assistance with joint promotions and marketing			9	75%			X	X	X	X	n/a		X	X	X	X	X		
Use of civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at reduced cost			9	75%			X	X	X		n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X		
City staff expertise – e.g., planning related to feasibility study, business plan and design plan development			8	67%			X	X		X	n/a		X	X	X	X	X		
City support systems – e.g., IT services, purchasing, training, input into City policy and planning documents, financing accounting, and payroll services and expertises			5	42%			X	X		X	n/a		X					X	
Support to fundraising activities			5	42%			X		X		n/a	X	X				X		

LEGEND	
X	Mechanism for cultural infrastructure
x	Mechanism in development for cultural infrastructure
■	Mechanism for other infrastructure
■	Mechanism for other infrastructure

Appendix B: Municipal mechanisms of support for cultural infrastructure survey

Developing and Sustaining Cultural Infrastructure A Brief Survey on Municipal Mechanisms of Support

Improving and sustaining public cultural infrastructure has been the subject of many planners' discussions in recent years. As follow-up of the *Centre of Expertise on Culture and Community Initiative*, we are circulating a brief survey on how cultural infrastructure is supported and funded in Canadian cities and communities.

This survey has three parts:

- 1. City sources of funding**
- 2. City incentives to promoters/developers**
- 3. Mechanisms to support community organizations**

At this point, we are interested in which sources, incentives, and mechanisms you are using and/or developing.

When completed, **please return the survey to Suzie Lanteigne:**

e-mail: [suzie.lanteigne\(at\)ottawa.ca](mailto:suzie.lanteigne(at)ottawa.ca)

tel: ****

fax: ****

Thank you!

Nancy Duxbury

Respondent information

Municipality:

Contact person:

Telephone:

Email:

City Sources of Funding*

Sources	Description ³	Does your municipality use this source?	Is this being applied to cultural infrastructure development?	Comments
Government service partnerships	Governmental partnerships can take place in the form of inter-municipal partnerships, provincial–municipal partnerships or federal–municipal partnerships. Inter-municipal partnerships, also known as “regionalization” of services, are viewed as an alternative form of service delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Development fees	A tool linked to municipal planning processes for the delivery of infrastructure that meets the community’s needs. It ensures municipalities have a revenue source to fund the municipal infrastructure. Development charges are not particularly new or unique; however, they can be used innovatively by municipalities to influence/align development in accordance with the strategic planning and economic goals of a community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Strategic budget allocation	This method entails strategically setting aside certain moneys collected from a portion of the tax bill or a portion of a rate bill into a special fund. The special fund is invested, and interest earned is reinvested with the goal of having a special fund for certain types of capital for future needs. Strategic budget allocations ensure a secure source of revenue so there is improved security for certain categories of infrastructure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Special taxes	This strategy is based on the implementation of special targeted taxes such as a hotel or visitor’s tax or lotteries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Special levies	This method is a distinct fund established separately from the general tax levy by the municipality to manage the special levy revenues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Utility models (user fees)	This approach involves the management of capital assets, operations, and maintenance on a cost-recovery basis through fees for service. The user fee is a specific charge for a certain service that is clearly separate from general taxes. This is a cost-recovery mechanism for a service separated from other municipal services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sponsorships	Corporate sponsorships allow private companies to get some form of public recognition through advertising, signage or monuments, for example,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

* Thank you to Suzie Lanteigne (City of Ottawa Cultural Services Division) for your work developing this survey.

³ Most of the descriptions presented in these three tables have been extracted or adapted from documents such as the *National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure* or other Municipal Policy Framework documents.

Sources	Description ³	Does your municipality use this source?	Is this being applied to cultural infrastructure development?	Comments
	in exchange for significant donations or strategic funding arrangements to cities to pay for the operating and maintenance of facilities or recreational areas.			
OTHER		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

City Incentives to Promoters/Developers

Incentives	Description	Does your municipality use this incentive?	Is this being applied to cultural infrastructure development?	Comments
Land transfer	The City owns land that can be used to leverage a partnership agreement with potential developers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Funding partnerships (P3s, P4s, etc)	A private company or non-governmental organization forms a partnership with a municipality, often, but not necessarily, following an open competitive bid process. The partnership could be a specific infrastructure project or for a package of services, or even an exchange of services. The method typically involves private sector capital financing, often including private operation and maintenance services for a set period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Innovative incentives & Zoning incentives and programs	Flexible and enabling zoning bylaws, density transfers, and/or density bonuses to encourage private sector participation in cultural asset development Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Amenity Bonus Program ▪ Arts and Heritage District 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Development policies	This strategy involves the implementation of criteria and guidelines requiring civic/cultural contributions for all developers in a particular area (For example, Boston's new waterfront plan requires that 25% of ground-floor space in all new construction be designated for cultural or civic purposes.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Endowment incentives	This component invites active involvement of the private sector in the cultural affairs of the community by providing matching funds for moneys raised from private donors, to create endowment funds or to increase existing ones.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
OTHER		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Mechanisms to support community organizations

Mechanisms	Description	Does your municipality use this mechanism?	Is this being applied to cultural infrastructure development?	Comments
Rental subsidies	This method refers to space-use agreements or reduced rental rates for community partners who use space in City facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Purchase of service, Service agreement, or Operating grant	<p>This method refers to City investment of sustaining operational and/or capital funding to not-for-profit, locally based arts and heritage agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To cultural organizations that own or lease their own facilities ▪ To a not-for profit agency to lease facilities owned by City major partners such as schools ▪ Contracts with non-profit organization to operate a civic-owned public facility <p>Or to private sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing internal expertise in capital maintenance and management and other services/expertise such as utilities, building maintenance, janitorial, security and ground. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Loan programs	This approach allows organisations to obtain up-front working capital for specific projects. It requires repayment of a portion of the funder's investment, based upon formulas that consider the applicant's operating budget and the project's earned revenue. This repayment replenishes the fund, enabling the funder to invest in further projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Capital grant program	This program supports not-for-profit organizations to purchase facilities or renovate and refurbish facilities not owned by the City	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes	Cultural municipal and community non-profit facilities, if not owned by the City, will be taxed at the preferential residential tax rate if the provision of the Assessment and Municipal Acts are met. Facilities owned by the City and those being transferred to the City may be exempt from property tax if the provisions of the Assessment and Municipal Acts are met.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Mechanisms	Description	Does your municipality use this mechanism?	Is this being applied to cultural infrastructure development?	Comments
In-kind services/support	In-kind services/support offered to community organizations, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="402 428 914 575">☐ City support systems – e.g., IT services, purchasing, training, input into City policy and planning documents, financing accounting, and payroll services and expertises <li data-bbox="402 590 914 680">☐ City staff expertise – e.g., planning related to feasibility study, business plan and design plan development <li data-bbox="402 695 914 806">☐ Promotional support – e.g., City website, calendars of events, free space in Activity guides, etc. which include assistance with joint promotions and marketing <li data-bbox="402 821 914 869">☐ Use of civic-owned buildings or land at no cost or at reduced cost <li data-bbox="402 884 914 919">☐ Support to fundraising activities 	☐	☐	
Advocacy	Municipal support of approaches by arts and heritage organizations to other levels of government	☐	☐	
OTHER		☐	☐	

© 2007 Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities

Creative City Network of Canada

Transforming communities through culture

The Creative City Network of Canada is a national non-profit organization that operates as a knowledge-sharing, research, public education, and professional development resource in the field of local cultural policy, planning and practice.

Through its work, the Creative City Network helps build the capacity of local cultural planning professionals—and by extension their local governments—to nurture and support cultural development in their communities. By doing so, the Creative City Network aims to improve the operating climate and conditions for artists and arts and cultural organizations across the country, and the quality of life in Canadian communities of all sizes.

The members of the Creative City Network are local governments across Canada.

More information is available at www.creativecity.ca

Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities

Located at Simon Fraser University's Vancouver campus, the Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities is a three-year project of the Creative City Network of Canada and Simon Fraser University's School of Communication. It is supported by Infrastructure Canada, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the City of Ottawa, and the Centre for Policy Research on Science and Technology (CPROST) at SFU. It is advised by a national multidisciplinary team of project collaborators consisting of leading individuals in the cultural, government, and academic fields.

The Centre's work includes three interlinked components: knowledge generation (research), outreach and networking, and awareness/knowledge exchange. It conducts research and brings together academia and practice in four areas:

1. The state of cultural infrastructure in Canadian cities and communities
2. Culture as the fourth pillar of community sustainability
3. Culture in communities: Cultural systems and local planning
4. The impacts of cultural infrastructure and activity in cities and communities

For more information, visit: www.creativecity.ca/cecc

Production of this paper has been made possible through a financial contribution from Infrastructure Canada. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Government of Canada.

CreativeCity.ca
réseau des villes créatives
creative city network



SIMON FRASER
UNIVERSITY



Infrastructure
Canada



Patrimoine
canadien

Canadian
Heritage

Canada