



Supports Item No. 2
P&E Committee Agenda
January 21, 2010

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Report Date: January 12, 2010
Contact: Jacqueline Gijssen
Diana Leung
Contact No.: 604.871.6843
604.871.6844
RTS No.: 8398
VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20
Meeting Date: January 21, 2010

TO: Standing Committee on Planning and Environment

FROM: Acting Managing Director of Cultural Services in consultation with the Directors of Licensing and Inspections, Development Services, Planning, Fire and Rescue Services and the Vancouver Police Department

SUBJECT: Regulatory Review for Live Performance Venues

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report titled, Regulatory Review for Live Performance Venues, including a Review Framework for enabling the sustainable creation and operation of live performance venues as outlined herein, be received for information.

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The City Manager submits the following for information.

COUNCIL POLICY

In January 2008, Council adopted *The Culture Plan for Vancouver 2008 - 2018*, which defines the vision and strategic themes guiding the City's continuing support for Vancouver's creative sector.

In the same year, Council adopted the *Cultural Facilities Priorities Plan 2008 - 2023*, which identifies strategies and tactics for enabling the creation and operation of cultural spaces. One of the key recommendations in that plan is addressing the City's regulatory systems to harmonize and modernize these systems to better support cultural spaces.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to update Council on the development of a Live Performance Venue Regulatory Review Framework to address issues in various civic bylaws and policies,

such as the Zoning and Development By-law, the Vancouver Building By-law, and permits and license regulations that impact the creation and operation of live performance venues.

BACKGROUND

Cultural spaces are an essential attribute of a livable and sustainable community. These spaces support cultural creation, production and presentation, as well as administration and other activities. Cultural spaces are utilized by a range of audiences and operators that include both non-profit organizations and creative commercial enterprises. Amidst the multitude of cultural spaces in Vancouver, live performance spaces bring life and creative spirit to the city. Live performance venues include both indoor and outdoor spaces for live music, theatre, dance, media, interdisciplinary, festival and performance arts as well as spaces for celebratory events and activities.

Not unique to cultural spaces or live performance venues, a proliferation of civic regulations govern the uses and activities of these spaces. Governing bodies, such as municipal governments, use regulatory processes to ensure that activities within their jurisdictions take place in a safe and neighbourly manner. These processes, including those outlined in the Zoning and Development By-law, Vancouver Building By-law, and various permits and licenses, are intended to safeguard the city's residents and visitors. In addition, these processes also provide structure for how the city envisions its social and economic development. Over time, the growth of the regulatory systems that govern the use and safety of live performance spaces has resulted in a complex structure that is not always consistently applied, up to date or harmonized with other regulatory systems. As a result, rather than enabling the sustainable creation and operation of live performance venues, the City's regulatory environment often creates barriers that result in significant restrictions on the dynamic nature of this sector. This includes forcing live performance venues underground – operating outside of the regulatory systems, driving them into inappropriate neighbourhoods and/or forcing them outside the city altogether.

Within the cultural community is a lack of clear understanding of the regulatory systems including why such systems (at their effective best) are important. While there are many experienced operators, many more young organizations are seeking to create and operate live performance venues with little or no experience or knowledge of the key regulatory attributes such operations require. Additionally, live performance venues often include the aspect of liquor sales, which involve complex regulations and processes that further complicate the ability of the community group or venue operator to safely, efficiently and sustainably offer their program.

Finally, the nature of Vancouver's strong real estate market affects all types of cultural spaces. For live performance venues, finding the right location that enables the operation to succeed is challenged by expanding residential areas which can fuel conflict between residents and live performance events over noise and other use issues.

The *Cultural Facilities Priorities Plan 2008 - 2023* outlined regulatory structures as one of the key barriers for cultural facilities development and operation. It identifies some of the base issues and recommended a full "harmonization and modernization" of these systems. From that starting point, Council, in May 2009, directed staff to begin with live performance venues. The Framework that is the subject of this report is the result of that direction (see Appendix A).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the live performance regulatory review is to improve the City's regulatory systems to enable the sustainable creation and operation of live performance venues.

Process

In September 2009, Cultural Services staff launched the regulatory review on live performance venues. This included convening a Community Roundtable with representatives from the arts, culture and creative industries sectors as well as an interdepartmental staff team.

The Community Roundtable consisted of cultural sector representatives from small to medium-sized live performance venues and organizations involved in music, dance, theatre, media arts, interdisciplinary arts, festivals and community arts, including both non-profit and creative industry venues and organizations/enterprises (please see Appendix B for participants of the Community Roundtable).

The interdepartmental staff team was comprised of staff from Vancouver Fire and Rescue, Vancouver Police Department, Development Services, Licensing and Inspections (Liquor, Noise, Building and Business Licensing), Planning, Engineering (Film and Special Events), the Park Board and the Vancouver Economic Development Commission.

The Cultural Facilities Implementation Team (please see Appendix C for members) provided advice and guidance on the process, and suggestions for invitees to the Community Roundtable.

Two Community Roundtables were held with independent facilitators so that members would feel comfortable speaking freely. The first Community Roundtable involved no staff beyond Cultural Services representatives; the second was a blend of Community Roundtable participants and key staff.

The two Community Roundtables were structured to achieve the following (please see Appendix D and E for notes from the Community Roundtables held respectively on October 20, 2009 and November 10, 2009):

- Issues identification, including
 - opportunities for live performance venues, and
 - barriers to the creation and operation of live performance venues.
- Circulation of the draft Framework for review and feedback.

The interdepartmental staff team reviewed the findings from the two consultative sessions and developed a series of recommendations for the short (to begin after the 2010 Winter Games), medium (to begin fall/winter 2010/2011) and long-term (to begin 2011).

Both the Community Roundtable and the staff interdepartmental team have provided positive feedback on the process to date and the recommended Framework. The Regulatory Framework has also been presented to CMT for their information and input.

Live Performance Venue Regulatory Review Framework

The Live Performance Venue Regulatory Review Framework (Appendix A) outlines nine key issues faced by the live performance venue sector. They are listed in order of importance to the community and staff and consist of the following:

1. Lack of mechanism to collect and address regulatory issues
2. Incongruent and outdated policies (City and external agencies and associations)
3. Restrictive requirements and permitted uses
4. Complex processes and lengthy staff response time
5. Inconsistent interpretation of regulations
6. Complaints, noise and nuisance
7. Inconsistent, costly fees for permits and licenses
8. Limited knowledge, mutual understanding and communication between staff and cultural community
9. Lack of coordination/implementation body

The Framework identifies objectives for each key issue and short, medium and long term recommendations for resolving them. There is a mix of recommendations from eliminating or reducing regulations, updating outdated regulations where appropriate, ensuring clarity in interpretation and application of regulations, assisting both city staff and the cultural community to better understand the regulations and know when they should be applied, to creation of new processes to streamline the regulatory systems. The Framework is primarily about improvements in “process”, based on the understanding that by implementing an effective agreed upon process, individual regulations, be they large or small, will have a mechanism for review, prioritization and resolution.

Oversight

Central to the implementation of the Live Performance Venue Regulatory Review Framework is the creation of an interdepartmental staff team to advise and oversee its implementation. This oversight team will report to the existing joint community and staff Cultural Facilities Implementation Team for advice and community input.

This oversight team and its defined relationship to the Cultural Facilities Implementation Team are necessary to ensure that the recommendations are appropriately implemented to meet the needs of live performance venues, staff and relevant regulations and policies. In addition, they are also necessary to ensure that the implementation process continues to move forward and responds to evolving priorities and needs.

Through the relationship with the Cultural Facilities Implementation Team, the work of the regulatory review will benefit from both community representation and input and be connected back into the initiatives underway under the auspices of the Council-approved *Cultural Facilities Priorities Plan*.

Further consultation

Further consultation with the cultural live performance venue community will expand the understanding of the issues for both staff and the community, thereby effectively informing the implementation of the Framework. While the Community Roundtable involved a range of cultural and creative sector representatives, a broadened engagement with live performance venue owners and users will enable staff to delve deeper into each regulatory issue. The findings from this expanded consultation process will directly inform improvements to the regulatory systems. Examples of work that will be undertaken in this next phase of consultation include case studies, an online survey, consultation with specific target groups such as those venue users and operators that work outside the regulatory system and ongoing work with the participants from the Community Roundtables.

At this point, it is assumed that the contemplated regulatory changes and by-law amendments will have a negligible impact on adjacent residential neighbourhoods. Should this prove to not be the case, consideration will be given as to how best to consult with these additional communities.

By-law Revisions to Council

Staff will present the first package by-law revisions for Council's approval (including draft by-laws from Legal Services) in the first quarter of 2011. Subsequent by-law revision packages will follow as completed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial operating or capital cost implications with the implementation of the Live Performance Regulatory Review Framework.

CONCLUSION

The cultural sector has experienced significant barriers in the creation and operation of live performance venues. These barriers include cost and availability of spaces that meet the City's safety and other standards. General issues raised through the Live Performance Community Roundtables included: incongruent, outdated and onerous regulations; complex processes and inconsistent interpretations; costly fees, and a "gatekeeper" approach taken by civic regulators. Included within these general issues are more specific concerns over liquor licenses, excessive safety requirements and restrictive or limited uses permitted in a given venue.

The Live Performance Regulatory Review Framework outlined in this report identifies key issues and objectives as well as short, medium and long term tactics for modernizing and harmonizing the regulatory systems. The goal of the Live Performance Regulatory Review is to create an enabling environment for the sustainable creation and operation of live performance venues.

* * * * *

Framework for Live Performance Venues Regulatory Review

Key issues	Objectives	Short term recommendations ¹	Medium term recommendations ¹	Long term recommendations ¹
1 Lack of mechanism to collect and address issues	Process for capturing and reviewing regulatory issues as they arise	Develop intake mechanism to track, prioritize and review new and recurring issues; Establish protocol for ongoing regulatory review		
2 Contradictory and outdated policies and regulations (City and external agencies and associations)	Regulations that enable development of cultural spaces	Involve Cultural Services in creating new or revising existing policies and formalize Cultural Services as a review group for culture-related applications	Update arts and culture definitions in regulations and policies, and explore adding "cultural uses" as a permitted use in the Zoning and Development Bylaws for key areas and districts	Seek to ensure cross-policy objectives are met (e.g. green building strategies may also improve sound proofing)
	Up-to-date, streamlined and harmonized regulations between various regulatory systems	Review and, as appropriate, delete, create or update regulations and policies	Undertake review of liquor licensing issues (including fees, occupant load, interpretation and BC Liquor Licensing Branch)	
3 Restrictive requirements and permitted uses	Minimum base life safety standards that safeguard residents, operators and visitors	Finalize and implement minimum Base Life Safety standards	Apply lessons learned from 2010 Winter Games Bylaw for temporary venues (building code)	Review accessibility requirements
			Develop Building Code for industrial flex space, harmonize with other policies and regulations (e.g. land use policy), and pilot	
4 Complex processes and lengthy staff response times	Appropriate staff response time	Convey to cultural community importance of early communication with staff and providing complete information ²		Create processing streams and procedures for common types of spaces and/or uses ³
		Review and, where appropriate, revise and communicate anticipated processing times		
	Streamlined processes		Develop and apply processes for multi-year and recurring permits and licenses	Explore creating one application intake system for related permits and licenses

¹ Short term (Spring/Summer 2010), Medium term (Fall/Winter 2010/2011) and Long term (2011 and beyond) indicates start of work program

² ³ Recommendations with matching footnote numbers are related

Key issues	Objectives	Short term recommendations ¹	Medium term recommendations ¹	Long term recommendations ¹
5 Inconsistent interpretation of regulations	Consistent interpretation by staff, senior staff and Council	Empower staff to apply flexibility that meets City objectives and initiatives	Clarify interpretations and objectives of relevant regulations	
6 Complaints, noise and nuisance	Clear responsibilities for live performance venues	Require venue operators to submit and abide by Operation Management Plans, which would include provisions for dealing with neighbourhood complaints		
	Clear responsibilities for new developments near live performance venues		Explore mechanism for purchasers to acknowledge potential impacts of neighbouring live performance venues (apply lessons learned from Northeast False Creek)	Explore enhancing building requirements for new developments neighbouring live performance venues
	Process and standards for addressing complaints	Confirm Council's tolerance for responding to complaints	Develop policy process and standards for addressing complaints	Outreach to neighbours and building owners near frequently used venues
7 Inconsistent, costly fees for permits and licenses	Transparent realistic fee structures	Ensure all application forms capture non-profit society numbers and staff are aware of different fees for non-profits	Clarify and review fee structure	
8 Limited knowledge, mutual understanding and communication between staff and cultural community	Knowledge and understanding of challenges and opportunities for live performance venues	Undertake expanded community consultation with cultural live performance venue community including case study analysis		Prepare guidelines for use of key spaces to help simplify issues for land owner, users and staff ³
		Prepare inventory of high-usage cultural venues and applicable regulatory information (i.e. allowable use; occupancy load, etc.)	Make inventory accessible to public and staff	
		Research other municipal models for regulating live performance spaces		

¹ Short term (Spring/Summer 2010), Medium term (Fall/Winter 2010/2011) and Long term (2011 and beyond) indicates start of work program

^{2 3} Recommendations with matching footnote numbers are related

Key issues	Objectives	Short term recommendations ¹	Medium term recommendations ¹	Long term recommendations ¹
	Readily available information and resources	Improve online information through centralized information and links to relevant permits, licenses, fees, checklists, "how-to's", processes and review timelines ²	Create templates for documents such as Operational Management Plan, Fire Safety Plan, Security Plan, etc.	
	A knowledgeable and capable cultural community	Facilitate capacity building activities for cultural community such as "how to" workshops and opportunities for mentoring and information-sharing	Ongoing capacity building activities for cultural community	Ongoing capacity building activities for cultural community
				Explore creation of a "learner's license" for new live performance cultural groups with additional assistance, clear expectations for learning and performance
	A knowledgeable and capable staff team	Facilitate capacity building activities for staff such as workshops on cultural organizations and their activities and constraints, as well as applicability of relevant permits and licenses	Ongoing capacity building activities for staff	Ongoing capacity building activities for staff
9	Lack of coordination/ implementation body	Appropriate staff and community oversight for regulatory review implementation	Create an interdepartmental staff team to oversee the implementation of the live performance regulatory review with community input via a reporting relationship with the existing community/staff Cultural Facilities Implementation Team	Work with "FEST Committee" on regulatory review implementation

¹ Short term (Spring/Summer 2010), Medium term (Fall/Winter 2010/2011) and Long term (2011 and beyond) indicates start of work program

² 3 Recommendations with matching footnote numbers are related

Participants, Community Roundtable held on October 20, 2009 and November 10, 2009:

- Ben Reader, Open Studios
- Byron Lonneberg, Commodore Ballroom
- Cathy Kwan, Strathcona BIA
- David Duprey, Narrow Artist Lounge and The Rickshaw
- David Kerr, independent
- Elia Kirby, Great Northern Way and UBC Theatre
- Hank Bull, Centre A and the Western Front
- Jill Elliott, WISE Hall
- John Donnelly, Music BC
- Jonathan Middleton*, Or Gallery
- Jonathan Kassian, Vancouver Economic Development Commission
- Jordie Yow, Discorder Magazine
- Julie Smith, Coastal Jazz and Blues Society
- Kevin McKeown, Alliance for Arts and Culture
- Malcolm Levy, New Forms Festival and Open Studios
- Marg Watts, Roundhouse Community Centre
- Mark Pickersgill, independent
- Michael Doehle, independent
- Mirna Zagar, Scotiabank Dance Centre
- Morna Edmundson*, MusicFest Vancouver
- Myriam Steinberg, In the House Festival
- Rachel Zotteneerg, Grace Gallery
- Vince Alvaro, independent (formerly Richard's on Richards)
- Yuriko Iga, BLIM

*Jonathan Middleton and Morna Edmundson are also members of the City of Vancouver Cultural Facilities Implementation Team

Cultural Facilities Implementation Team

MEMBER NAME & TITLE	ORGANIZATION
Jonathan Middleton Director/Curator	Or Gallery/Pacific Association of Artist Run Centres
Sue Porter Executive Director	Greater Vancouver Professional Theatre Alliance
Amir Ali Alibhai Executive Director	Alliance for Arts and Culture
Valerie Arntzen Executive Director	Eastside Culture Crawl Society
Nancy Noble, CEO	Museum of Vancouver / BC Museums Association
Morna Edmundson Administrative Director	MusicFest Vancouver/ Arts Festivals of Metro Vancouver
MEMBER NAME & TITLE	DEPARTMENT
Rich Newirth Acting Managing Director	Cultural Services
John Breckner Associate Director	Business Planning & Services Real Estate
Brent Toderian/ Director Dwayne Drobot/Planning Liaison	Planning Department
Vickie Morris Senior Social Planner	Social Planning
Doug Robinson Facilitation Group Manager	Development Services
jil weaving Coordinator Arts & Culture	Park Board
Jacque Gijssen Senior Cultural Planner	Cultural Services: Public Art, Facilities Development & Planning



NOTES FROM COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE

Transcription of notes from a Community Roundtable held on October 20, 2009

Conducted for Cultural Services, City of Vancouver

October 22, 2009

A. BACKGROUND

The City of Vancouver is home to a vibrant artistic and cultural community reflecting a broad range of disciplines, institutions and organizations. From small artist collectives to large institutions, the City boasts a rich cultural foundation upon which to grow and prosper. Recognizing that spaces for arts, culture, and creativity are vital to the City, in 2008, City Council adopted a new 15-year Cultural Facilities Priorities Plan that identifies strategies and tactics for enabling the creation and operation of cultural spaces. One of the key recommendations in that plan is addressing the City's regulatory systems (zoning and development, building code and licensing) to harmonize and modernize these systems to better support cultural spaces.

Earlier this year, Council recommended focusing on live performance spaces for arts and culture as the first priority for the regulatory review. As part of the research phase of this review, staff in Cultural Services convened a Community Roundtable of arts and culture sector representatives to help identify and understand regulatory barriers and opportunities that affect live performance spaces. At this time, the focus is particularly on small to medium-sized live performance venues for dance, theatre, music, media arts, interdisciplinary arts and community arts, including venues created and operated by the non-profit and private sectors.

The intent for the round table was to provide an opportunity for members of the arts and culture community to share their experiences with the regulatory framework in creating and supporting live performance venues and their suggestions for opportunities to modernize the framework. The objectives for the roundtable were to discuss:

- opportunities and options of enabling the creation and sustainable operation of live performance venues, and
- current barriers to the creation and operation of live performance venues.

From the information gleaned through this consultation and additional research conducted by City staff, initial recommendations will be prepared for Council regarding modernization and improvement of the regulatory framework. It is anticipated that implementation of the first set of recommendations will occur beginning in 2010 with additional consultation and detailing of issues continuing as the review moves forward.

This document provides a summary of the results of the discussion at the Community Roundtable held on October 20, 2009. The roundtable was facilitated and the summary of results was prepared by The YES Resolution Group Inc. (YES). YES has endeavoured to be thorough, accurate and helpful in presenting this document while maintaining a commitment to confidentiality for individual comments made or stories shared at the Community Roundtable.¹

The agenda for the Community Roundtable on October 20, 2009, is included as Appendix A.

This list of participants is included as Appendix B.

¹ In this document the term “use” is intended to refer to permits, licenses and zoning.

Barriers to creation and operation of live performance venues

Below is a chart listing barriers to creation and operation of live performance venues identified during the Community Roundtable. Overall comments regarding barriers include:

- application processes take too long and are unpredictable and subject to unannounced change and to too wide a range of interpretation.
- clear, consistent and coordinated information regarding regulations for use, permitting and licensing is not available.
- City policy is interpreted and applied differently by various City staff within each Department.
- regulations are often either outdated or inconsistent.
- too many City departments are involved with use, permits and licenses.
- City staff do not appear to have an understanding of or experience with the “realities” of creating and operating live performance venues.
- City staff appear to have a “gate keeper” mindset rather than an enabling one.
- consideration of the needs and issues related to creation and operation of live performance venues is not included as part of policy change or development.
- performance venues are expensive due to expensive real estate, too few options, increasing ownership of venues by corporate groups with profit motivation.
- associated secondary costs of creation and operation of live performance venues are prohibitive, particularly for newer or younger events (e.g. zoning variance costs, rental costs during renovation, architect’s fees, engineers fees, noise reduction costs, security costs, costs related to completing multiple applications and reports)
- obtaining and having a liquor license for an event is highly problematic.
- a single resident complaint appears to be able to “shut down” or prevent an event without consideration of benefit of the event to the larger community, larger community support or the costs to the event organizers and participants.
- there is an increasing lack of space in the City where it is possible to hold a public gathering and “make noise”.
- Regulations are contributing to a trend toward “homogenization” of the arts in the City that is driving new, innovative performances out of the City.

"It's not a corrupt system, but if you have a relationship or you know the right person, it is influencable."

ISSUES	EXAMPLES
<p>Communication Internal to the City</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ various departments within the City do not communicate effectively with each other for use, permitting and licensing processes ▪ various departments within the City are not aware of the use, permitting and licensing requirements of other departments ▪ City staff are not made aware of use of all venues (applicants can be redirected by staff to apply for use of another venue, go through the process and discover that the venue is already reserved for another use at the same time) ▪ directions from staff regarding applications (which venues are available) can result in lack of continuity/poorly aligned events produced in the same venue with similar timeframes ▪ police and fire departments lack general understanding of live performances
<p>External Communication</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ access to a full set of use, permitting and licensing requirements and application process (including all departments e.g. fire, police, building, zoning) is not available to applicants ▪ information or feedback regarding applications is not available to applicants in a timely manner ▪ City website is not effective in making information available ▪ hard to access regulations and procedures if you are a "newcomer" to City staff
<p>Policy Co-ordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ use, permitting and licensing requirements of various City departments are not integrated or co-ordinated ▪ changes to regulations in various City departments are not coordinated with regulations of other departments. ▪ regulators (e.g. City and Province) do not co-ordinate use, permitting and licensing requirements ▪ non-architect cannot design assembly spaces as required by AIBC
<p>Policy Interpretation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ there is not an apparently consistent set of policies and interpretations for use, permitting and licensing ▪ there are no clear formulae for determining in a co-ordinated manner requirements of various departments (e.g. building,

ISSUES	EXAMPLES
	<p>fire policy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “judgement calls” are regularly made by staff depending on the profile of event or individuals involved ▪ a mechanism needs to be implemented to regularly review and update regulations ▪ City staff appear to fear public complaints or litigation
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ requirements for zoning to allow for new events are onerous ▪ change to assembly use can require zoning change ▪ hard to know which is the best organizational structure to use for staging performance (e.g. does zoning permit use by retail, non-profit, community organizations) ▪ difficult to know what is the codified use of public space (e.g. new vs. grandfathered performances/parks vs. buildings) ▪ zoning variances are really only available to large or rich organizations ▪ heritage by-laws can be very restrictive ▪ easier to operate as a club without a live performance
Building Permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ building permit requirements are the same for both temporary and long term, permanent venues
Capacity Determination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ different requirements for events with liquor license ▪ restrictive occupancy load allowance
Use Permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ permit requirements change frequently without notice to venues ▪ permits are costly ▪ a permit must be applied for each year for “temporary” events that happen on a regular basis ▪ assembly rating not available to galleries ▪ impact of “receiving money” at an event has significant impact on whether an event is seen as resident, community, non-profit, informal, commercial for permitting purposes
Inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ inspectors tend to have a punitive approach and appear to be looking for infractions ▪ inspectors have too many discretionary powers ▪ “barrage” approach to fire inspections (e.g. everyone is inspected at Halloween but not for the rest of the year)

ISSUES	EXAMPLES
Street Usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ regulations are inconsistent
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ noise by-law too open to interpretation
Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ festivals must apply and pay for building code requirements that don't apply to permanent buildings ▪ fees are reflective of film industry prices ▪ subsidies or reduced fees not available for non-profits
Health, Safety, Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ accessibility regulations are prohibitive (all spaces within a venue must be accessible/requirement for installation of a lift for stage area) ▪ costs of meeting full health and safety requirements can be prohibitive ▪ regulations are too open to interpretation by inspectors ▪ approvals are relationship based (knowing a Department head eases approvals over dealing directly with staff) ▪ security requirements are reducing audience attendance ▪ insurance requirements are onerous
Liquor Licensing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ too many liquor licensing categories - too difficult to determine "where you fit" ▪ lack of flexibility to accommodate all ages, event types, performance media, multi uses ▪ licensee number too expensive and difficult to obtain ▪ limited number of licensees restricts events that can be staged due to costs despite fact that the event may need alcohol revenues to break even ▪ location of licensees limits event possibilities within zoning regulations ▪ a new license must be obtained by the same group for each individual event ▪ limitations on number of licenses possible within each year are confusing and limiting ▪ limitations on amount of sales for various licenses are confusing and limiting ▪ selling alcohol can restrict access to funding ("clean" revenue vs. "dirty" revenue) ▪ concentration of liquor licenses in hands of small number of corporate groups

ISSUES	EXAMPLES
Resident Complaints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="548 289 1406 405">▪ resident complaints about liquor use, noise, parking or street use in areas where the housing was developed after an established event in the area place an event in jeopardy

OPPORTUNITIES FOR creation and operation of live performance venues

Below is a chart listing opportunities for creation and operation of live performance venues identified during the Community Roundtable. Overall comments regarding opportunities include:

- There is respect for the cultural value of arts and entertainment and an optimism regarding cultural events at the City, among Councillors, staff and residents.
- The regulations need to be modernized and simplified.
- The regulatory framework could be restructured to allow for organic development of events.

“We need to be able to move out of mere survival and be able to expand what we do.”

OPPORTUNITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexible multi-purpose venues to accommodate various audience sizes and art forms and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enabling environment for live performance venues (looking for ways to make it work/ creating mechanisms that support moving from the “underground” to legitimacy)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulations specific to cultural spaces and events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accountability for City staff to actively support cultural events and live performance venues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow use, permitting and licensing for base life safety requirements only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program to teach “how to” skills regarding regulatory requirements (how the system works, what it takes, where to go)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Fest committee” for identifying and managing specific needs and issues for festivals and temporary events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mentoring to facilitate moving through the regulatory environment for newer and younger events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enabling fee structure for cultural events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider loss of live performance venues before demolition of existing buildings or structures is allowed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tax relief incentives for non-profit usage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public information campaign regarding the value of arts and culture, the benefits and realities of live performances
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zoning to allow for densification needs to include a requirement for developers to have dwelling owners sign an “acknowledgement” that there is a live performance venue in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase number of public spaces available for live performance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-use multi-year permits for temporary events that are staged regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Entire building for live multimedia performance and related businesses

OPPORTUNITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify number and use of liquor licenses available and make more flexible over a one year period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase number of City staff positions for “cultural concierge”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify classifications and requirements within regulations (e.g. festivals, temporary events) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate City departments and staff for consistency in application of regulations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greater flexibility in open hours for events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular regulatory review process that includes arts and culture community
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designated loading zones and parking for producer/performer vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One complete, comprehensive, integrated application process that includes requirements of all City departments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate transit availability with venues and performances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue regulatory framework developed for 2010 Olympics (e.g. regulatory environment created by Expo 86 continues)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced sound proofing requirements for developments with proximity to live performance venues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internal education program for City staff to be more welcoming and supportive for diversity of live performance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use vacant buildings as performance spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maximize performance venue opportunities in NE False Creek
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulatory framework that supports small venues as well as larger venues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff liaison position between City and performance venues

APPENDIX A: AGENDA FOR COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE, OCTOBER 20, 2009

Tuesday, October 20th, 2009

1:00pm - 4:15 pm

Multimedia Room (2nd floor) -

Roundhouse Community Arts and Recreation Centre

AGENDA

1:00 pm	Introductions and Objectives
1:30 pm	Small group discussion: Barriers to creation and operation of live performance venues
2:15 p	Report back to the whole group
2:45 pm	Break
3:00 pm	Small group discussion: Opportunities for creation and operation of live performance venues
3:45 pm	Report back to the whole group
4:00 pm	Questions/Next Steps
4:15 pm	Conclusion

**APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE,
OCTOBER 20, 2009**

Julie Smith, Coastal Jazz
Yuriko Iga, BLIM
John Donnelly, Music BC
Ben Reader, Open Studios
Byron Lonneberg, Commodore Ballroom
Vince Alvaro, Richard's on Richards
Jordie Yow, Discorder
Myriam Steinberg, In the House Festival
Elia Kirby, Great Northern Way, UBC Theatre
David Duprey, Narrow Artist Lounge, The Rickshaw
Rachel Zotteneerg, Grace Gallery,
Jill Elliott, WISE Hall
Marg Watts, The Roundhouse
Cathy Kwan, Strathcona BIA
Hank Bull, Centre A, Western Front
Michael Doehle
Mark Pickersgill
David Kerr

UNABLE TO ATTEND

Kevin McKeown, Alliance for Arts and Culture
Paul Kajander, Helen Pitt
Jay Dodge, N.E.R.B. (Boca Del Lupo)
Mirna Zagar, Dance Centre
Morna Edmundson, Music Fest and Cultural Facilities Implementation Team
Jonathan Middleton, Or Gallery and Cultural Facilities Implementation Team

Prepared for: Cultural Services
City of Vancouver

By:



THE YES RESOLUTION GROUP INC.

17th Floor, Nelson Square, 808 Nelson Street
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6Z 2H2
(604) 688-9377 www.yes.bc.ca

April English, Mediator and Certified Professional Facilitator

We help build productive agreements and working relationships.

October 22, 2009



NOTES FROM COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE

Transcription of notes from a Community Roundtable held on November 10, 2009

Conducted for Cultural Services, City of Vancouver

November 17, 2009

BACKGROUND

This document provides a summary of the results of the discussion at a Community Roundtable held on November 10, 2009. The roundtable was facilitated and the summary of results was prepared by The YES Resolution Group Inc. (YES). YES has endeavoured to be thorough, accurate and helpful in presenting this document while maintaining a commitment to confidentiality for individual comments made or stories shared at the Community Roundtable.

The roundtable was a follow up to a Community Roundtable held on October 20, 2009. The roundtable on October 20 was intended to provide an opportunity for members of the arts and culture community to share their experiences with the regulatory framework in creating and supporting live performance venues. The results of this discussion were shared with City staff from various departments within the City. Staff of Cultural Services then prepared a summarized set of key issues and draft recommendations for action based on the results of the roundtable discussion and meetings with City staff. These key issues and draft recommendations for action were then reviewed for sufficiency, clarity and applicability by a combined discussion group of community members and City staff at the November 10 roundtable. The intent for this roundtable was to provide an opportunity for members of the arts and culture community and City staff to come together to provide advice and guidance for finalizing and prioritizing key issues for modernizing the regulatory framework affecting creation and support for live performance venues.

From the information gleaned through this consultation and additional research conducted by City staff, initial recommendations will be prepared for Council regarding modernization and improvement of the regulatory framework. It is anticipated that implementation of the first set of recommendations will occur after the 2010 Winter Games, with additional consultation and detailing of issues continuing as the review moves forward.

Participants at the Community Roundtable on November 10, 2009, expressed their appreciation for the opportunity and benefit of shared discussions between members of the arts and culture community and City staff. They also expressed a hope for continued opportunities for meaningful and informative dialogue. The list of participants at the roundtable is included in this document as Appendix A.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION RESULTS

Participants at the November 10, 2009 Community Roundtable were asked to review the summarized set of key issues and draft recommendations presented by Cultural Services Staff. These are included in this document as Appendix B, page 12.

Overall comments from participants regarding the set of key issues and draft recommendations presented included:

- An enabling and positive spirit needs to be adopted by staff in all departments to support success for live performance and to end the current impression that City staff often work offensively rather than in a supportive manner.
- The human aspect of regulation needs to be reflected in the regulatory framework, the actual application and impact and not just the idea or theory.
- Regulations need to reflect the “big picture” for the City and recognize the value of live performance for the City, citizens and visitors.
- Change is a long term strategy and needs to be kept current and “living”.
- There is need for an arts and culture “voice” within the City that can coordinate, advocate and problem solve across City departments and City Council.
- The arts and culture community, staff, Council and the public need confidence that the regulatory framework is current, transparent and consistent and that it works.

The following table provides a summary of more specific comments and recommendations made by roundtable participants, organized by key issue.

KEY ISSUE	COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Level of knowledge, mutual understanding and open communication between staff and the arts and culture community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ need to ensure that objectives of regulatory requirements are clear so they can be met in numerous ways ▪ processes/requirements need to be more visible ▪ need for City staff at all levels to have consistent/uniform understanding of regulations ▪ remove barriers where possible as early as possible ▪ need to ensure that requirements are completely mapped early in application process, including cross department processes and approval ▪ check for duplicate regulations in different departments, make clear, reconcile if possible ▪ interdepartmental communication for design and execution is required ▪ use objective-based requirements to improve and evaluate consistency of application and interpretation ▪ application, interpretation and review of regulatory requirements needs to explore impacts of implementation, and not just be a process to gather information regarding regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ educate City staff on guidelines ▪ provide “go to” staff internally at the level of original inquiry from the arts and culture community ▪ use case studies to illustrate current issues and possible solutions/include consideration of temporary events, users, variety of events, variety and flexibility of venues, various residential areas ▪ create an inventory of venues, established and not well established, with information on uses, capacity, access, flexibility, etc./make inventory readily available through on-line catalogue/use to create consistent application and approval processes across departments/use to streamline process of decision making and approvals ▪ align terminology across City departments for consistency ▪ set up a WIKI as abroad based source of information ▪ offer a “live performance night” for all staff twice per year
<p>Clarity and consistency of processes and staff response time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ tie into new City building bylaw planned for 2011 ▪ remember to allow for innovation ▪ relationships and credibility need to be built between staff and event organizers/need to seek mechanisms to build relationships and trust ▪ events need to drive regulations rather than regulations driving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ shorten response times ▪ create “guaranteed” City response times ▪ provide a set of response times and completion guidelines integrated across City departments developed based on existing venues (e.g. PNE)/develop these guidelines to reflect space, event, attendance numbers, capacity, indoor or outdoor, etc./capture key details necessary for risk assessment ▪ hold City staff accountable for each

KEY ISSUE	COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	events	<p>business licence transaction/create an accountability roadmap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ create 'one stop shop' for multi jurisdictional approvals (e.g. City and province [liquor], inter departmental [fire, licensing, development services]) ▪ create ongoing and active feedback loop for constant quality improvement/use intake process as mechanism to monitor current activities to be proactive re constant quality improvement ▪ create a "credibility (reputation) record" for arts and culture groups for consideration in approvals
Consistent interpretation of regulations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ document requirements and procedures for the arts and culture community "so that anyone can do it" ▪ provide information bulletins regarding changes to regulatory requirements ▪ support mentoring for applicants ▪ offer pre-approval of venues, events and organizations ▪ offer a City staff person specialized in live performance venue application and approval
Congruent and up to date policies between City departments as well as with external agencies and associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ identify other agencies or organizations that may have significant impact on interpretation of regulations (e.g. other governments, Olympics, etc.) ▪ regulations affecting live performances (e.g. liquor licensing) under provincial control and out of city control lead to various levels of authority ▪ current liquor processes (City and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ create a "low threshold" license (e.g. for gallery opening) for events ▪ adapt regulatory requirements to recognize temporary events that are staged every year ▪ adapt regulations to allow flexibility in use of space as per current need/practice for that space ▪ change zoning and development bylaws to recognize temporary uses ▪ define new uses to acknowledge

KEY ISSUE	COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>province) need to be more clear and coordinated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ bylaws need to be considered in terms of impact for live performance venues (e.g. smoking bylaw and smokers in the streets outside performance venues) 	<p>current practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ clarify and update definitions of live performance, audience participation, retail, restaurant, gallery, etc. ▪ consider linking business licence approval and liquor licence approval ▪ ensure cohesive regulations across different zoning areas
Flexibility in allowable uses and safety requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ eliminate un-enforced regulations and strictly and consistently enforce identified base life safety regulations ▪ have the City actively prepare for and support cyclical/seasonal events ▪ include all City departments (including police, fire, parks) in developing and defining base life safety requirements ▪ include both permanent structures and temporary venues in regulations and align these requirements as much as possible ▪ focus on getting vacant buildings occupied, even on an interim basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ determine base life safety and recognize as allowable level for regulatory requirements ▪ list all base line safety issues and regulations to be assessed and approved before event ▪ issue base life safety permits for temporary events ▪ create “special” permits that cover several events for the same venue ▪ offer “probationary” permits/pull permits as a result of violation of probation ▪ relate approvals to other approvals (e.g. business license, use license) ▪ base approvals on track record for the venue or the event ▪ explore approval of “live live” spaces (spaces that accommodate live performance and residency)
Clarity and consistency of fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ fee structure needs to be revised and updated ▪ make total scope of fees needed known early in application process ▪ when costs are prohibitive, arts and culture groups find venues in less appropriate or residential neighbourhoods ▪ non-profit is valuable to the community and is a valid approach to live performance - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consider a refund policy for application fees (where possible) ▪ create an inventory of the fee structure ▪ develop a baseline for determining fees (e.g. evidence of regular or long standing event, revenue or loss for event) ▪ allow for multiple use fees for venues (i.e. if a venue offers several events that do not change in capacity for each event, charge

KEY ISSUE	COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>fee schedule could be modified for non-profits, small events or innovators</p>	<p>only one fee for the venue rather than a new fee for each event)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ prioritize fee levels to reflect City support for events
<p>Responding to complaints, noise and nuisance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ clarify what are City supported events ▪ have the City “take on” (e.g. partner, champion) events that define the City ▪ publicly confirm and advance Council’s position in support of live performance ▪ distinguish between short term and long term events and venues when responding to complaints ▪ distinguish event size (i.e. 50 or 500) for establishing a threshold for complaints and review these thresholds and violations in issuing approvals for venues ▪ balance impact of complaints with lack of complaints in terms of policy design ▪ encourage Council to confirm its risk tolerance in policy (remove from the political sphere) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ use Good Neighbour Agreement for performance and venues more consistently/build support for use among senior City staff and Council members ▪ create a 24 hour clock for arts and culture (e.g. City of Berlin)/adopt international best practices to manage the 24 hour clock regarding noise, traffic, etc. ▪ record repeat offenders and complainers/ track complaints and issues (geo code) that arise and develop responses shared across City departments ▪ do ‘sound testing’ for special venue sites (people and music) ▪ update standards of noise and nuisance ▪ set consistent end times across the City for external events, including set up and tear down requirements ▪ create review process to adjudicate/reconcile event incidents ▪ consider a “performance advocacy” group ▪ create ombudsperson position for responding to complaints ▪ provide mechanisms for public to show support for events, new policy directions, etc. (e.g. Facebook) ▪ amend noise bylaw for events in N.E. False Creek

KEY ISSUE	COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Coordination between regulatory bodies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ intersection of regulatory bodies impacts the issues for live performance venues ▪ availability of public transit impacts live performance ▪ liquor licensing is critical to all venue categories ▪ liquor licensing requirements are currently too complicated and need to be standard across all venues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify external agencies that have impact and advise regarding “harmonizing” strategies ▪ involve urban planning to help develop strategies ▪ advocate with province for increase in number of primary liquor licences available in the City ▪ loosen zoning to allow for more primary liquor licences ▪ advocate for primary liquor licences for temporary events

PRIORITY FOR ACTION

At the conclusion of the November 10 roundtable, participants were asked to indicate priority for action by Key Issue by casting their “vote” for their individual top three priorities. The following list of priorities indicates the tabulation of the votes.

Priority 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Congruent and up to date policies between City departments as well as with external agencies and associations (14 votes) ○ Clarity and consistency of process and staff response time (12 votes) ○ Flexibility in allowable uses and safety requirements (12 votes)
Priority 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level of knowledge, mutual understanding and open communication between staff and the arts and culture community (7 votes) ○ Responding to complaints, noise and nuisance (7 votes) ○ Consistent interpretation of regulations (6 votes)
Priority 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination between regulatory bodies (1 vote) ○ Clarity and consistency of fees (0 votes)

SUGGESTIONS FOR INTAKE MECHANISM

During the roundtable discussions, both on October 20 and November 10, 2009, participants regularly expressed a need for an available and accessible method for raising issues, providing feedback or seeking assistance with the regulatory framework that affects live performance venues. Participants offered the following comments regarding key aspects of this mechanism:

- start with City needs when creating this mechanism, and then take this to the arts and culture community for feedback and refinement.
- provide information about this mechanism for the arts and culture community through a variety of methods (e.g. City web site, information bulletins, mail outs, email blasts)
- ensure that the mechanism is universally available to the arts and culture community.
- track issues raised through the mechanism and use to develop consistent responses, to streamline processes and to advocate for change.

consult with the arts and culture community on an ongoing basis regarding effectiveness of the mechanism.

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE,
NOVEMBER 10, 2009**

COMMUNITY

Ben Reader	Open Studios
Byron Lonneberg	Commodore Ballroom
David Duprey	Narrow Artist Lounge and The Rickshaw
David Kerr (DK)	Independent
Emma Hendrix	Vivo Media Arts Centre
Hank Bull	Centre A and Western Front
Jill Elliott	WISE Hall
Jordie Yow	Discorder
Kevin McKeown	Alliance for Arts and Culture
Malcolm Levy	New Forms Festival
Mark Pickersgill	Writer/Researcher
Michael Doehle	Independent
Mirna Zagar	Dance Centre
Myriam Steinberg	In the House Festival
Vince Alvaro	Richard's on Richards
Yuriko Iga	BLIM

CULTURAL FACILITIES IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

Jonathan Middleton, Or Gallery
Morna Edmundson, Music Fest

VANCOUVER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Jonathan Kassian

CITY STAFF

Alex Clarke, Vancouver Police Department

Dave Schwab, Vancouver Fire and Rescue - Special Events

Diana Leung, City of Vancouver Cultural Services - Cultural Facilities

Jacque Gijssen, City of Vancouver Cultural Services - Cultural Facilities

Marcia Belluce, City of Vancouver Cultural Services - Cultural Facilities

Michael Gordon, City of Vancouver Central Area Planning

Muriel Honey, City of Vancouver Film and Special Events - Liquor Coordination

Will Johnston, City of Vancouver Licensing and Inspections

APPENDIX B: ISSUES AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS, PRESENTED TO COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE, NOVEMBER 10, 2009

Framework for Live Performance Venues
Regulatory Review

APPENDIX A
page 1/2

Key issues	Objectives	Short term recommendations ¹	Medium term recommendations ¹	Long term recommendations ¹
1 Lack of mechanism to collect and address regulatory issues	A process for capturing and reviewing regulatory issues as they arise	Develop intake mechanism to track and review new and reoccurring issues; Establish protocol for ongoing regulatory review		
2 Incongruent and outdated policies (City and external agencies and associations)	Regulations that enable development of cultural spaces	Involve Cultural Services in creating new or revising existing policies and formalize Cultural Services as a review group for culture-related applications	Update arts and culture definitions in regulations and policies, and add "cultural uses" as a permitted use in the Zoning and Development Bylaws for key areas and districts	Seek to ensure cross-policy objectives are met (e.g. green building strategies may also improve sound proofing)
	Up-to-date and harmonized regulations between various regulatory systems	Prioritize outdated regulations for review and updating	Undertake review of liquor licensing issues (including fees, interpretation and BC Liquor Licensing Branch)	
3 Restrictive requirements and permitted uses	Minimum base life safety standards that safeguard residents, operators and visitors	Finalize and implement minimum Base Life Safety standards	Apply lessons learned from 2010 Winter Games Bylaw for temporary venues Develop Building Code for industrial flex space, harmonize with other policies and regulations (e.g. land use policy), and pilot	Review accessibility requirements
	Appropriate staff response time	Convey to cultural community importance of early communication with staff and providing complete information ²	Set response targets for staff (number of weeks for processing different types of request)	Create processing streams and procedures for common types of spaces and/or uses ³
4 Complex processes and staff response time	Streamlined processes		Create processes for multi-year and reoccurring permits and licenses	Explore creating one application intake system for related permits and licenses
	Consistent interpretation by staff, senior staff and Council	Empower staff to apply flexibility that meets City objectives and initiatives	Clarify interpretations and objectives of relevant regulations	
5 Inconsistent interpretation of regulations	Clarity of responsibilities for live performance venues	Require venue operators to submit and abide by Operation Management Plans		
	Clarity of responsibilities for new developments near live performance venues		Require pre-purchasers' agreement for new developments neighbouring live performance venues (apply lessons learned from Northeast False Creek)	Explore enhancing building requirements for new developments neighbouring live performance venues
	Process and standards for addressing complaints	Confirm Council's tolerance for responding to complaints	Develop policy process and standards for addressing complaints	Outreach to neighbours and building owners near frequently used venues
6 Complaints, noise and nuisance	Transparent realistic fee structures	Ensure all application forms capture non-profit society numbers and staff are aware of different fees for non-profits	Clarify and review fee structure	

¹ Short term (Spring 2010), Medium term (Fall/Winter 2010) and Long term (2011) indicate start of work program

^{2,3} Recommendations with matching footnote numbers are related

Framework for Live Performance Venues
Regulatory Review

APPENDIX A
page 2/2

Key issues	Objectives	Short term recommendations ¹	Medium term recommendations ¹	Long term recommendations ¹
8 Limited knowledge, mutual understanding and communication between staff and cultural community	Knowledge and understanding of challenges and opportunities for live performance venues	Undertake expanded community consultation with cultural live performance venue community including case study analysis		Prepare guidelines for use of key spaces to help simplify issues for land owner, community users and staff ³
		Prepare inventory of high-usage cultural venues and applicable regulatory information (i.e. allowable use; occupancy load, etc)	Make inventory accessible to public and staff	
		Research other models for regulating live performance spaces		
	Readily available information and resources	Improve online information by creating a "one-stop" webpage with links to relevant permits, licenses, fees, checklists, processes and review timelines ²	Create templates for documents such as Operational Management Plan, Fire Safety Plan, Security Plan, etc.	
	A knowledgeable and capable cultural community	Facilitate capacity building activities for cultural community such as "how to" workshops and opportunities for mentoring and information-sharing		Explore creation of a "learners' license" for new live performance cultural groups with additional assistance, clear expectations for learning and performance
	A knowledgeable and capable staff team	Facilitate capacity building activities for staff such workshops on cultural organizations, activities, constraints and relevant permits and licenses		
9 Lack of coordination/ implementation bodies	Appropriate staff and community oversight for regulatory review implementation	Create an interdepartmental staff team to oversee the implementation of the live performance regulatory review with community input via a reporting relationship with the existing community/staff Cultural Facilities Implementation Team	Work with "Fest Committee" on regulatory review implementation	

¹ Short term (Spring 2010), Medium term (Fall/Winter 2010) and Long term (2011) indicate start of work program

^{2,3} Recommendations with matching footnote numbers are related