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Abstract

This research thesis follows up on research conducted by Nathan Medeiros in 2005 that studied planning for creativity in Winnipeg’s Exchange District. The thesis is guided by two research questions “What policies and planning approaches have supported the development of creative industries in Winnipeg’s Exchange District?” and, “In particular, what policies and planning approaches support the creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work there? These research questions are translated into two objectives: (1) compare changes in the Exchange District since 2005, and (2) make policy recommendations for the City of Winnipeg especially on how to attract and retain creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work in the Exchange District. The case study includes a document analysis of planning and policy documents for Winnipeg, MB., interviews with thirteen (13) participants, and participant observations. Medeiros conducted a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis of Charles Landry’s “Cycle of Urban Creativity” in relation to the Exchange District. A similar SWOT has been conducted in order to compare findings from 2005 to 2017. Three elements have been identified as contributing to the development of creative industries in the Exchange District: (1) a strong public realm; (2) internal/external networking for arts, culture, and creative industries; and, (3) support and advocacy organizations for arts, culture, and creativity. Three additional elements have been identified as equally as important, although are not present in the Exchange District: (1) connectivity to surrounding areas; (2) multilateral civic collaboration and leadership; and, (3) mixed-income and mixed-type housing and workspaces. Five recommendations for the City of Winnipeg: (1) develop and implement an affordable housing strategy for Winnipeg’s downtown; (2) incentivize heritage building redevelopment, and at the same time de-incentivize empty buildings and empty lots; (3) recognize the uniqueness of the Exchange District in official planning documents; (4) support opportunities for cross industry collaboration as well as outreach to other creative centres; and, (5) create a ‘creative spaces strategy’ for the Exchange District.
Executive Summary

Introduction

In 2005 Nathan Medeiros conducted a master’s research thesis that studied how planning for creativity had been conducted in the Exchange District of Winnipeg MB. To conduct his thesis, he used Charles Landry’s (2008) cycle of urban innovation to perform a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis. He was highly critical of the planning processes in the Exchange District, mainly the lack of a secondary plan or city wide cultural plan. However, he did praise the projects being undertaken by organizations like CentreVenture and ACI Manitoba that promoted the Exchange District, as well as the multi-level governmental cooperation and funding available for arts, culture and creativity projects. This research project revisits Medeiros’ works twelve (12) years later, to see how the Exchange District has changed.

The connection between urban centres and innovation has been well documented, with recent emphasis being placed on the concept of creativity and knowledge-based economies. There have been many perspectives discussed on how to develop creative industries in cities, and what their roles are for the economy. The goal of this thesis is to better understand the role of planning in relation to creative industries. Winnipeg, MB. is a mid-sized prairie city, which presents an opportunity to expand the level of understanding of creative city policies and how they have affected mid-level cities.

Question and Objectives

Two related questions guided this thesis:

1. What policies and planning approaches have supported the development of creative industries in Winnipeg’s Exchange District? and,

2. In particular, what policies and planning approaches support the creative entrepreneurs and workers that live there?
These questions translate into the following research objectives:

1. Draw on Nathan Medeiros’ (2005) research thesis, Planning for Creativity: The Case of Winnipeg’s Exchange District, to compare what has changed in the Exchange District since 2005, and assess what has been successful and what has not, focusing on planning processes, policies, and strategies that have been implemented since his study.

2. Make policy recommendations for the City of Winnipeg that will aid in the development of robust creative industries and support creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work in the Exchange District.

**Methodology**

A literature review was completed to provide a theoretical as well as planning context for the study. The literature revealed that the definition of creative industries, as well as art, culture, and creativity, is not universal, and that many perspectives exist. The United Nations Conference on Development and Trade’s (UNCTAD) definition allows for a flexible approach to defining creative industries, while still maintaining useful categorizations, and the United Kingdom’s Department for Culture, Media, and Sport offers a definition that allows for precise measurement of industries and their performance. The literature also discusses that despite the prescriptions offered by creative city advocates, the resulting policies have resulted in
negative outcomes, such as gentrification, and fails to consider an intersectional approach that includes the lived outcomes and experiences of marginalized groups, women, and people of colour in the analysis of outcomes of creative city outcomes.

A single embedded case study was chosen for this research, that used multiple units of analysis to study the Exchange District. Twelve interviews with industry advocates, city planners, architects, local arts and culture organizations, and provincial organizations were conducted, as well as participatory observations over June, July, and August of 2017, as well as a thorough document analysis of planning and policy documents pertaining to Winnipeg and the Exchange District. To create a comparable analysis to Medeiros’ 2005 research a similar SWOT analysis was performed for Landry’s (2008) cycle of urban creativity.

Observations and Analysis

The SWOT analysis revealed a number of changes since Medeiros published his research thesis in 2005. The most notable discoveries in the 2017 research are:

1. The Exchange District has a strong presence of support and advocacy organizations for arts and culture activities, however, they lack a unified direction.

2. The lack of a unified cultural plan for the city, and secondary plan for the Exchange District, has resulted in conflicting goals between policymakers and organizations working in the Exchange District. The inability of the City to implement such plans has resulted in a severe mistrust of the planning process, and of City Council’s commitment to the Exchange District. This also has a negative impact on the planning professionals that work in the city. Despite this, their remains a strong dedicated core of individuals and organizations that want to anchor arts, culture, and creative industries in the Exchange District.

3. Gentrification that has resulted in low income artists being pushed out of the Exchange District is a significant problem in the Exchange District.
4. Previous multilateral government cooperation has dissolved significantly, and there is concern amongst support and advocacy organizations for the arts, culture, and creativity sector over the decreases in funding over the past years.

5. For creative industries and professionals to be successful, there needs to be connections between the “tastemakers” in industry hubs such as Toronto or New York.

6. There are two forms of creative pursuits in the urban setting: economic creativity, which pursues creativity for the sake of economic/financial gain, and personal (or vernacular) creativity, which focuses on personal or community benefit.

Recommendations

Five recommendations are made for the City of Winnipeg:

Recommendation 1: Develop and implement an affordable housing strategy for Winnipeg’s Downtown.

Recommendation 2: Incentivize heritage building redevelopment, and de-incentivize empty buildings and empty surface lots.

Recommendation 3: Recognize the uniqueness of the Exchange District in Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities.

Recommendation 4: Support opportunities for cross industry collaboration as well as outreach to other creative centres.

Recommendation 5: Create a Creative Spaces Strategy for the Exchange District.

Conclusion

To answer the research question put forth in this thesis Three elements have emerged as working to support the development of arts, culture, and creative industries in the Exchange District:

1. The first is networking and promoting both internally and externally (including marketing, connecting with people, and importing and exporting products/services). This networking is essential for the success of arts, culture, and creative industries.
2. The second is for the presence and support of organizations that provide funding and other supports (in the form of training, networking opportunities, administrative resources, advocacy, etc.) to the arts, culture, and creative industries and entrepreneurs.

3. The third is that public spaces are essential because they can facilitate public performances (preferably free), they can provide space for public art, and public space can also be used as a vehicle to promote a wide variety of (free) programming over the course of the year (including winter).

There are three additional elements that I have identified as important for fostering arts, culture, and creative industries, but are not present in the Exchange District:

1. The first is that multilateral civic collaboration with strong civic leadership is important because it can get community members, organizations, and city organizations involved from the outset of a project.

2. The second is that arts, culture, and creative districts need to be well connected to the rest of the city, with multiple modes of transportation available.

3. Third, and perhaps most importantly, mixed-income, and mixed-type housing and workspaces, are essential for the longevity and dynamism of an arts, culture, and the creativity district.

Future research with Indigenous peoples, newcomers, minorities, and women in the Exchange District (and creative cities more broadly) is important, and in fact essential to furthering the understanding of how creative city policies are impacting urban centres and people. There is an enormous potential to learn new stories, new creativities and counter-narratives that have been otherwise ignored. This will also help expand the understanding of the importance of the economic aspects of creativity to human life, but also the personal and communal aspects of art, culture and creativity.
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1. Introduction

The idea of creative cities as a form of urban development has been around for some time, but most of the discourse has focused on major innovation hubs such Silicon Valley or London, England. With few exceptions, small and mid-sized cities have been mostly left out of the analysis (see for example, Lewis and Donald 2010; Hall and Donald 2009). The connection between urban centres and innovation has been well documented, with recent emphasis being placed on the concept of creativity and knowledge-based economies. Richard Florida brought the discussion to the mainstream in 2002 with the publication of *The Rise of the Creative Class*, which has been influential in urban policy and urban development strategies. By no means is his work the benchmark for research on creative industries, but over the last fifteen years, it has brought the conversation out of the realms of academia and into the public and policy realm. There have been many perspectives discussed on how to develop creative industries in cities, and what their roles are for the economy. Despite the abundance of literature on the topic of creative cities, however, there is still little understanding on what the consequences of creative city policies have been on particular places. Sold as magic beans that will remedy decaying cities and districts, the creative city paradigm has been adopted by many places hoping to match the economic growth found in major urban centres like Silicon Valley or London.

This thesis sets out to better understand the role of planning in relation to creative industries. As the research process unfolded, it became evident that although arts, culture, and creativity are related and intertwined with one another, there is a distinction to be made between these three areas. As well, there is a difference between creativity for economic activity, and creativity for personal/community activity. As well, the findings of this research uncovered that the issues facing creative industries are as closely related to social planning issues as they are to land-use issues.
1.1 Research Question

The two related research questions guiding this thesis are:

1. What policies and planning approaches have supported the development of creative industries in Winnipeg’s Exchange District?
2. And in particular, what policies and planning approaches support the creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work there?

In 2005, Nathan Medeiros conducted a case study of the Exchange District in Winnipeg, MB., using Charles’ Landry’s “Cycle of Urban Creativity” (2008). This was a useful study that I used as a starting point for my own research on the Exchange District. Drawing on insights from Medeiros’ use of Landry’s (2008) “Cycle of Urban Creativity,” I have conducted my own case study of the Exchange District to compare changes that have happened since Medeiros’ thesis was written over twelve years ago. The case study involves a document analysis of relevant plans and by-laws, twelve semi-structured interviews with various stakeholders in the district, and participant observation of several events occurring in the Exchange District over the last year. The stakeholders consisted of city planners, employees and directors of arts and cultural organizations in the Exchange District, and members of several “arm’s length” city organizations. Appendix 08 contains the names and titles of participants.

1.2 Research Objectives

The above two research questions translate into the following research objectives:

1. Draw on Nathan Medeiros’ (2005) research thesis, Planning for Creativity: The Case of Winnipeg’s Exchange District, to compare what has changed in the Exchange District since 2005, and assess what has been successful and what has not, focusing on planning processes, policies, and strategies that have been implemented since his study.

1 Landry’s book was originally published in 1995, but I am using the second edition that was published in 2008.
2. Make policy recommendations for the City of Winnipeg that will aid in the development of robust creative industries and support creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work in the Exchange District.

1.3 Chapter Outline

Following this introduction, the thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter Two is the Literature Review, and in here I discuss how creative industries are defined, review several major works on the creative city paradigm and their critiques, and discuss Nathan Medeiros’ thesis which is used as a springboard for my own research on what has happened in the Exchange District since his thesis was written in 2005. Chapter Three, Methodology, reviews the methods applied for conducting the case study, and the rationale behind them. Chapter Four, Exchange District Profile, discusses the history of Winnipeg’s Exchange District, and provides demographic and economic data on the city, and the creative industries that are there. Chapter Five, Data Analysis, contains a document analysis of relevant plans and by-laws, including some that were created but not approved, and an assessment of Landry’s “Cycle of Urban Creativity” (2008) that compares what Nathan Medeiros’ identified in 2005 to the situation today. Chapter Six, Discussion, makes key observations about planning for creativity and the usefulness of the cycle of urban creativity as a planning tool. Chapter Seven, Recommendations, contains five policy recommendations for the City of Winnipeg, and several conceptual recommendations that I believe will help improve its approaches to planning for culture and creativity. Chapter Eight, Conclusion, provides a summary of the findings, including a brief discussion on some of the limitations of my project and some concluding thoughts on future research.
2. Literature Review

2.1 A Short Review of the Term Culture

My study area on the Exchange District in Winnipeg is comprised predominately of arts and cultural business, institutions and arts, culture, and creativity advocacy groups. This cluster of economic and social activity is often grouped under the broad term of “culture” industries and as such I have decided here to briefly review what is meant by “culture”. Indeed, there is a substantial literature on the topic of culture, much of it debating the definition of culture, and the merits and demerits of cultural industries. I do not wish to wade into such debates, but rather intend to provide a brief exploration of the topic through the work of Jon Hawkes (2001) in order to enhance the reader’s understanding.

Broadly speaking, an acceptable understanding of culture can be described as “the values upon which a society is based and the embodiments and expressions of these values in the day-to-day world of that society” (Hawkes, 2001, p. 3). From this perspective, Hawkes (2001) has identified two concepts of culture that have emerged in the public discourse, one relating to values, and the other a broad concept of the arts. These are delineated as culture, referring to values, and Culture, which refers to the output of artists, though cannot be considered entirely part of the “artistic practices of communities,” the activities considered as popular culture, or as part of value-based culture (Hawkes, 2001, p. 5). Value-based culture permeates society, informing daily routine to government policy. However, policy makers have often mistaken culture policy as the same as arts policy, leading to a predominance of market driven ideas about culture as something to be packaged and sold (Hawkes, 2001). That is what Hawkes (2001) considers as Culture.

Ira Wells (2017) has identified the pitfalls of this in his article published in The Walrus when he compares the goals of the Massey Commission and Canada’s new cultural policy Creative Canada: “The Massey Report imagined culture as the vehicle of moral and intellectual education. Creative Canada
imagines culture as something you stream on Netflix” (Wells, 2017). Whereas the Massey Report saw culture as the soul of society, and “reflected a fear over what the rise of mass culture... meant for the survival of distinctively Canadian culture” (Wells, 2017), Creative Canada is attempting to foster Silicon Valley style economic growth, and is a “cultural policy that reflects little of Canada and none of our culture” (Wells, 2017).

I have highlighted the differences here because arts, culture, and creativity, are often associated with each other, and they are often mistaken as being one in the same. This is seen throughout Winnipeg’s policy documents, as well as the literature reviewed here. Throughout the literature review, I do use the concepts that an author used in their own works; if they used “arts” to discuss all things related to arts, culture, and creativity, then I have done the same. However, in the discussion and analysis sections I have chosen to use “arts, culture, and creativity” as a phrase when referring to the activities that occur in the Exchange District, and more elsewhere. I have done this to demonstrate that these three concepts are distinct, but still related to one another. When discussing a particular aspect of arts, culture and creativity, I will use appropriate terms. Arts refers to any form of artistic pursuit; culture as the values and beliefs of a group/community/city etc. as well as the expression of those values and beliefs; and creativity as the process of creating or being creative, either for monetary gain or personal/communal benefit. The terms culture industries and cultural industries are also used in this thesis in reference to any industry or activity that creates artistic or cultural products/services for monetary gain or mass production.

2.2 Defining Creative Industries

Defining creative industries is not a straight forward process as there is no universal definition that is being used. This section reviews some of the more popular approaches taken: The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2010), the United Kingdom’s Department of Culture, Media and Sports (2001, 2016) as well as Richard Florida’s Creative Class (2014). None of these use the same set of
principles or framework in the development of their definitions, but they do come up with a similar conclusion as to what makes up creative industries.

2.2.1 UNCTAD. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) Creative Economy Report 2010 presents a comprehensive analysis on the subject, stating that the “intention is not to reach a final consensus about concepts, but to understand its evolution” (2010, p. 3). This statement captures the challenges of defining creative industries. The definition is a moving target, changing depending on the context it is used, and the place it is being used in. UNCTAD’s (2010) overview is comprehensive, providing several perspectives on the topic, making it an excellent source for this discussion.

UNCTAD identifies three approaches to discussing the characteristics of creativity (2010). The first, links artistic, scientific, and economic creativity together, each involving some degree of technological creativity (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). Artistic creativity is identified as involving “imagination and a capacity to generate original ideas and novel ways of interpreting the world” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 3) which can then be expressed through different mediums; scientific creativity is linked to curiosity and a desire to experiment to make new connections; and, economic creativity is a process of innovation, connected to obtaining competitive economic advantages (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010).

The second approach identified is referred to as the 5Cs model, which connects social capital, cultural capital, human capital, and structural or institutional capital which all output creative capital (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). The 5Cs framework is based on the idea that the link between creativity and economic growth and development is not clear, and so the cycle of creativity must be analyzed (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). The third

---

2 Not to be confused with Charles Landry’s “Cycle of Urban Creativity” (2008)
approach is defined as a process in which ideas are transformed into valued things, or “the use of ideas to produce new ideas” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 4). The emphasis with this perspective is more focused on the output, as a tangible or copyrightable good, rather than the process itself (Boston Redevelopment Authority/Research Division, 2005; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010).

To establish its own definition of creative industries, UNCTAD offers an overview of four perspectives on creative industries, and then offers its own version based on these four perspectives. The symbolic texts model focuses on popular culture, arguing that the “culture of a society is formed and transmitted [through] industrial production, dissemination and consumption of symbolic texts or messages, which are conveyed by means of various media such as film, broadcasting and the press” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8). In the concentric circles model, the core is where creative ideas are generated through creative arts, which diffuse outwards, and diminish in cultural content and increase in commercial content as it moves further out from the core (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). In this perspective, cultural goods have cultural value, making these industries unique amongst others (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). The World Intellectual Property Organization’s framework is focused on intellectual property, as it is the “embodiment of the creativity that has gone into the making of the goods and services included in the classification (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). The final framework discussed is from the United Kingdom’s Department of Culture, Media and Sport, and is discussed in a later section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK DCMS</th>
<th>Symbolic Texts Model</th>
<th>Concentric Circles Model</th>
<th>WIPO Copyright Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Core Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Core Creative Arts</td>
<td>Core Copyright Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and antiques market</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Collecting societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>Film and video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and video</td>
<td>Television and radio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Video and computer games</td>
<td></td>
<td>Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Television and radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual and graphic art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Cultural Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Interdependent Copyright Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Blank recording material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Consumer electronics</td>
<td>Museums and libraries</td>
<td>Consumer electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photocopiers, photographic equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Industries</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Heritage services</td>
<td>Wider Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Partial Copyright Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound recording</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing, footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television and radio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video and computer games</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Household goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Cultural Industries</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Copyright Industries</td>
<td>Collecting societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television and radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual and computer games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent Copyright Industries</td>
<td>Blank recording material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photocopiers, photographic equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Copyright Industries</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing, footwear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Industries</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Industries</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Classification systems for the creative industries derived from different models (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010)

UNCTAD’s (2010) definition is derived from these perspectives, and it is combined with the characteristics of creativity previously discussed. According to UNCTAD, creative industries:

1. are the cycles of creation, production, and distribution of goods and services that use creativity and intellectual capital as primary inputs;
2. constitute a set of knowledge-based activities, focused on but not limited to arts, potentially generating revenues from trade and intellectual property rights;
3. comprise tangible products and intangible intellectual or artistic services with creative content, economic value and market objectives;
4. stand at the crossroads of the artisan, services and industrial sectors; and
5. constitute a new dynamic sector in world trade. (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8)

Using this definition, UNCTAD provides a classification of creative industries into heritage, arts, media, and functional creations, each of which are further divided into subcategories (2010, p. 8). The heritage category is defined as “the origin of all forms of arts and the soul of cultural and creative industries” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8), and is divided into the subgroup of “traditional cultural expressions,” mainly art crafts and festivals, and “cultural sites,” which includes archaeological sites, museums, and libraries (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). Arts are those industries that are “based purely on art and culture,” as “artwork is inspired by heritage, identity values and symbolic meanings” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8). Here, the sub-categories are visual arts, which includes painting, sculpture, and photography, and performing arts, such as live music, theatre, dance, and opera (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8). Media is composed of industries that “produce creative content with the purpose of communicating with large audiences;” the sub-categories are publishing and printed media, and audio-visuals, which includes “film, television, radio and other broadcasting” (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8). The functional creations classification constitutes demand driven and services oriented industries (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010). It is made up of three sub-groups: design, including interior, graphic, and fashion; new media, which includes software, video games, and digitized creative content; and, creative services, such as architecture, advertising, creative research and development, and cultural and recreational (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2010, p. 8).

UNCTAD (2010) provides a thorough overview on the perspectives and classifications of creative industries. Its final conceptual framework for creative industries provides a holistic perspective, demonstrating the interrelated nature of these industries, while maintaining a broad overview.
2.2.2 United Kingdom Department of Culture, Media and Sport. The United Kingdom’s Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS) has been given a separate section for two reasons. First, it has created a method of classification that is precise and detailed, allowing for ease of analysis, while also allowing for industries to overlap into multiple sectors. This flexibility recognizes that some industries occupy multiple sectors, such as performing arts, which exists as a creative and cultural sector industry. Second, the DCMS classification is being used as a benchmark for definitions by Creative Manitoba in the development of their creative cluster strategy. I have found the approach to be useful in making comparisons because the UK DCMS approach relies less on conceptual definitions like the UNCTAD approach, and instead uses already defined industries. The definition was first developed as part of a 1998 project to map the creative industries in the UK, and was retained for a subsequent mapping document in 2001, and continues to inform data collection on creative industries in the UK (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2001, 2016). The DCMS broadly defines creative industries as:

“those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (2001, p. 5).

The industries identified as being creative are listed in Table 2. In its 2016 report detailing economic estimates for the various industries that are part of the DCMS, the industries in the creative sector are further divided into sub-categories, with descriptions derived from the Standard Industrial Classification 2007 (called the SIC 2007), and are detailed in Appendix 02 (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2016). Although the definition allows for flexibility within its classifications, it is rigid in the sense that industries that are not listed as creative or cultural will never be included unless the definition is amended. For example, gastronomy is not part of the DCMS definition, but could be considered creative and cultural in nature.
UK DCMS Creative Sector Industries

Advertising
Architecture
Art and antiques market
Crafts
Design
Designer fashion
Film and video
Interactive leisure software
Music
Performing Arts
Publishing
Software and computer services
Television and radio

Table 2 List of UK DCMS Creative Sector Industries (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2001)

2.2.3 Creative Class. Richard Florida’s work, The Rise of the Creative Class (2002), followed up in 2014 by The Rise of the Creative Class Revisited (Florida, 2014), is likely the most widely recognized work on creative industries and creativity. Florida argues that the economy is being driven by creativity and creative industries, rather than raw resource extraction or traditional manufacturing production. At the core of the creative class thesis is that the quality of place and the amenities that are offered draw in creative people, which in turn brings in more firms and leads to increased economic activity and growth (Florida, 2014). There are two elements of Florida’s thesis relating to the definition of creative industries: the creative index, and the creative class.

The creative class is made up of the people performing a variety of creative activities and functions in the economy. Florida (2014) defines the creative class in two categories: the super creative core and creative professionals. The super creative core is made up of people that engage in creative work on a regular basis as a part of their job, often in the form of problem solving and finding (Florida, 2014). Occupations in the super creative core include entertainers, actors, architects, scientists and engineers, and those considered to be the “thought leadership of modern society,” for example novelists, think-tank researchers and cultural figures (Florida, 2014, p. 38). This group is considered to be responsible for the
highest order of creative work, producing new forms or designs that are useful and easily transferred between people and institutions, and used for things like consumer products, or strategies that can be applied to different cases; an example would be composing music that can be performed by different groups or individuals (Florida, 2014). The second category is made up of creative professionals, which are those individuals that work in knowledge-intensive industries and are required to use complex knowledge to solve problems, but do not necessarily create anything (Florida, 2014). The difference between the two is that the super creative core is made up of the creators and innovators, while the creative professionals are the doers or users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative Class</th>
<th>Non-Creative Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Super-Creative Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and mathematical occupations</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and engineering occupations</td>
<td>Construction and extraction occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, physical, and social science occupations</td>
<td>Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, and library occupations</td>
<td>Production occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, design, entertainment sports, and media occupations</td>
<td>Transportation and material moving occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Professionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management occupations</td>
<td>Service Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and financial operations occupations</td>
<td>Health-care support occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal occupations</td>
<td>Food preparation and food-service-related occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care practitioners and technical occupations</td>
<td>Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-end sales and sales management</td>
<td>Personal care and service occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-end sales and related occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office and administrative support occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and social services occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protective service occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Richard Florida’s Creative Class and Non-Creative Class Classifications (adapted from Florida 2014)

The Creativity Index is the second component of Florida’s creative class thesis and is comprised of three variables: technology, talent, and tolerance, or the 3Ts (Florida, 2014). This index provides an indication of a region’s “economic development and longer-run economic potential,” and provides a system for ranking cities for their creative potential (Florida, 2014, p. 253). The talent variable is the most straightforward, and it is comprised of the creative class as described in the previous section. Technology
is measured using three variables: Milken-Institute’s Tech Pole Index, which measures high-tech industry, patents per capita, and average annual patent growth, each measured regionally (Florida, 2014). Tolerance is also comprised of three variables: immigrants or foreign-born residents, the Gay and Lesbian Index, and the Integration Index, which measures the “level of integration versus segregation of a metro area” (Florida, 2014, p. 402). Florida’s argument hinges on the diversity component, as he makes a strong case that those regions that are open to diversity, and capable of attracting talent from around the world, are more likely to develop “different cognitive styles” (Florida, 2014, p. 232) and lead to a wider breadth of talent and ideas.

2.2.4 Critiques of Creative Class Methodology. There is a fair amount of literature testing Florida’s creative class thesis, and critiquing his approaches. Criticisms of the creative class approach typically question the validity of the methodology used, how the creative class is defined, the extent to which the thesis results in attracting talent and promoting economic growth, and target the negative consequences of policies that promote the creative class approach. This section examines the first two aspects (methodology and definition), while the latter aspects are discussed as part of the following section. Many of the criticisms are based on the original publication of The Rise of the Creative Class published in 2002, and the 2014 edition responds to some of them.

Edward Glaeser was one of the first to offer up a critique of Florida’s work in a book review published in 2005. For the most part, his views are positive, stating the book is “best seen as a great volume popularizing the academic literature on the importance to cities of attracting human capital” (Glaeser, 2005, p. 596) and that the book is “generally dead on” (Glaeser, 2005, p. 596). He applauds Florida for bringing the concepts of lifestyles, creativity, and quality of place together, and for noting that different occupations are often associated with different lifestyle preferences, and that it is important for cities to attract people by providing for these preferences (Glaeser, 2005). Glaeser’s issue is with Florida’s departure from the “mainstream of urban research” (Glaeser, 2005, p. 596). His major critique is Florida’s
argument that creative capital is different from human capital, which explains urban growth better (Glaeser, 2005). Glaeser argues that these are still one in the same, and that human capital has always been a predictor of “urban success” (Glaeser, 2005, p. 594). Glaeser (2005), using data provided by Florida, ran his own models to test the creative index, and found that when controlling for variables, higher education levels, and thus higher quality skills, have significant positive impacts on growth, while bohemianism and diversity were found to have little impact.

Glaeser’s other major critique relates to the make-up of the creative class. While he agrees that cities need to attract creative people, he does not share Florida’s view that they are purely made up of artistic bohemians that want to live downtown (Glaeser, 2005). He argues that many are suburbanites in their 40s (Glaeser, 2005b), which means they will probably have very different preferences than those discussed by Florida (2014) as being common across the creative class. Ann Markusen shares Glaeser’s criticism, saying that Florida’s research does not represent the whole creative class, evidenced by his “selective use of interviews and anecdote to suggest behaviours and preferences that are not representative of the ‘class’ as a whole” (Markusen, 2006b, p. 1923). Markusen identifies that a wide range of the creative class, particularly members of Florida’s super creative core like engineers, scientists, and managers, “disproportionately work and live in suburbs where homogeneity and low-density are highly valued” (Markusen, 2006b, p. 1923). Storper and Scott (2009) go a step further by connecting the predominant suburban preferences to Florida’s argument that the creative class has a preference for diverse and tolerant communities. While cities are more tolerant than ever before, they are “also accompanied by huge overlays of indifference, narcissism and separation” and ideas of urban elitism (Storper & Scott, 2009, p. 155). Storper and Scott (2009) question this creative class that desires tolerance in their communities yet live in “upscale and relatively homogenous neighbourhoods, often in the suburbs” and are removed from “diversity externalities” (2009, pp. 155–156).
Markusen also critiques the link between high education levels and creativity and skills (2006b). She contests that high education does necessarily mean higher creativity, arguing that some occupations not part of the creative class, such as repair technicians, can be very creative in their daily duties; she further argues that it is “dangerous” to make broad stroke categorizations that one group is creative while another is not (Markusen, 2006b). She also scrutinizes Florida’s method of grouping occupations, for both being too broad in some instances, and skipping over other occupations that are creative in nature, such as airplane pilots, millwrights and tailors (Markusen, 2006b). Markusen goes so far as to question the very use of class in the definition, suggesting that the diversity of personal and political beliefs within these occupations does not meet the criteria of a cohesive class interest, outlook or social patterning of behaviours (Markusen, 2006b).

Storper and Scott (2009), as part of their larger critique of amenity based urban economic growth theories, suggest that the creative class perspective (along with others) miss the major point of asking why cities even exist in the first place. From their perspective, any argument or theory that does not consider the history and underlying factors of urban development, cannot offer an adequate theory on growth as many complexities are overlooked (Storper & Scott, 2009). A second criticism they offer is that the posited theories are not addressing the real preferences of people, rather, just those that are measurable, called revealed preferences (Storper & Scott, 2009). As an example they suggest that while warmth and sunshine may be a high priority amenity for people, if there are no jobs available, people will not go there (Storper & Scott, 2009). In short, Storper and Scott (2009) argue that the amenity based theories are only measuring what is easily observable, rather than attempting to reveal deeper connections to peoples preferences that are not overtly available.

In *Rise of the Creative Class Revisited*, Florida responds to the critiques against his work, even agreeing with some to an extent, and claiming others simply misunderstood his work (2014). In his rebuttal of Glaeser’s remarks, which linked education to high skills and creativity, Florida argues that higher
education does not equal creativity (Florida, 2014). Florida says that almost three quarters of college degree holders are members of the creative class, but less than 60% of the creative class have college degrees (Florida, 2014). In response to criticism of his occupational groupings, he admits that his original concept was based on “subjective assessment of the skill content of work,” (Florida, 2014, p. 43), but that new research confirms that his original definition help up, and is in line with the updated one (Florida, 2014). Florida also claims that the theory does include many of these other jobs, but that there are ultimately many manufacturing jobs that remain “mind-numbing, de-skilled and controlled by machines” (Florida, 2014, p. 44).

The creative class thesis (and accompanying amenity based growth theories) have become popular, especially amongst city policymakers, but critics have shown the holes and gaps in this approach. Although rationale has been provided in defense of the creative class, its ability to hold up as an approach that adequately explains urban growth, why people or firms locate as they do, or provide an equitable approach to urban development is still in question. Other critiques of the creative class have emerged in conjunction with the creative city approach, and will be discussed in the following sections.

2.3 The Creative City

*The Creative City* was first published by Charles Landry in 1995, followed by a second edition in 2008, which is the version that will be used in this thesis. The book is presented as a toolkit for developing cities for creativity in order to foster innovation and economic growth (Landry, 2008). By examining what other cities have done both historically and in contemporary times, a set of tools and building blocks are set out, that if replicated properly, should result in innovative and creative economic growth (Landry, 2008). Landry (2008) does not claim that it is that simple, and does not sell his ideas as a magic bullet for economic success, but he does propose that if these steps are followed that the right climate will be created for success. This section reviews some key elements of Landry’s (2008) approach: the “Creative Milieu” and “The Cycle of Urban Creativity.”
2.3.1 Creative Milieu and Innovative Milieu. The concept of ‘creative milieu’ comes from Charles Landry’s *The Creative City* (2008), though it may not have originated there, as Sir Peter Hall spoke of the innovative milieu as early as 1998 (Hall, 1998). Creative milieu is a place that has the soft and hard infrastructure necessary to support creative endeavours and attracts a ‘critical mass’ of creatives, ultimately leading to innovation and economic success (Landry, 2008). It is the setting, socially and physically, for creativity.

Hard infrastructure refers to the physical environment, the material elements where creativity happens, and is complemented by various support services such as health care and other kinds of amenities (Landry, 2008). Soft infrastructure consists of the intangibles, such as social and business networks and other human interactions that “underpins and encourages the flow of ideas between individuals and institutions” (Landry, 2008, p. 133). Landry (2008) lists various traits of creative milieu that have been identified by other authors, which can be summarized as leaning heavily on ensuring that people have the skills, knowledge and capacity to be creative, have the capacity to communicate with others as well as firms internally and externally, are diverse places, and possess a degree of tension or imbalance between the needs of creatives and opportunities (characterized as aspects that are lacking). Locality is considered important for capitalizing on local knowledge, clustering, and developing a political climate that has policy to help creative endeavours through institutions and trust building between people and firms (Landry, 2008). Furthermore, it is suggested that a degree of uncomfortableness and instability need to be balanced with a level of comfort and security in order to ensure there is an equilibrium of competition and collaboration (Landry, 2008).

Peter Hall (1998) takes a different approach that he refers to as the innovative milieu, which focuses more on geopolitical economic aspects. In other words, Peter Hall takes a macro approach to analyze what fosters innovation, while Landry takes a micro approach to innovation. Three paradigms of capitalist innovation are identified by Hall (1998):
1. The Heroic Era of Capitalism: considered the first era (late 18\textsuperscript{th} and early 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries), innovation is characterized as spontaneous, in which “challenges were met with a series of brilliant intuitions and adaptations” (Hall, 1998, p. 306). Here, personal relationships between innovating individuals was essential, and the industrial district provided the place for ideas to circulate and be tested and improved.

2. Corporate Era of Capitalism: begins in the 1880s, and is best represented by Germany and the United States at the time. Innovation is closely linked with general scientific advancements, with corporate entities often pushing innovation forward in an attempt to meet their own goals.

3. Warfare State Innovation: emerges during World War II and is propelled forward by the Cold War. Innovation is driven by the needs of war, as the competition between nations for power requires newer and better weapons. Think of mutually assured destruction, where every new weapon is met with a newer and bigger one by the opposing state. Scientific achievements are quickly exploited for their weaponized potential.

Hall (1998) uses these paradigms in six case studies of different places across different times. The case studies help to demonstrate that these paradigms are not discreet, that they overlap with one another. For instance, Silicon Valley is driven by the Heroic Era paradigm (the individual in the garage turning an idea into a global enterprise), but exists during the warfare state paradigm (Hall, 1998). Hall (1998) proposes two potential innovative models that stem from these case studies and paradigms: the first is the laissez-faire model, as embodied by the USA, and the state-guided centralization approach, found in Japan and Germany. Both work in their own way, and in their respective places, and it seems it will be some time before one can be proven as superior to the other (Hall, 1998). “The general long-term tendency is toward scale, bureaucratization and state-industry relationships,” but tends to be “regularly interrupted by success cases from the other tradition, based on networking, synergy and spin-off” (Hall, 1998, p. 497). Suffice to say, from Hall’s (1998) approach, there is no single prescription of innovative or creative milieu that can
encapsulate every dimension of creativity and innovation. Each place, each time, seem to resonate their own form of it, though traits may be shared between them.

2.3.2 Cycle of Urban Creativity. Landry’s (2008) “Cycle of Urban Creativity” is his method for identifying and describing how cities can develop creative industries. This is a tool used to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a creative project, and it is made up of five stages, with the fifth feeding back into stage one kick starting the process all over again. The cycle is described as a means by which cities can assess which stages they are strong at, and which ones they are weak at, enabling them to capitalize on the former, and to enhance the latter. Cities should look to cities that are similar in order to find a benchmark to compare themselves (Landry, 2008).

The first stage is “Generating Ideas and Projects” (Landry, 2008), which starts with people’s ideas and the capacity to generate new ideas and innovations. Some measurements for this include the extent to which patents and copyrights are applied for, the brands or trademarks held by individuals and firms, the companies and high profile individuals that call a city home, and the amount of new business start ups there are. Landry uses several examples to illustrate supports for this stage: the first is a forum where innovators and entrepreneurs can meet and interact with each other, and explore future collaborations that may not happen otherwise; the second is a program aimed at helping unemployed and underemployed people acquire the necessary skills to operate in the creative economy, such as teamwork building, public presentation and even drama (Landry, 2008).

The second stage is “Turning Ideas Into Reality” (Landry, 2008) At this stage the goal is to ensure that the necessary resources are present to turn people’s ideas into a marketable product: financial supports, people with the right skills etc. Landry uses examples of finance suppliers (outside of major banking institutions), institutions providing market viability analysis, and programs aimed at helping innovators that have strong ideas but no support as key for this stage. The third stage is “Networking,
Circulating and Marketing Ideas and Products,” and it is as it sounds (Landry, 2008). The idea driving this stage is that behind creativity and creative ideas are marketers, PR people/firms, managers, agencies, distributors as well as the people who manufacture the product. The fourth stage is “Platforms for Delivery,” which are the places where creatives sell their products, pilot new ideas, and display their innovation (Landry, 2008). These spaces need to be affordable, and are typically found in places where the use is changing like old warehouse buildings (Landry, 2008). The final stage is “Dissemination, Reflection, and Evaluation,” which is the final act of getting the knowledge of the project or product out to the public, and ensuring that there are feedback mechanisms to inform how the projects are being received (Landry, 2008).

There are no measurable indicators provided for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the various stages of the cycle, Landry mostly provides examples of what has been done in other places. Landry may have opted to not be this precise so that policymakers can have freedom to create their own approaches and identify their own creative assets. However, this makes it difficult to assess the strengths of a city’s creativity if there are no policies present, or to compare different strategies and outcomes. Colin Mercer (2006) has made some progress on this front by combining Australia’s Integrated Local Area Planning mechanism with Landry’s cycle of innovation to create what he calls the Urban Value Production Matrix. This is a tool that combines social, economic, infrastructure, culture, and environmental planning and development into an easy to understand grid with basic indicators to ensure that development policies are not leaving out any areas. Mercer’s matrix is effectively a checklist to ensure that various elements are present, but could be adapted to a more in-depth indicator matrix to help assess the quality of the stages of the cycle of urban creativity.

2.3.3 Criticisms and Critiques of the Creative City Approach in Practice. There is no shortage of criticisms of the creative city approach, be they directed at Landry’s work, Richard Florida’s work, or at the entire prescriptive policy approach of promoting creative cities. While some of these critiques are quite
extensive, I have elected to highlight four issues that have arisen in connection to creative city policies: the creation of gentrification, social/economic inequality, re-stratification of social classes, and elite favouring subsidies. These criticisms target the application of research into creative cities, and the outcomes that have resulted. In this section, creative cities will be used to discuss the wider concept of policy making for creativity in cities, and not Landry’s (2008) work alone.

Gentrification, as a process of neighbourhood change and class disruption, has been a well-documented issue in urban geography and urban studies. Unfortunately, the dominant policy application of the creative city work of scholars like Florida and Laundry has been heavily criticized for further fuelling gentrification processes in select cities. According to Scott (2014) “Creative city policies help to turbo-charge gentrification processes thus exacerbating the exclusion of low-income families from central city areas and underwriting the takeover of those areas by the new bourgeoisie” (Scott, 2014, p. 573). Similarly, Leslie and Catungal (2012) have argued that to attract creatives and consumers, creative districts in cities are championed as hip places, drawing in investment which ultimately result in the displacement of low income populations that once lived in these areas (Leslie & Catungal, 2012).

The mainstream creative city approach is also relatively silent on the issue of the social and economic inequality that it produces, often mentioning it may exist, as Landry (2008) does, but not offering any solutions or policy prescriptions for remedying the issue (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). In this respect, social inequality functions at several levels. For example, women and minorities face high entry barriers, and must often function within masculine norms that have been established and entrenched in these industries (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). Career advancement is also gendered, with women poorly represented, and newcomers often excluded (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). Creative jobs are often

---

3 Inequality is in reference to the disparity that exists between people with different incomes, and expectations for outcomes in social and economic situations (i.e. the difference in wages and the differences in what low wages can afford a person versus what a high wage can afford a person).
accompanied by high insecurity, requiring (and even championing) long hours, and require networking in bars and navigating the ‘old boys clubs,’ which increases the barriers of women finding success in this arena (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). As tolerance and diversity are championed throughout the creative class framework, it appears to be limited to a certain type of diversity and tolerance, and does not recognize the barriers that many have to overcome to be participants in the new economy.

Another criticism levelled at the translation of policy prescriptions derived from the mainstream creative city approach is the concern that these policy prescriptions are further facilitating a re-stratification of classes into those that are creative, and those that are in low-wage supportive service industries (Scott, 2014). This new arrangement is characterized by a class that is required to work long hours and consequently requires others to provide services to supplement this kind of lifestyle (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). Devaluing the cognitive skills of the service providers is a mistake, as these professions often require special skills that cannot be offshored, or packaged and sold (Scott, 2014). This will have the effect of further stratifying society, inhibiting class consciousness, and potentially reinforcing negative stereotypes and prejudice. Further qualitative research will help policymakers and planners understand the effects of this class re-stratification, and identify the extent to which it is occurring along lines of race and gender.

The final area of contention is found in policies that favour elites. Creating high-quality amenity based places in an effort to draw in creatives requires “regressive subsidies to privileged groups at the expense of other social fractions” and are “likely to provide disproportional benefits to property owners” (Scott, 2014, p. 573). The investment in these amenities is often found to be uneven, supporting the most popular institutions that cater to the interests of the elite, while others falter (Leslie & Catungal, 2012). In addition to funding discrepancies, these amenity based places often see a high use of policing and security to make these places ‘safe’ (Leslie & Catungal, 2012), though that safety is often not extended to the homeless, or minority groups that are displaced as a result of this policing.
These are just some of the criticisms that have been levied at the policy prescriptions derived from the Floridian and Laundry-inspired mainstream creative cities framework, and it is worth noting that further research is needed to incorporate these more critical perspectives. As Pratt (2011, p. 124) notes, “[p]olicy makers and citizens cannot afford to be ‘starry eyed’ about the creative city, rather they need to engage with both the challenges and opportunities that it may bring” (Pratt, 2011, p. 124). It is tempting to only look at, and consequently advocate for, initiatives that can bring in many benefits, such as the creative city approach. However, discourse that fails to address the shortcomings of these initiatives ultimately fail a city and the people who live there. After all, the goal of planners is to build cities and communities for all people, not just the ones that are on top, or those who visit our unique destination districts.

2.4 Cultural Planning

Landry (2008) considers culture to be the soil from which creativity is grown, and cultural planning is the development and implementation based on those cultural resources. In his view, and I agree, cultural planning is not the planning of culture, but rather the undertaking of a “cultural approach to any type of public policy” (Landry, 2008, p. 173). This point is an important distinction to make, as it is easy to assume (or confound) this label of cultural planning as the attempt to plan for a particular form of culture to take place, or to happen, which is an absurd proposal. Cultural planning is a vast field that spans many aspects. These aspects cannot all be discussed here, rather it is my intent to provide a brief overview of cultural planning, and how it can relate to creative cities, based on the description from Landry (2008) provided above.

As described above, cultural planning seeks to include cultural resources and principles into the plans and strategies of a city (Kovacs, 2010; Landry, 2008; Markusen, 2006a; Mercer, 2006). In this sense, it is more of a dynamic process, one that is ongoing, rather than the development of a set plan to see a certain outcome. Cultural planning can be considered “an ethical corrective to physical planning” (Kovacs, 2010, p. 321). Mercer (2006) describes some of the characteristics of cultural planning as being strategic,
in that cultural planners are wheelers and dealers throughout the planning process making connections between the interests and activities of agencies and communities; it is an integral part of the entire planning process, weaved throughout and not just an add-on at the end; it has planners that are engaged with the community; and it uses cultural resources, which should be viewed broadly and democratically, counting whatever people consider to be cultural as potential cultural resources. At the heart of these ideas is avoiding the Eurocentric approaches to culture, and pursuing inclusive policies that recognize culture at all levels, and not just high culture (Creative City Network, 2010). The Creative City Network of Canada (2010) identifies a number of forms that cultural planning can take, such as comprehensive cultural plans, single focused plans (e.g. the arts strategic plan), and cultural asset mapping. The goal is to be as open as possible as to what can be considered culture, to ensure that the breadth of diversity of cities can be accounted for (Creative City Network, 2010).

Markusen (2006a) has made several key observations on cultural planning that challenge some commonly held assumptions. The most significant of these is that clustering culture in one area or district is a mistake, and that cultural institutions should be spread throughout a city (Markusen, 2006a). This helps to expand the participation levels in the arts, and avoids the risk of neighbourhoods being labelled as not cultural or vibrant (Markusen, 2006a). To support her argument, she cites Jane Jacobs (1992), who argued for diversity throughout the city, and recognized the strengths of having numerous districts with unique cultures. While this is certainly worth pursuing in large cultural centers such as New York or Toronto, small and medium cities may not be able to achieve a diversity of eclectic neighbourhoods with unique cultural foundations, simply because they do not have the population capacity to do so.

2.5 Planning Cultural and Creative Districts or Clusters.

If we accept that having a creative milieu is essential for the success of creative industries, and that creative industries tend to agglomerate into a geographical cluster, then it is necessary to bring together the concepts discussed above and study what is involved in the planning of these cultural and creative
districts. It is fortunate that this work has already been done and can be summarized for ease of understanding. Here, the work of John Montgomery (2003, 2004) will be relied upon heavily to develop an understanding of creative districts, as well as the work of Matthew Wansborough and Andrea Mageean (2000) who argue that urban design is an essential (if not central) component of cultural regeneration in cities.

Historically, cultural districts may have seemed to happen organically (Hall, 1998; Landry, 2008) or even by accident (Montgomery, 2004), but now they are being developed as a model for urban regeneration in areas that have fallen into “decline” (Montgomery, 2004). Wansborough and Mageean (2000) provide insight into several factors that may have led to culture as a part of civic policy. While these are more closely tied to the United Kingdom, I believe that they are worth considering as these phenomena have also played out in the United States and Canada in their own way. Shifts in the political sphere towards neoliberalism led to arts being viewed as a consumer product, and not just a service, which has consequently led to increased private sector partnerships to provide arts services (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000). Connected to this is the breakdown of barriers between high art and popular culture, as well as the changing patterns of consumption that sees people sampling a variety of cultural forms (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000). The third, and most dominant factor, is that arts and culture are now seen as an economic driver and important for place marketing, leading to the exploitation of culture for profit through consumption (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000). As a result of these changes, Wansborough and Mageean (2000) argue that urban design must embody the culture of cities, and reflect the ideas,

---

4 I hesitate to use the term decline as this is a relative term; areas may be undesirable to members of the elite or upper middle class, but are homes for many others that have no issue with the neighbourhood. These areas may not be perfect (none really are), but there are often thriving communities where people have strong relationships with each other and the place. The perception of decline is very much in the eye of the beholder, and using such a term can potentially lead to harmful consequences, such as over policing or stigmatization.

5 It should be recognized that neoliberalism is a complicated and contested term. Here it is used to refer to its promotion of small government, reduced funding (austerity), and the idea that the free market can effectively and efficiently provide goods and services. From this perspective, arts and arts services and supports are better served through private endeavours, rather than government ones.
beliefs and values of the people that live there, not just to enhance the profitability aspect, but, perhaps, also to counteract it.

With the shift of urban economies away from manufacturing, coupled with the aforementioned changes, it has been necessary for cities to compete on a global scale. A new urban landscape has emerged in response to this, and it endeavours to create unique cities, distinguished from others and typified by flagships projects to spurn urban regeneration (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000). This is connected to people now buying into their own cities, resulting in “the built environment [becoming] little more than a new commodity” (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000, p. 185). This new urban landscape is a reflection of the complex relationship between social, political and cultural life; this is not necessarily determined by a dominant class or ideology, but by the fragmentation of views and beliefs of a diverse society, contesting dominant ideas (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000). The following excerpt from Wansborough and Mageean (2000, p. 186) discusses these ideas:

Culture is negotiated and contested between different social groups; therefore, it follows that the nature of the built environment is a result of many different forces and cannot be ascribed to a single cause.

The urban landscape, then, could be said to be the result of a social representation, in which meaning is constructed or ‘mapped’ by individuals and groups to create a shared, ‘common sense’ or mutually accepted framework for experiencing such a place. Such ‘maps of meaning’ are not limited to purely spatial information but incorporate many different experiences and personal perceptions gathered from many different sources. This results in the creation of a hierarchy of social representations, which together make up the characteristics of an environment and ultimately help to provide the identity of a place. Although places are (physically and symbolically) constructed by a collective social interaction, they are translated and articulated by individuals,
thus reinforcing the point that cultural meaning is apparently a consensus reached after negotiation between affected individuals and so is constantly being changed and reinterpreted through time as different configurations of individuals and groups reach a different consensus. This concept provides a key to the understanding of how cities and places develop.

If the built environment is a product of two types of design (the one imposed by the dominant social groups and the one contested and re-interpreted by everyday users), over time and as a result of many different design decisions made by many different people a recognizable landscape is produced – a city.

I have included this excerpt to establish the importance of perception of place, and that many forces are acting on a place, whether it is a cultural district or a financial one, and these forces shape the meaning and experiences of these places. In simple terms, this is culture, or at the very least, an aspect of it. Therefore, it is important that “the social groups that are involved in producing a city’s culture need to be involved in producing the built environment of that city” (Wansborough & Mageean, 2000, p. 186).

Montgomery (2003) has identified three characteristics of cultural districts, each with their own set of indicators for gauging success: activity, built form, and meaning. Table 4 provides an overview of these characteristics and indicators.
### Table 4 Characteristics of Cultural Places (Montgomery 2003, p. 295)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Built Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of primary and secondary land uses</td>
<td>• Fine-grain urban morphology</td>
<td>• Important meeting and gathering spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extent and variety of cultural venues and events</td>
<td>• Variety and adaptability of building stock</td>
<td>• Sense of history and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of an evening economy, including café culture</td>
<td>• Permeability of streetscape</td>
<td>• Area identity and imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strength of small-firm economy, including creative businesses</td>
<td>• Legibility</td>
<td>• Knowledgeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to education providers</td>
<td>• Amount and quality of public space</td>
<td>• Design appreciation and style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active frontages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activity category is focused on diversity of uses, different business types, and varying venue sizes in order to accommodate artists and culture producers across the spectrum of talent. There is also a desire to attract a diverse set of consumers, from the local market and outside of it. In order for these activities to be present, there must be a supply, or potential supply, of highly skilled and educated individuals that want to be entrepreneurs and set-up their own businesses; Montgomery refers to university graduates as being prime candidates for this, and suggests this is why there are often strong ties between universities and cultural districts. As with the activity category, diversity is key for built-form. Montgomery advocates for the ideas of Jane Jacobs and Kevin Lynch that pertain to building an imageable place that has diverse uses, good street life, and a mixture of building types in terms of age, size, types and conditions. He also argues that public space is an important part as a dynamic place for interactions between people and also as a space for traditions and festivals and other identity and meaning forming activities to occur (Montgomery, 2003).

Meaning relates to the capacity of the urban environment and its image to “make a strong impression on the individual” (Montgomery, 2003, p. 301). Similar to Wansborough and Mageean (2000),
Montgomery (2003) makes an important observation that meeting and gathering spaces are very important in creating meaning; these are the spaces where people come together, history and progress unfold, and people experience life that they then share with others (Montgomery, 2003).

Montgomery (2004) applied his methodology to four case studies: Temple Bar, Dublin; Sheffield Cultural Industries Quarter; Hindley Street, Adelaide; and Manchester Northern Quarter. Montgomery (2004) concludes with six questions that emerged through his research. The first is whether or not arts led regeneration works, and Montgomery (2004) says it does, “depending on the skill of policy makers” (Montgomery, 2004, p. 29). Montgomery falls into the trap of assuming that culture led is the same as arts led. As has been established throughout this literature review, cultural planning needs to go beyond the assumption that art equals culture and move to broader more inclusive definitions of culture. The second question addressed asks if a cultural quarter can be planned, to which Montgomery (2004) emphatically says “yes,” while noting that the most market driven case study was the least successful, and the one with the most intervention felt the most organic and natural.

The third question refers to an issue of outcomes not reflecting the intent of the policy, an issue brought up in both of Montgomery’s articles (2003, 2004). He seems to be defending against critiques brought forward by both Marxists and free-market advocates, the former never being satisfied with success unless capitalism is replaced while the latter would have to suffice without cultural districts (Montgomery, 2004). This is a strawman argument that comes out of nowhere, as these issues do not appear anywhere in his research for these two papers. His arguments against these perspectives attempt to dismiss any criticisms of cultural districts, which relates to his thoughts on his fourth question, which focuses on the issue of gentrification. Montgomery (2003, 2004) almost entirely dismisses the arguments that cultural districts cause gentrification, or that gentrification is negative, as well as arguments that cultural districts are not needed in every city or town. His argument is two-fold. At first he dismisses the critiques as missing the point, that the intent of the policy is not for negative things to happen, that was just the way the
outcome turned out (Montgomery, 2003). His second argument is that gentrification is not bad, and it is okay that some “low-value” industries get pushed out, such as tattoo parlours (Montgomery, 2004). However, if artists start to get priced out then it is important that policies are put in place to prevent this from happening (Montgomery, 2004). That Montgomery (2004) targets tattoo parlours demonstrates a lack of understanding of art and creativity; tattoos are quite popular in 2017, many artists and non-artists have them, and tattoo professionals are often referred to as tattoo artists.

His fifth question relates to authenticity, and whether or not planning for culture can tarnish authenticity (Montgomery, 2004). No argument is made, rather, as with the previous two questions, he attempts to dismiss the whole issue. Targeting the Marxists again, along with liberals and traditionalists, he argues that authenticity is subjective as everyone has a different view of what is authentic (Montgomery, 2004). When discussing culture, authenticity is a valid concern, as artists, and even the public, can be a discerning group. For example, a trained ear in music can be irritated by a performance that has been artificially manipulated to have perfect pitch by correcting out the errors using software. By tuning out the human element of error, the authenticity is lost, which can alienate some people from enjoying the performance. So too in the planning of cultural quarters must we be concerned with such violations of authenticity. His final question asks if every urban area can or should be a cultural one, to which he says no, and only those with the right combination of ingredients are found (Montgomery, 2004), an approach that has been critiqued in the previous section.

Cultural districts present several dilemmas, and Montgomery’s (2003, 2004) ignorance towards some of them reveals a neoliberal tendency to prize development at all costs without regard for the consequences to communities, or to cultural integrity. As well, it is worth considering that developing a specific area for culture falls into the line of thinking often criticized by New Urbanism. Trying to declare that “culture will happen here” and circle an area on a map is absurd on several levels. As planners, we are attempting to encourage a mix of uses, and move away from the segregated uses brought on during the
peak period of suburban developments. Culture is everywhere, in some capacity or another, and sometimes is more visually present than in others. Anytime someone picks up a guitar in a basement, or tunes into the CBC on the radio, culture is happening. Even industrial districts develop their own sense of culture, it just might not involve flashy stages and old heritage buildings.

2.6 Nathan Medeiros’ Planning for Creativity: The Case of Winnipeg’s Exchange District

In 2005, Nathan Medeiros wrote a graduate research thesis for the Faculty of Environmental Design at the University of Calgary titled *Planning for Creativity: The Case of Winnipeg’s Exchange District* (2005), which uses Charles Landry’s “Cycle of Urban Creativity” (2008, originally published in 1998) to assess how Winnipeg has planned for creativity in this sector. The Medeiros thesis (2005) is effectively a time capsule that can be used to measure how change has occurred in the Exchange District over the past twelve years, and how the creative city theory has held up over time. This section will discuss Medeiros’ theoretical framework, his findings, and his recommendations and conclusions.

![Nathan Medeiros’ Theoretical Framework (Medeiros 2005)](image-url)
To perform his analysis, Medeiros (2005) created a framework that links together various creative city concepts, which helps to visually understand how creative cities function. At the top is the broad creative city concept, under which everything else occurs. Under this is the creative milieu, which has four inputs: creative class and creative ethos provide the human capital elements, while cultural planning and creative industries provide the institutional and economic supports (Medeiros, 2005). Each of these four inputs has been previously discussed, and will not be expanded on here. The cycle of urban creativity is the crux of Medeiros’ work, and provides the most information for follow-up analysis (2005). Policy is the final component, though it is not regarded as separate from the cycle of urban creativity but rather as an input informing the various stages of the cycle (Medeiros, 2005).

The case study revolves around a strength, weakness, opportunity and threat (SWOT) analysis of each of the five stages of the cycle of urban creativity in relation to planning in Winnipeg’s Exchange District. The methodology section provides a brief overview of the SWOT analysis technique, and what some of its pros and cons are. Medeiros cites the usefulness of the cycle for its recognition of the need of diversity, and the need to get different actors working together towards common goals and visions. Following is a summary of Medeiros’ analysis of the Exchange District.

2.6.1 Stage 1: Generating Ideas and Projects. Medeiros (2005) describes this stage as the most vital as it revolves around people, but also as one of the most difficult to analyze as it is not “something one can mandate via [direct] policy” (Medeiros, 2005, p. 77). Some key strengths that were noted in this area are supports for existing events that provide opportunities for networking both within and outside of Winnipeg; the high number of arts and culture organizations in the Exchange, which also held events and created opportunities; the promotion of housing by the CentreVenture Development Corporation (CentreVenture) through competition projects; and, the completion of the Red River College Downtown Campus, which allowed for some heritage conservation and has functioned as an incubator for ideas “within the context of educational programs such as Information Systems Technology, Creative Communications, Graphic
Design, and Digital Media Technology” (Medeiros, 2005, p. 78). These programs were identified as potential factors that would foster “synergies and cooperative study/work placements” in businesses located in the Exchange District (Medeiros, 2005, p. 78). A significant weakness was the lack of communication between anyone, leading to limited innovation and information being shared between individuals and institutions from different creative sectors (Medeiros, 2005).

Several opportunities were identified in this area, mostly in the form of increases to arts funding, which were expected to flow to the Exchange District. The perception of the Exchange as a logical place for new creative industries, and Winnipeg’s future ability to attract and support traditional and new technology industries were both cited as opportunities. Red River College provided a third opportunity, mostly as a connector between students and industry professionals (Medeiros, 2005). The largest threat for this stage was identified as being Winnipegggers themselves, who “tend to complain about all the negative aspects of their city” (Medeiros, 2005, p. 80) and ultimately undermine the ability of people to be open to new ideas, and presents Winnipeg not as a place to be, but as a place to leave or pass through. Winnipeg’s distance from other major urban centers was cited as another threat, this is because the distance functioned as a barrier to attaining a critical mass in the arts and culture sector, and creatives felt they lacked the tools and resources for success that were available in other places. A final threat in this realm is identified as the then newly elected mayor, who was seen as having a poor vision and policy direction for the creative industries, and lacked the passion of the previous mayor in this area (Medeiros, 2005).

2.6.2 Stage 2: Turning Ideas into Reality. Strengths in this area related to the large number of institutions providing financial support in the forms of tax incentives, grants, or loans. Other strengths noted were the recognition of the Exchange District by the province and city as a natural creative cluster, ongoing support for heritage preservation and conservation from the City and CentreVenture, and a history of inter-governmental cooperation in the pursuit of urban regeneration between the federal, municipal
and provincial governments. A key weakness that was identified was that there were too many agencies involved resulting in inefficiencies and the duplication of services, and that each of these organizations had their own ideas and vision for the Exchange District. This also applies to the abundance of financial resources, the availability of which may fluctuate with the government of the day, and cause problems if they suddenly disappeared. Compounding this issue was the lack of a central place for a business owner or artist to go to for information on supports or resources. A final weakness identified was that there was no clear policy direction or framework, despite the recommendations to create cultural and creative policies almost a decade earlier (Medeiros, 2005).

Two opportunities were identified, the first being interest in the regeneration of Winnipeg’s downtown core, and that the successes at the time legitimated the need for a planning response to manage the pressures from various actors and the changing landscape. A variety of threats were identified in the report. The first related to Winnipeg’s slow growth economy, and that some private organizations had become overly reliant on public funding as a result, and could dissolve if funding disappeared, resulting in a decline in growth. As well, the competition amongst individuals and organizations for funding could result in less cooperation and collaboration, especially if they are relying on the same funding. A second major threat was the competition between heritage conservation and the desire for economic growth and development. Medeiros identified a conflict of interest between CentreVenture’s task of increasing development in the downtown, and the need to preserve heritage; it was thought that development would take precedence over heritage preservation. A final threat identified was that regardless of the funding available for heritage preservation, it was never enough; the criteria for funding was onerous, and the costs to prepare the documentation could be high, and projects tended to be abandoned as a result (Medeiros, 2005).

2.6.3 Stage 3: Networking, Circulating, and Marketing. Medeiros discussed that due to the lack of official strategy for creativity in the city it was difficult to establish what the strengths were in this area.
Despite this, he describes several strengths for this stage as the Exchange District’s reputation as Winnipeg’s arts and cultural centre (people know what to expect when they are there), and the existing events such as the Fringe Festival, which brought creatives together and helps them interact with people and institutions from Winnipeg, and those outside of the city. In terms of weaknesses, the lack of understanding of activities in the area, or the benefits they provide, was noted as a major shortcoming, made worse by the lack of statistics or studies of the area. Another significant weakness was the lack of resources for local organizations such as the Winnipeg Exchange District Business Improvement Zone (Exchange District BIZ). Hype over recent developments in the Exchange District was described as a major opportunity to profile the community, and to develop a brand for the Exchange. The most notable threat identified in this area was competition from other cities that had quickly adapted and developed culture and creativity plans and frameworks, while Winnipeg had fallen behind and risked staying behind (Medeiros, 2005).

2.6.4 Stage 4: Platforms for Delivery. A number of strengths were identified for this part of the cycle. The abundance of gallery and studio space in the Exchange was a significant strength, and had been supported by residential development focusing on live work units and unique condos, and CentreVenture’s efforts at marketing old warehouses as potential residential units. The Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law was noted as a strength for its flexibility and responsiveness to slow growth development, and not requiring parking in the Exchange. Weaknesses in this area almost all related to planning. The lack of a coordinated planning framework and secondary plan for the Exchange District, the result of Winnipeg’s weak and reactive planning methods resulted in little pressure being put on developers to be unique and innovative in the district. As well, the permit approval process was identified as not being favourable for mixed-use heritage projects (Medeiros, 2005).

There were some opportunities in this area. The development of a secondary plan that included goals and a vision for the Exchange District was identified as an opportunity, especially for engaging a wide
array of stakeholders. In a similar vein, the *Exchange District Strategic Action Plan* that was in development was identified as an opportunity to discuss creative city approaches with stakeholders (Medeiros, 2005). Finally, the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement provided an opportunity for future funding for delivery platforms for the industry. The threats were similar to issues previously discussed, mainly the lack of an existing secondary plan, the lack of flexibility for creativity in the existing land-use plans, as well as the increasing property values in the area (Medeiros, 2005).

**2.6.5 Stage 5: Building Markets.** Medeiros asserts that this stage was too difficult to assess using the SWOT technique, and considered the line between stages one and five difficult to assess. In short, Medeiros identifies that those who live and work in the Exchange District have bought in to the area, but that this buy-in is not yet there from other Winnipegers, and a greater effort was needed to get this. A greater effort from all stakeholders (City of Winnipeg, CentreVenture, Exchange District BIZ, etc.) to build internal and external markets and communicating the opportunities and successes of the Exchange District is needed (2005). Medeiros concludes his analysis of this section saying

> “a lack of leadership and vision with respect to the roles each of these stakeholders could play in the future development in the Exchange District and Winnipeg remains a serious threat to their effectiveness” (2005, p. 98)

Medeiros’ conclusions do not paint the Exchange District of 2005 in a very favourable light, but do suggest that for all of its shortcomings, the Exchange District had many opportunities for improvement. While it had been successful at attracting creative industries, the lack of policy, secondary plans, and a weak approach to planning by the City had left the area vulnerable to the whims of the time and policymakers. This has been made worse by policy institutions not communicating and working without common goals and objectives. He discusses that the problems plaguing the Exchange District at the time were typical of many artistic districts: artists moved in, made the area popular, developers seized the hype, new
developments priced the artists and creatives out of the area, and the district lost the very thing that gave it appeal in the first place. Despite these significant shortcomings, Medeiros attempts to turn them into opportunities, maintaining that it was an opportune time for new plans and action strategies, and that existing funding could be expanded upon to enhance the Exchange District. Medeiros suggests that future research should focus on policies to address the issue of gentrification that is pushing artists out of the Exchange District (Medeiros, 2005).

The Medeiros Thesis concludes with four recommendations to help with future development in the Exchange District. The first was to develop a cultural policy plan to guide cultural development, identify opportunities to use its assets, and make use of the cycle of creativity as a policy guide (Medeiros, 2005). It was recommended that such a cultural policy should follow the framework of Toronto’s plan, and would bring Winnipeg in-line with other Canadian municipalities (Medeiros, 2005). Recommendation two was to adopt a secondary plan for the Exchange District that would go beyond a typical land-use and heritage plan, and recognize the need for a holistic approach that includes heritage, creativity, culture and economic development (Medeiros, 2005). The intent of this plan would be to help shape the vision, identity and brand of the Exchange District, and address the inconsistency of development decisions and confusion over priorities for the area (Medeiros, 2005). Ideally, this plan would embody the principles of Landry’s Creative Cities (2008): accept that conventional approaches might be limited; that creative thinking is a serious input into any planning exercise; think from the perspective of other disciplines; and, there are more potential resources for planning than usually considered (Landry, 2000 p. 166 in Medeiros, 2005).

The third recommendation made was to establish a creative development agency that is recognized by all three levels of government and is the key resource for Winnipeg’s creative economy. This agency would be responsible for developing and implementing initiatives in line with the creative city approach, and for researching and analyzing the performance of creative industries in the city. It would also take on creating a set of best practices for planning, working with various agencies and stakeholders
to develop building codes to help bring heritage buildings up to code, amongst various other activities. Medeiros notes his concern that CentreVenture was overstepping its mandate by taking on a planning role in the Exchange District. The fourth recommendation involves strengthening the then titled Arts and Creative Industries Association of Manitoba (ACI Manitoba, now Creative Manitoba). In particular, this organization should help with internal networking, circulating, marketing creative activities and products, while including “industry based ingenuity” in the plans for creativity in the Exchange (Medeiros, 2005).

Medeiros (2005) recognized that his recommendations were limited, mostly due to the lack of quantitative information available regarding creativity in the Exchange District, and the lack of planning documents. Despite this, the recommendations were concrete, and follow the ideas put forward by the creative city approach. Unfortunately, only recommendation four, support ACI Manitoba, was ever realized. This organization has evolved over time and is now called Creative Manitoba, and is slowly starting to undertake the roles prescribed in recommendation three. As will be discussed, many of the issues noted by Medeiros (2005) still exist, despite the continued success of the Exchange District.
3. Methodology

This section provides an outline of the methods used for the case study, as well as a brief discussion of the limitations of this project.

3.1 Case Study

Using criteria laid out by Robert Yin (2009), it is clear that a single embedded case-study design is appropriate for this project. This approach uses multiple units of analysis to study a single case (Yin, 2009). In this instance, The Exchange District in Winnipeg, Manitoba, is the case study, and the units of analysis are interviews (of multiple organizations), participatory observations, and document analysis.

The Exchange District in Winnipeg, Manitoba, has been chosen for several reasons. The city recognizes itself as a significant arts and cultural hub in Canada, and claims as much in its official plan, “OurWinnipeg” (City of Winnipeg, 2011d). Winnipeg is a mid-sized city of approximately 705,244 as of 2016 (City of Winnipeg, 2017), with approximately 778,489 in the census metropolitan area (Government of Canada, 2017a), and offers an opportunity to explore an alternative to large metropolises that most of the creative industry research has focused on. Economic data collected by various organizations in Winnipeg indicate that the creative industries are expanding extensively (see Economic Development Winnipeg, 2013; Prairie Research Associates, 2014), and this will be discussed in detail later in this report. Additionally, The Exchange District is a National Historic Site, featuring 150 heritage buildings over 20 city blocks (City of Winnipeg Planning, Property & Development & City of Winnipeg, n.d.), which is considered to be the largest of its kind in North America (“About the Exchange,” n.d.), and provides an opportunity to understand the relationship between heritage districts and creative industries.

3.1.1 Interviews. The case study used semi-structured, in-person interviews as a primary means of collecting data. Iain Hay (2000) identifies key strengths of interviews as being able to: (1) investigate complex ideas and behaviours; (2) collect a diverse set of opinions; and, (3) gather knowledge not available
through other means (2000). The objectives of this thesis require diverse opinions from numerous actors and stakeholders in the Exchange District of Winnipeg.

To ensure consistency throughout the interviews, an interview schedule/guide was used (see Appendix 10), which included questions that may be asked throughout the interview. Questions followed Hay’s (2000) hybrid model, going from simple, to abstract-reflective, to sensitive. The semi-structured design allowed for flexibility in the questions, and for probing for information that may come up during the interview that is not present in the questions. To negate power imbalances during the interview, focus was placed on “wh-” questions (who, what, where, when, why), as detailed in the Sage Handbook of Interview Research (Gubrium, Holstein, Marvasti, & McKinney, 2012). This kind of questioning allows participants to expand on their answers as they feel comfortable doing so (Gubrium et al., 2012).

Interview participants were found through industry websites, and through personal contacts. The snow-ball approach was used, allowing for participants to make recommendations for additional participants, which yielded one quarter of participants. Interviews were on average one-hour in length, and occurred mostly at participants’ offices, with two occurring at a local coffee shop and one over the phone. Some information was also provided through e-mail correspondence. All participants included in this thesis received a letter of information, and signed a letter of consent to participate in this research (see Appendix 09). Interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded using Dedoose Version 7.0.23.

Only one participant asked to be left out of the final research (he wanted to provide some background information but could not get permission from his organization to be included), the remaining participants agreed to be identified in the thesis with their organizations. On a positive note, the participants are given the opportunity to publicly say what they think, and allow for their comments to be put on a record. It gives legitimacy to what they are advocating for within their positions, and demonstrates their commitment to the Exchange District and the arts, culture and creativity scene that is there. However,
it does also mean that because they chose to be identified, there is the possibility that some people held back for fear of repercussions, which in some cases participants did flag a few comments they did not want included.

3.1.2 Document Analysis. The objective of this thesis is not to assess the quality of planning documents, but to understand what policies and planning strategies are being used in relation to the development of creative industries. The City of Winnipeg’s official plan is “OurWinnipeg,” (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) and is complemented by “Complete Communities” (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) and several other direction strategies. There is no secondary plan for the Exchange District, but it is controlled by the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law 100/2004 (City of Winnipeg, 2004). A variety of additional documents have also been discovered that are pertinent to this thesis, including, “The Mayor’s Task Force on Heritage, Culture and the Arts” (InterGroup Consultants & City of Winnipeg, 2017) “Ticket to the Future Phase 2: A Cultural Action Plan for Winnipeg” (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011), and The Warehouse District Plan Draft (City of Winnipeg, 2012), as well as others. Documents will be used to understand policies supporting culture and creativity in Winnipeg and the Exchange District.

Originally, the intent was to evaluate OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) using a framework that already existed, such as Montgomery (2003, 2004), Baer (1997), Ewing and Clemente (Ewing & Clemente, 2013) or adapt previous masters reports such as Misiak (2015). However, as these methods were explored it was clear that using an approach that attempted to either quantify a plan through a scoring method, or use qualitative descriptors (e.g. strong, poor, partial, non-present) was not appropriate for this research. Systems like this are best used for case studies that compare multiple plans, our use established methods from other studies. The results do not have much meaning if they cannot be compared to the ratings of other plans. Second, the approaches that did address culture or creativity focused on built form and land-use issues or did not have criteria that assessed plans at a level comparable to the cycle of urban creativity. Because of this, a hybrid approach that integrates criteria from several evaluation methods
would be required, which is not useful if only one plan is being evaluated. The data would not be comparable to the evaluation of other plans unless they underwent the same evaluation, and it is not my intent to develop a new means of evaluating plans for creativity and culture. The final issue is a critical flaw found within the plans themselves: ambiguous policies and strategies. Since the planning documents typically do not provide specific measurable objectives, applying any of the criteria becomes difficult. Baer (1997) actually identifies this as one of the critiques of using criteria, citing that the reason for vagueness could be technical ineptitude or political demands, either way it would be almost impossible for the reviewer to know which it was.

Considering this, I have elected to use a descriptive approach for evaluating the planning documents. Rather than grading them, I seek to understand what their contents are, and identify how creativity and culture are incorporated into the plans. Unlike Medeiros (2005), I have an entire section of directions and strategies on creativity in OurWinnipeg (2011d) that can be evaluated. To do this, I have created a table (Appendix 06), which assess the policies in the context of the cycle of urban creativity.

3.1.3 Participant Observation. During June, July and August of 2017, I explored the Exchange District and attended several major events that were held there: The TD International Jazz Festival and The Winnipeg Fringe Theatre Festival (Fringe Fest). Throughout these months, I spent time walking and cycling through the Exchange District taking notes about life in the area, as well as assessing the built-form, streetscapes and the community life of the area. While done informally, the information collected has been useful in understanding how the Exchange District is used and contributes to the creativity and culture of Winnipeg. I took notes while in attendance at events, and while walking through the Exchange District. These observations provided an additional level of context and richness to the discussions had in the interviews conducted. As participants described various phenomena I was able to relate it back to my experiences at events, or even just casually strolling through the area.
To conduct these observations, I modelled my notetaking and analysis from the work of Georgiana Varna (Varna, 2014) and, to a lesser extent, Vikas Mehta (2014). Varna’s (2014) methodology for studying public spaces was used as the framework for making participant observations; she provided a useful guide for what she observed, which included notes on observation time, observation point, weather conditions, presence of vendors, activities of people (e.g. sitting, walking, conversing etc.), control presence (i.e. police or security), and diversity of users (age, race, gender). Mehta (2014), created an index that used a weighting system for analyzing public space, which was based on the foundations of inclusiveness, meaningful activities, comfort, safety, and pleasure. Each of these authors have developed extensive methodology for analyzing public spaces, which is useful in its own right, but I only made a rudimentary use of these methods to inform what I should be observing. The categories I made observations in were safety, control (police or security presence), diversity (race, sex\(^6\), age), configuration/layout of the space, activities of people in the space, and comfort (types of seating, tables, grass, accessibility etc.).

My objective with the participant observation portion of the thesis was to experience how people used the space, and to make observations of other people using the Exchange District. Although I only sparsely discuss the observations made from these experiences, I do believe that they were instrumental in helping me understand the Exchange District, its complexities, and its relationship to the surrounding area.

3.1.4 SWOT Analysis. Medeiros (2005) conducted a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis for each of the stages of the cycle of urban creativity. As part of revisiting his research I have chosen to do a SWOT analysis of my own, in order to compare how things have changed over time. There is a large literature on the SWOT analysis technique, which discusses how it is used and its pros and

\(^6\) As it was not possible to determine gender visually, I only made estimations on what perceived genders were. This was not done at an academic level, and only for general information and context. It should be noted that individuals may self identify differently than how I may have identified them.
cons. I will provide a brief description of some key aspects of the SWOT analysis that I believe are relevant for understanding the different approaches available, and why I have chosen the method that is used in this thesis.

David W. Pickton and Sheila Wright (1998) define SWOT analysis as “the collection and portrayal of information about internal and external factors which have, or may have, an impact on business” (p. 103). The internal factors are strengths and weaknesses, while the external factors are opportunities or threats. Although they are discussing the process in relation to business practices, as much of the literature does, I believe the discussion can also be applied to the use of SWOT analysis in urban planning as the process is effectively the same.

In a SWOT analysis, factors are categorized into one of four lists as a strength, weakness, opportunity or threat. The process is “highly commended for its simplicity and value in focusing attention on key issues” (Pickton & Wright, 1998, p. 102). However, it is this simplicity that is often criticized. Some key criticisms are that the process only creates a list and does a poor job describing issues; it can be difficult to categorize factors if they affect multiple areas; there are challenges to connecting the analysis to decision alternatives; and, the data collected is reliant on the capabilities of those involved in the process (Kurttila, Pesonen, Kangas, & Kajanus, 2000; Pickton & Wright, 1998). Despite these flaws, Pickton and Wright (1998) argue that assuming the SWOT analysis is only a list is “inexcusably inadequate” (p. 104-105).

There are approaches to the SWOT analysis that deepen the data collected. Kurtilla et al. (Kurttila et al., 2000) describe several of these methods: the TOWS matrix developed by Weihrich (1982 in Kurtilla et al., 2000), identifies the relationships between threats, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats, and a framework for creating strategies from the analysis; Kotler (1991, in Kurtilla et al., 2000; Pickton and Wright 1998) suggests using a rating system to classify opportunities by their attractiveness and success probability, threats by their seriousness and probability of occurring, and strengths and weaknesses by their
performance and importance; and, Wheelen and Hunger (1995 in Kurtilla et al., 2000) developed a weighting system that articulated how factors were being responded to, and the importance to stakeholders. Kurtilla et al. (2000) advocate for the use of an analytical hierarchy process to determine the importance of factors. Each of these methods have their own merits and flaws, and certainly reduce the simplicity of the SWOT analysis, but they do offer a much more in-depth analysis.

Medeiros (2005) went beyond the basic form of the SWOT analysis by providing a detailed qualitative assessment for each of the four SWOT categories for each stage of the cycle of urban creativity. Unfortunately, Medeiros (2005) does not provide information on the methodology of how he classified factors into the SWOT analysis. This created a bit of a guessing game for my own analysis for identifying which factors belonged in the internal categories versus which ones belonged in the external categories. Where there were similarities between factors I followed what Medeiros (2005) did in his thesis, though some of the elements that were categorized under the internal strengths and weaknesses could have as easily gone into the external opportunities and threats categories, and vice versa. Regardless, I believe the integrity of the analysis is sound. Future research should consider the challenges of categorizing factors into the SWOT analysis, and ensure that at least some description of the methodology is included.

I have opted to not use the scoring and weighting systems described above for several reasons. One, I have doubts of how useful such a process would be when I am a single person scoring the factors identified. There would be far too much bias in such an analysis. Secondly, without other numbers to compare to, the numbers that I would generate (even if they did not have any bias) would have very little meaning. If Medeiros (2005) had used such an analysis then this would make more sense. And lastly, Medeiros’ (2005) method of providing an in-depth discussion for the factors in each category provides enough data to make a qualitative comparison that has more value than a scoring system could provide at this point. For these reasons, I have chosen to replicate Medeiros’ (2005) approach unaltered.
3.1.5 Limitations. Several limitations emerged during this thesis. The first, and perhaps the most important, is my personal location in society. I am a middle-class, white, able-bodied male in his 30s, and as such I have privileges that others do not, and experience life in the Exchange District differently than many others. I do not encounter mobility issues, often caused by the buildings that require steps to access doors, or have to contend with navigating streets that have cobblestones. I am typically surrounded people of a similar class, income bracket, and are the same race as I am. I do not have to think about my belonging here or “fitting in,” and it is not second guessed by authority figures (security, area patrols, or police) in the area. When I forgot my photo identification, I was able to negotiate use of a photo of my passport I had on my smartphone. A person that could not afford a cell phone, or a photo ID for that matter, would not have such privilege. Issues of safety came up through my research, and as a man, I do not have the same experiences as a woman, and did not question my safety in the Exchange District. I think the issues that are discussed in the following sections do reflect my position in society, as I do not discuss in detail issues of race, safety, mobility, or class. My ability to analyze the environment of the Exchange District through participant observation reflects only my experiences, and how I see and interact with the area. Second, I was unable to conduct interviews or surveys of people who attend the events at the Exchange District, or just go there as something to do. My interviews were with people typically in charge of, or at least in a relatively high-up position, of institutions and companies advocating for culture, the arts, creativity, or planning and design in the Exchange District. Their views may, and probably do not, wholly reflect the views of citizens living and working the Exchange. Unfortunately, there was not enough time, or resources to conduct this level of analysis.

A final limitation of this research is the engagement with the Indigenous population, or other visual minorities, in the Exchange District, or with people with disabilities. Due to ethics considerations and other limitations of this project, it was decided that token inclusion of Indigenous Peoples would not adequately represent their experiences and views of the Exchange District. Further research that focuses entirely on
Indigenous Peoples and creativity in the Exchange, as well as other visual minorities and newcomers, would be incredibly valuable to understanding creativity, planning, and the Exchange District.
4. Exchange District Profile

The Exchange District has been extensively written about, providing a rich account of its history and current status. This section is a cursory look at the history of the Exchange District that focuses on some key details describing why this area is significant to Winnipeg. Following this is a contemporary account of the Exchange District, and a brief overview of the demographics of the area. Third, a discussion of Winnipeg’s creative economy will be provided. There is a wealth of economic data available for the creative and cultural sector of Winnipeg, which further legitimizes the rationale for this study.

4.1 History of the Exchange District

The Exchange District makes up approximately twenty city blocks, and was considered to be Winnipeg’s Downtown, until the development of the T. Eaton store on Portage Avenue (Parks Canada, 2001). The Exchange District derives its name from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and was the centre of the grain industry between 1881 and 1919 (“Heritage Winnipeg - Stories: All: The Exchange District,” n.d.). The City of Winnipeg became known as the “Chicago of the North” during this period, attracting many architects from Chicago, which influenced the architectural scene in Winnipeg (“Heritage Winnipeg - Stories: All: The Exchange District,” n.d.). The city was a hub of transportation, and found itself at the centre of shipping between east and west (Medeiros, 2005). This attracted business people and investors, spurring manufacturing and commercial retailers to come to the city and set-up shop in the Exchange District (Medeiros, 2005).

The decline of Winnipeg as a shipping and manufacturing hub began shortly after the end of World War I, which saw a drop in wheat prices, increased farming costs, and a reduced level of immigration, which contributed to a decline in commercial activity (Parks Canada, 2001). However, one of the most significant impacts upon Winnipeg’s power as a shipping centre was the opening of the Panama Canal (Parks Canada, 2001). This led to a sharp decline in the cost of shipping alternatives to rail, and other centres like
Vancouver, Montreal, and Toronto became more lucrative transportation hubs (Parks Canada, 2001). The Exchange District lost most of its tenants by the mid-1920s, and much of the retail moved to Portage Avenue (Parks Canada, 2001). Unlike other cities, Winnipeg could not afford to demolish the vacant warehouses, and they stood empty and derelict. This is why Winnipeg has “North America’s largest and best preserved collection of heritage buildings” from this era (“About the Exchange,” n.d.).

4.2 Development of Creativity and Culture in the Exchange District

Artspace is credited as being the starting point for much of the cultural rejuvenation in the district (“History,” n.d.; Thom Sparling, July 26, 2017). The arts community started making use of the abandoned warehouses in the 1960s and 1970s (“History,” n.d.) as it was an affordable place to set-up, live and work. A series of rejuvenation projects were started, including the museum, a new theatre, and civic buildings (Medeiros, 2005; Parks Canada, 2001). Artspace emerged as part of a “$90 million plan to revive Winnipeg’s downtown,” which resulted in a transfer of the Gault building to the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation (“History,” n.d.). The 55,000 square foot building was renovated, and leased to Artspace for one dollar a year for ninety-nine years (“History,” n.d.). The space has become a home to artists, studios, film, video, book publishing, management support services for artists and a fundraising program (“History,” n.d.).

Today, the Exchange District is a hub for entertainment, and creative and cultural industries, boasting over 500 restaurants, retailers, non-profits, service organizations, government offices, galleries, and dance studios (“Business Directory,” n.d.). The district is starting to garner a reputation around the world. Vogue published an article on the Canadian prairies, calling it a must-visit destination and prominently featured the Exchange District as the place to visit for indie restaurants, shops and bars (Schwartz, 2016). During the summer months, the weekends are filled with festivals like the TD Winnipeg International Jazz Festival (Jazz Fest), the Winnipeg Fringe Theatre Festival (Fringe Fest), the Soca Reggae Music Festival, and the Manitoba Electronic Music Exhibition Festival (MEME) (“Summer Festivals,” n.d.).
The district has changed substantially since the first artists took over warehouse space in the 1960s and 1970s, and will continue to change and grow with the City of Winnipeg.

4.3 Description of the Exchange District and Study Area

The Exchange District is often viewed as distinct from downtown. This may be why the Exchange District has its own business improvement zone that is separate from the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ. Identifying the boundaries of the Exchange District is difficult as there are several boundaries depending on how the Exchange District is defined. There is the Exchange District neighbourhood map (City of Winnipeg, 2016), which provides boundaries determined by the City; The Exchange District BIZ boundaries (City of Winnipeg, 2008), as determined by a Council approved By-law; and the Exchange District National Heritage Site boundaries (City of Winnipeg, 2012). For this thesis, the Exchange District BIZ boundaries (City of Winnipeg, 2008) will be respected as the site study area, as it includes the National Heritage Site, and several key arts and cultural institutions such as the Centennial Concert Hall, Manitoba Museum, and the Royal Manitoba Theatre Centre. See Appendix 07 for a map of the study area.

Main Street runs through the middle of the Exchange District, dividing it into the East and West Exchange District, which has at times resulted in one side being given more attention than the other. At the heart of the Exchange District is Old Market Square, which houses the Cube Stage, and is at the centre of most events that happen in the area. It is surrounded by pubs, restaurants, shops and a small movie theatre. Although there is often heavy traffic moving through the area during rush hour, particularly on Princess Street and Main Street, the area is considered walkable and pedestrian-friendly. There are no formal markings or entrances to the Exchange District, but it is quite distinct from the surrounding area due to its old buildings and street structure, and a person is quite aware that they are entering a unique area. Except for several towers located on the edge of the district at Portage and Main, most buildings are no higher than four or five stories, with a few going as high as seven or eight.
Despite the high volume of shops and amenities, and the walkable nature of the district, pedestrian life does become stagnant in the late afternoon and evenings, even on the weekends. I attribute this to the surrounding non-commercial businesses that often close around five o’clock. Special events and festivals often alter this trend, as they attract many people to Old Market Square with free shows. During some festivals, the streets are shut down on the weekends (and sometimes during the week) to allow for a completely pedestrian dominated district. The district almost feels like a different place during these events as there is substantially more life on the streets.

Map 1 City of Winnipeg 2017. Not to scale. (arcgis.com)
Map 2 City of Winnipeg Central Context 2017. Not to scale. (arcgis.com)

Map 3 Approximate Exchange District BIZ Boundaries 2017. (arcgis.com)
Map 4 Exchange District BIZ Boundaries Bylaw. (City of Winnipeg, 2008)
Map 5 Exchange District BIZ Boundaries Bylaw with Landmarks 2017. (City of Winnipeg, 2008)
4.4 Demographics and Economic Data

As of the 2016 Census, the population of Winnipeg is 705,244 people, an increase of 6.3% since 2011 (City of Winnipeg, 2017; Government of Canada, 2017b). It has a population density of 1,518.8 people per square kilometre (Government of Canada, 2017b). Data for 2016 from the Exchange District was not available at the time of writing, but data from 2006 – 2011 is provided below. It is likely that there may be some changes in information for 2016, but the data provided demonstrates trends that have been happening for approximately ten years, and I expect them to continue. I was informed by the City that the 2016 data for the Exchange District would not be prepared until sometime in 2018 (City of Winnipeg Neighbourhood Profiles, personal communication, 27 October, 2017). The Exchange District intersects multiple census tracts and dissemination areas, and it was not possible to create reliable information from this data that would be comparable to previous years.

4.4.1 Population. The table below includes population numbers from 1991 – 2011. There are several things to be noted about the data. It is likely that the data does not include people that were illegally occupying spaces, which many artists were, especially over a decade ago. As well, the data for the Exchange District only includes the Non-Institutional population, while the City of Winnipeg data includes Institutional and Non-Institutional population (City of Winnipeg, 2011a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exchange District Number</th>
<th>Exchange District % Change between periods</th>
<th>City of Winnipeg Number</th>
<th>City of Winnipeg % Change between periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>663,617</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>633,451</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>619,544</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>618,477</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 2011 Population Census Data (City of Winnipeg, 2011a)

7 Due to the removal of the mandatory long-form census in 2011, it should be noted that the integrity of information that year may not be as accurate as previous years. The 2011 Exchange District National Household Survey global non-response rate was 37% (City of Winnipeg, 2011a).
4.4.2 Education. The Exchange District is above the city rate of university education attainment across all three years. By 2011, there is almost a doubling of university education while there is a decline in trades level education. In 2006, people with a university bachelor’s degree were the highest at 39.1% of respondents, while the second highest was grade 9-12 without graduation certificate at 21.9%. In 2011, the number of university degree holders increased to 67.4%, while the level of people holding high school diploma or equivalent dropped to 15.7%. In 2006, most secondary education was in the fields of business, management and public administration (33.3%), social and behavioral sciences, and law (23.1%), and health, parks, recreation and fitness (17.9%) (City of Winnipeg, 2006). By 2011, health, parks, recreation and fitness was the highest (52.4%), business, management, and public administration remained approximately the same (33.3%) and social and behavioural sciences and law decreased just slightly (14.3%) (City of Winnipeg, 2011a). There is no data for 2001. The large shift to respondents with university level education is an indication of gentrification that is occurring in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Highest Level of Schooling</th>
<th>Exchange District Number</th>
<th>Exchange District % of Total</th>
<th>City of Winnipeg Number</th>
<th>City of Winnipeg % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Less than Grade 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>35,210</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9-12 without graduation certificate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>92,375</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9-12 with graduation certificate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>53,040</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades certificate or diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>50,290</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-university without certificate or diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>27,610</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-university with certificate or diploma</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>68,615</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University without degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>43,270</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University with bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>82,875</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Highest Level of Schooling</td>
<td>Exchange District Number</td>
<td>Exchange District % of Total</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg Number</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>No Certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>119,020</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school certificate or equivalent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>145,305</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>47,285</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>81,185</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>121,895</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>No certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>106,765</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>153,955</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44,705</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>86,025</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>122,445</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Exchange District Education levels  (City of Winnipeg, 2001, 2006, 2011a)

4.4.3 Employment and Income. Gauging the changes in the employment rate from 2001 to 2011 is quite difficult as the classification of the data available changes substantially between years, with some categories disappearing completely. As such, only a few key numbers from “Labour Force Activity” will be reviewed. In 2001 and 2006, women have a lower participation rate and lower employment rate than men, but in 2011 women emerged slightly higher in both categories (City of Winnipeg, 2001, 2006, 2011a).
--- | --- | --- | ---
Participation Rate | 73.8% | 65.0% | 83.1%
Employment Rate | 73.3% | 58.8% | 80.9%
Unemployment Rate | 5.7% | 7.7% | 0.0%


In terms of employment sectors, there are some significant changes that happen. In 2001, educational services is the largest sector (12.8%), followed by five sectors all listed at 8.5%: information and cultural services; arts entertainment and recreation; real estate and rental and leasing; professional, scientific and technical services, and wholesale trade (City of Winnipeg, 2001). In 2006, the health care and social assistance sector was the highest (16.3%), public administration was the second highest (14.3%), and information and cultural industries was the third highest (12.2%) (City of Winnipeg, 2006). Wholesale trade dropped to 6.1%, educational services to 4.1% while arts, entertainment and recreation, and real estate and rental and leasing both dropped to 0.0% (City of Winnipeg, 2006). By 2011, health care and social assistance increased to 26.9%, along with public administration (also, 26.9%) (City of Winnipeg, 2011a). Arts, entertainment and recreation, and information and cultural industries remained at 0.0% (City of Winnipeg, 2011a). The significant decrease in artist representation in the census data suggests that artists are either living in spaces that are not being included, or have moved out of the area.

In terms of employment sectors, there are some significant changes that happen. In 2001, educational services is the largest sector (12.8%), followed by five sectors all listed at 8.5%: information and cultural services; arts entertainment and recreation; real estate and rental and leasing; professional, scientific and technical services, and wholesale trade (City of Winnipeg, 2001). In 2006, the health care and social assistance sector was the highest (16.3%), public administration was the second highest (14.3%), and information and cultural industries was the third highest (12.2%) (City of Winnipeg, 2006). Wholesale trade dropped to 6.1%, educational services to 4.1% while arts, entertainment and recreation, and real estate and rental and leasing both dropped to 0.0% (City of Winnipeg, 2006). By 2011, health care and social assistance increased to 26.9%, along with public administration (also, 26.9%) (City of Winnipeg, 2011a). Arts, entertainment and recreation, and information and cultural industries remained at 0.0% (City of Winnipeg, 2011a). The significant decrease in artist representation in the census data suggests that artists are either living in spaces that are not being included, or have moved out of the area.

Income demonstrates some of the largest changes, and coincides with changes in sector employment. As more health professional entered the area, higher wages are reported in the census. Also,
by 2011 there is less of a gap between the average incomes of men and women, while in 2006 there is a noticeable difference between the median incomes of men and women. I have found no data explaining this shift.

**4.4.4 Dwellings.** As the Exchange District gained more attention throughout the 2000s, and various housing initiatives were pursued, there is a clear shift in the amount of dwelling types available, and in the dwelling tenure. I attribute this to the condo development along Waterfront Drive. There are some discrepancies between the total number of dwellings and the total number of dwelling tenures, which no explanation is given for in the data reports. It is possible that during the census some units were between ownership and unoccupied. Over these periods there is an increase in rents and in purchasing costs of housing in the Exchange District and in Winnipeg on average. Levels in each category are higher than the average cost of housing in Winnipeg.

![Table 9 Dwelling Costs Comparison](City of Winnipeg, 2001, 2006, 2011a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling</th>
<th>Exchange District</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Exchange District</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Exchange District</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155,020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>162,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, detached duplex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, building with five or more</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35,140</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>35,570</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>35,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, building with fewer than</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42,150</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46,020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Private Dwellings</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>252,815</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>261,090</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>268,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Number of Dwellings by Types and Dwelling Tenure (City of Winnipeg, 2001, 2006, 2011a)

4.5 Winnipeg Creative Industries Economic Data Overview

Medeiros (2005) did not have economic data describing creative and cultural industries in Winnipeg, a fact that he saw as a major detriment to the development of such industries and also hindered his research. Fortunately, this situation has changed since he published his thesis as many organizations are now conducting their own research, and there is now more information available from Economic Development of Winnipeg. Numbers for the Exchange District’s economic contributions are not available, but the data reviewed demonstrates the role, and importance, of creative industries in Winnipeg. Economic data from the Conference Board of Canada can be found in Appendix 11.

---

8 Total Winnipeg Dwellings includes dwellings that were not included in this list.
Winnipeg's gross domestic product (GDP) is approximately $36 billion at basic prices\(^9\) in 2007 dollars (Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., n.d.). Winnipeg has one of the most diverse economies in Canada, ranking forth in diversity in 2015, surpassing Calgary, Toronto and Halifax (Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., n.d.). In 2013, the creative industries sector contributed just over $1 billion in GDP making up 3.6% of Winnipeg's total GDP (Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., 2014). The sector employed 25,581 people, making up 6.1% of the city's work force (Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., 2014). Between 2008 and 2013 the creative industry sector had the largest employment increase at 18.5% (Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., 2014). There are more than 4,000 businesses in the creative sector, made up of approximately 700 visual and performing arts, 377 film and video production, 800 architectural, engineering, advertising and creative design firms and 300 in writing and publishing (“Creative Industries,” n.d.).

As discussed throughout the literature review, defining creative industries, and what to classify as being creative is a complex task that has resulted in many perspectives. Economic Development Winnipeg has used a definition similar to the DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2016; Economic Development Winnipeg, 2013), which is an acceptable definition to use. However, I would argue that it is likely that many elements of creativity may be getting missed. For example, the aerospace sector may employ engineers and designers whose jobs are creative in nature, or the information, communications and technology sector, whose work often intersects with creative pursuits. This should always be considered when discussing economic data pertaining to creative industries.

\(^9\) A full explanation of basic prices is available at StatsCan (“Latest Developments in the Canadian Economic Accounts,” n.d.). It essentially identifies the difference from factor cost. The difference is basic prices are inline with international standards, and includes areas such as property taxes which were previously excluded.
Creative Industries Sector Definition for Economic Development Winnipeg Inc.

Performing arts, visual arts and heritage institutions

Sound recording and music

Writing and published works

Film and video production

Television and radio broadcasting

Advertising, creative design and related services

Interactive digital media

Spectator Sports

Promoters/presenters of performing arts and similar events and related agents

Table 11 Economic Development Winnipeg’s Creative Industries List (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2013)
5. Data Analysis

5.1 Document Analysis

The document analysis is divided into two sections. The first addresses plans that have been formally approved by Winnipeg and the second reviews plans that were created but never approved. Each of the sections has a review of the plans and documents, and a discussion evaluating them.

5.1.1 Approved Plans. As part of understanding the context of Winnipeg as a case study, it is necessary to review, analyze and critique the planning documents that guide the city’s policies. This section reviews OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d), Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c), and the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004 (City of Winnipeg, 2004).

5.1.1.1 OurWinnipeg. OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) is the official plan for the City of Winnipeg, and was ratified in 2011. The plan was awarded the Canadian Institute of Planners’ Award for Planning Excellence in 2011 in the City and Regional Planning category (“Awards for Planning Excellence,” n.d.). According to the 2016-2017\(^\text{10}\) guidelines, plans are judged on seven categories: innovation and contribution to the profession; methodology; clarity of goals and objectives; implementation; overall presentation; public engagement; and, sustainability (Canadian Institute of Planners, n.d.). The aspects of the plan that earned the award are not detailed. The plan is a high-level visioning document: “[OurWinnipeg] guides and informs, but does not replace, more detailed planning on specific topics or for specific areas” (City of Winnipeg, 2011d). The detailed planning is found in four complementary direction strategies: Complete Communities Direction Strategy (City of Winnipeg, 2011c), Sustainable Transportation Direction Strategy (City of Winnipeg, 2011e), Sustainable Water and Waste (City of Winnipeg, 2011f), and A Sustainable Winnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011b).

\(^{10}\) The 2011 guidelines were not available.
Our Winnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) is divided into three main sections: “A City That Works,” which focuses on areas such as infrastructure, safety, and housing; “A Sustainable City,” which contains strategies for the city’s policies on the natural and built environment, as well as for social, economic, and environmental sustainability; and, “Quality of Life” which focuses on areas of healthy neighbourhoods, accessibility, and creativity (City of Winnipeg, 2011d). The plan functions by providing an overview and vision of a particular area (e.g. “Approach to City Building”), a series of directions related to that vision, and then strategies for how the direction will be achieved, which are typically conceptual in nature, rather than policy prescriptions (City of Winnipeg, 2011d).

The “Creativity” section is the most relevant to this research. Its inclusion indicates an interest from policymakers in recognizing the importance of creativity and culture to the people of Winnipeg, as well as to the economic prosperity of the city. I asked Kurtis Kowalke about what prompted the inclusion of this section, and he responded saying he would be more surprised if it was not in the plan, as culture is a part of Winnipeg’s DNA (personal communication, July 25, 2017). Culture and the arts are mostly featured throughout this section with one direction strategy directly related to creative industries. Most strategies are linked to building partnerships with existing organizations to enhance supports, and maintaining or increasing funding, while several others refer to the incorporation of public art, arts and culture education opportunities and accessibility. The plan does call for the development of a cultural action strategy for the City of Winnipeg to be formed in partnership with various stakeholders (City of Winnipeg, 2011d). It was created by the Winnipeg Arts Council, but never formally adopted, which will be discussed further on. Our Winnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) is the only document that contains strategies that directly relate to creativity. Since Our Winnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) is meant to be supported by actions and strategies in its complementary documents I expected to find at least some discussion relating to the vision put forward for creativity, but none of the supporting documents mention creativity, except
for some brief mentions of including public art. Although there is a high-level vision for creativity in the city, there are no actionable strategies supporting it at this time.

The Exchange District is discussed only briefly in *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) as part of the “A Sustainable City” section. Direction five says “enhance the viability of the Exchange District National Historic Site” (City of Winnipeg, 2011d, p. 70), and prescribes three strategies, which call for a vision for the Exchange District, and the development and implementation of the *Warehouse District Secondary Plan* (City of Winnipeg, 2012). The plan was developed, but never approved.

### 5.1.1.2 Complete Communities

*Complete Communities* (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) is one of four supporting documents for *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d), and functions as the “playbook guiding land use and development” (City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. n/a) for the City of Winnipeg. The document provides key directions for the different land-use areas of the city, which describes what the city hopes to achieve, a direction, or set of directions, that describe the objectives concerning the urban structure in detail, and enabling strategies for achieving these directions (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). The strategies are connected to tools to determine how they will be implemented: planning, incentives, capital budget/infrastructure, and leadership/partnership (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). The report does not give the details of how these tools will work, and says that “they will be further defined through the Complete Communities Toolbox and through future work plans” (City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. n/a). The *Complete Communities Checklist and Toolbox* (2014) appears to still be in the pilot stage of development according to the Council Minutes (City of Winnipeg Council, 2014). Transformative Areas (of which the Exchange District is a part) are not included in the checklist (City of Winnipeg, 2014). Appendix 04 includes details regarding *Complete Communities* (City of Winnipeg, 2011c).

*Complete Communities* (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) uses an urban structures land-use planning strategy. This is “a special articulation of city building objectives” (City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. 10) and
defines areas as they are envisioned to be, not as they currently are (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). Appendix 03 contains a map of Winnipeg’s urban structure land-use plan. An urban structure differentiates between areas of the city based on their period of growth and descriptive characteristics. This approach recognizes the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods and areas of the city, providing the basis for accommodating growth and change in a way that is sensitive to context (City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. 10).

Areas of the city are divided into hierarchal categories, which determines which policies take precedence over others in the event of conflict (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). The areas are:

- Airport Area, Aboriginal Economic Development Zones, Rural and Agricultural Areas
- Transformative Areas
- Major Redevelopment Sites
- Downtown
- New Communities
- Centres and Corridors
- Parks, Places and Open Spaces, Employment Areas
- Areas of Stability  

(City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. 10)

The Exchange District is within the Downtown area, and falls under the “Transformative Areas” section (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). Downtown is described as being the “entertainment, cultural and economic heart of our city and our window to the world” (City of Winnipeg, 2011c, p. 15) and “one of the best opportunities” for developing communities that are mixed-use and high(er)-density (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). The strategies for downtown are oriented to its unique character (i.e. preserve and use heritage buildings) and focus on high density development that is pedestrian friendly (City of Winnipeg, 2011c).
The overarching theme of the strategies in Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) is to make downtown more livable and to function as a hub for culture, sports and entertainment. Strategies include promotion and support of events, concerts and festivals, and other year-round programming; support for large and small-scale events; creating destination clusters; public and private investment in vacant parking lots; and improve safety, accessibility and comfort (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). There are several strategies pertaining to public art, including the inclusion of performing arts (e.g. music) in temporary and permanent installations, integrating art into streetscape, public works and renewal projects (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). Creativity does not show up in Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). The Exchange District is discussed only briefly, and calls for the same directions on developing a vision and secondary plan as seen in OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d, 2011c).

5.1.1.3 Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004. The Exchange District occupies all four downtown zoning categories: “Multiple Use-Sector,” “Downtown Living Sector,” “Riverbank Sector,” and “Character Sector,” which makes up the majority of the Exchange District (City of Winnipeg, 2004). Appendix 03 contains maps of the zoning sectors, and Appendix 05 contains the bulk regulations for each of the sectors. The Riverbank sector is the only zone that is heavily restrictive, as it is designed to preserve open and natural space in for public use, and thus limits uses and structures to those that complement or are accessory11 to park uses (e.g. community/recreation centre, plaza, or trail; accessory to park uses could be, but not limited to, restaurant, museum, or gallery uses) (City of Winnipeg, 2004).

The remaining sectors (“Multiple-Use,” “Downtown Living,” and “Character Sector”), are largely permissive, with the exception of heavy industry uses, which are prohibited (City of Winnipeg, 2004). The “Multiple-Use Sector” is “intended to encourage the range of uses, sites, activities, and buildings typical to a diverse and vibrant central business district” (City of Winnipeg, 2004, p. 37), and has few restrictions.

---

11 Accessory uses are considered to be in addition to a primary use; in this case, a restaurant may be permitted so long as the park is the primary use(City of Winnipeg, 2004).
requiring only some conditional approval from the city for certain uses on certain streets. There are no restrictions on building heights, and floor area ratios are the highest in this sector, likely to accommodate a variety of building types that are multi-use in nature (i.e. commercial and residential uses). The “Downtown Living Sector” encourages mixed-use development, but the “predominant use of buildings in this sector is expected to be residential” (City of Winnipeg, 2004, p. 58), and allows for a “built form that ranges from 2-storey century homes, to low-rise walk-up apartments, to high-rise condominiums” (City of Winnipeg, 2014, p. 58). To recognize the preference for residential use, most residential uses are permitted, except for single-room occupancies, bed and breakfasts, which are both conditional uses. Live work units are permitted, but conditional if not directly accessible from the sidewalk or if exceeding 3000 square feet of floor area. Most commercial uses are permitted or conditional, but almost all are conditional if not accessible from public sidewalk or exceed 3000 square feet of floor area.

The “Character Sector” is “intended to encourage a compatible, fine-grained mix of uses rather than a separation of uses in these diverse areas” (City of Winnipeg, 2004, p. 47), and specifically takes into the heritage nature of buildings in the Exchange District. While most uses are permitted, most require conditions depending on the surrounding streetscape. For example, Retail Sales and live-work units require conditional approval if “not directly accessible from public sidewalk or if exceeding 3000 square feet of floor area” (City of Winnipeg, 2004). Considering that the Exchange District is mostly made up of old warehouse buildings, any retail business or live-work unit on the upper floors would require conditional permission from the city to operate. The conditions attached to such an approval are at the discretion of the approving body. It is possible that requiring conditional approvals for these uses are viewed as a barrier to developing these spaces. However, by setting these uses as conditional, the city can ensure that these

---

12 Floor Area Ratio, or FAR, is the measurement that determines the amount of floor space a building can occupy compared to the size of the land parcel. For example, in the Multiple-Use Sector, the FAR is 15:1, so for every square foot of parcel land size, a building can occupy 15 feet; a 200 square foot lot could permit a 3000 square foot building.
spaces are safe for people, and fit for living in. Unfortunately, the extent to which zoning is viewed as an issue did not come up in my research.

5.1.1.4 Discussion of Approved Plans. OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) and its supporting documents are broad and vague in many areas, dominated by language such as “encourage,” “support,” or “should,” as opposed to “shall comply with,” or “conform to.” OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) may be a visioning document, which is understandably broad, however Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) is the direction document that should have policies and strategies that are more specific, but it is equally as vague. There are no measurable objectives, indicators, timelines, or responsibility for implementation assigned to institutions or departments. For example, there are no descriptions of density numbers, or what is considered high density or low density. It is common to see references to higher density or lower density in Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c), but there is no way of knowing what higher density actually means as there is no reference or definition made. A neighbourhood density level of 18 units/ha is higher than 12/ha, but is still considered to be low-density.13

The broad nature of OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) and its supporting documents is recognized by members of the planning department (Kurtis Kowalke, personal communication, July 25, 2017; Marsha Christiuk, personal communication, July 25, 2017). Kurtis Kowalke described the reasoning behind the broadness of the plans:

I think there was just a prevailing philosophy in 2008, 2009 when this document was created that flexibility and nimbleness were going to be priorities of this document. And I think one of the things that was a critique maybe of the previous version. You have these policy plates at the back of the document (Plan Winnipeg 2020), which was kind of a static description of Winnipeg. It told you where the neighbourhoods were, it told you where the agricultural areas were, where the

13 Density numbers from Leung’s Land Use Planning Made Plain (2003, p. 113).
industrial areas were, and that's the way it assumes all things shall be forevermore. And, if you suddenly say well actually we need a new residential area that means amending this document, which is, if secondary plans are two years and six committees, this is like three years and ten committees, including the provincial government is one of them. So, I think that left a bitter taste in people's mouths that any time the city wanted to do anything that deviated from basically what shows the status quo that involves getting approval from the provincial minister...

There is value in having a document that lays out your principles and your vision and your priorities, without getting down into the nuts and bolts of it. Which is kind of what this document should be. Especially because, as you're probably aware, this document is kind of the parent document of a suite of plans... all the more reason why this one can be sort of your high-level vision. (personal communication, July 25, 2017)

The drawbacks of this approach are recognized, and may be addressed during the review of OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) that is currently underway.

What we can do better, and what we should do better, is that when you have those companion documents... I think that's the opportunity then to put a little more depth into it and be a little more certain about what you're looking for. Plans should set out your vision and your ideals and aspirations, but technically plans are a regulatory tool as well and should kind of spell out to give us some predictability and some certainty what it is the city supports and doesn't support (Kurtis Kowalke, personal communication, July 25, 2017).

Being able to adapt is a desirable trait of plans, and getting bogged down in red-tape and approval committees is a considerable barrier to being adaptive. The consequence is a plan that goes too far to be flexible, and becomes too ambiguous to accomplish the objectives it intended to. The policy effectively becomes meaningless. I believe that it is because of this vagueness that City Council failed to adopt The
5.1.2 Non-Approved Plans. OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) required the development of a secondary plan for the Exchange District, The Warehouse District Plan (City of Winnipeg, 2012), and a culture action plan, Ticket to the Future (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). Each of these were developed, but never approved by the Winnipeg City Council. Regardless, it is worth reviewing each of these documents, as they provide understanding of the Exchange District and the cultural and creative aspirations of Winnipeg, and demonstrate the potential for the areas each of these documents addressed.

5.1.2.1 The Warehouse District Plan. The Warehouse District Plan (City of Winnipeg, 2012) is a secondary plan that includes five smaller districts, including the Exchange District National Heritage Site. The plan establishes from the beginning that it focuses on heritage, culture, and walkability as the zoning by-law already addressed issues pertaining to land-use (City of Winnipeg, 2012). The need for the plan is attributed to how the area is changing, specifically in regards to the conflict between artists and developers, the need to protect the integrity of heritage, and opportunities from the new Red River College Campus, which has brought new demographics to the area (i.e. students) (City of Winnipeg, 2012). The plan uses principles used by Ontario for a Heritage Preservation District, but also recognizes the need for cultural planning to acknowledge the history, heritage and identity of the area.

“Cultural Identity” is given its own section in the plan, an important recognition of the nature of the Warehouse District (City of Winnipeg, 2012). It recognizes the challenges to artists that new development has brought, as well as the distinct culture and identity that exists from the stores, shops, and the people that live and work there (City of Winnipeg, 2012). The section identifies four issues and sets our ten policies to address these issues (City of Winnipeg, 2012). The issues pertained to rising rents, the impact of increasing residential on the cultural identity of the district, lack of commitment to the arts, and the need
for increasing the evening economy and street life (City of Winnipeg, 2012). Policies were aimed at improving a mix of activities in the area (cultural, artistic and commercial), and supporting affordable spaces, but lacked measurable objectives and actions as seen throughout the rest of the plan (City of Winnipeg, 2012).

In many areas of the plan, policies provide very specific goals and actions to be taken on various issues. This is a stark contrast to OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) and Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c). For example, a policy for multi-family housing provides percentages of different types that should be required (e.g. 10% affordable housing) and sets out an action requirement to work with the Province to develop housing targets for the Warehouse District (City of Winnipeg, 2012). In another section, details are provided for bonusing requirements, which would allow an extra storey to be added if a developer were to meet certain requirements, such as eliminating a surface parking lot (City of Winnipeg, 2012).

Despite the strong framework that it set out, the plan was never approved. Marsha Christiuk, who developed the plan, said that people weren’t interested in it (personal communication, July 25, 2017). Kurtis Kowalke suggested that the secondary plan encountered several challenges:

It seemed, there was maybe just some challenges in terms of, and again I’m going off very vague memory, just in terms of getting kind of unanimous buy-in, not so much even from the grassroots stakeholders, more from the civic entity stakeholders. And, I think as more and more time passed, trying to get over that hurdle, change had been happening in that neighbourhood, there had been lots of new development, new uses in there, even a regulatory framework outside of that plan has evolved. So, one thing I have heard... before too long it would have been relatively out of date to try and push it forward (personal communication, July 25, 2017).
Despite the delay in process and disinterest that eventually led to the plan’s demise, some aspects were incorporated into the zoning by-laws through amendments (Marsha Christiuk, personal communication, July 25, 2017). However, many of the strongest policies, such as bonusing or social housing requirements have been lost. The plan offered a vision for the Warehouse District that at least appeared to have the support of community stakeholders, and offered a direction for the Exchange District and surrounding area that could have potentially channelled growth and development in a sustainable way. There are currently no plans to attempt the creation of another secondary plan, and I do not believe that there is support from either the planning department or major community stakeholders to support the process. Winnipeg City Council’s failure to implement the former plan has dampened people’s spirits in this regard.

5.1.2.2 Ticket to the Future. Ticket to the Future (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011) was developed by the Winnipeg Arts Council as “the action plan for protecting our city’s extensive investment in arts and culture and for capitalizing on our extraordinary cultural assets for the next ten years” (p. 6). Two strong features of the plan stand out: its detailed inclusion of OurWinnipeg’s (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) directions and strategies (given three pages in the plan), and the research into the economic impact of Winnipeg’s creative industries (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). The inclusion of these two elements gives credibility to the plan, as well as justification for its purpose; it would be hard to dismiss a plan on culture that demonstrates the important economic role of culture, and how it helps Winnipeg meet the goals of its official plan.

The plan targets five areas: “Stewardship,” “Placemaking and Public Art,” “Creative Communities,” “Creative Industries,” “Creative Spaces,” and “Funding for Sustainability” (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). Each area has a set of goals, which are accompanied with actions, responsibility/partners, and a timeframe for implementation (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). The sections pertaining to creativity focus on partnership building, community capacity for engaging with the arts, and funding for industries
and projects (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). Many of the goals and actions laid out do not have measurable aspects or indicators associated with them, and are more akin to developing a foundation that future plans and strategies can continue to build on. This makes sense considering this is the first cultural strategy for the city.

The WAC took the requirement of OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) to have a cultural plan created seriously, and put considerable resources into the development of Ticket to the Future, which included an extensive engagement process (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). City Council was not interested, as Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) describes:

One of the five directions from the City is to act as cultural advisor to the City of Winnipeg. So, again, naive as we are, we take these things seriously, and we had funds out of the 2010 capital, so we decided to do a cultural action plan because this was all coming out of OurWinnipeg, and, you know, it was absolutely timely. So, we did that and we talked to everybody, we talked to absolutely everybody in putting that together and then when it was completed, talk about walking the halls of power. I met with every councillor, with the mayor at the time, with you name it, and all the senior officials of the city. ‘Yea, it’s really interesting, really good ideas in here,’ but they never adopted it. They never acknowledged it in any way. So, it’s out there, and the reason it was referenced in the task force is because it is the only thing that is comprehensive, or was comprehensive in 2011. You know, things change a lot, and even some of the ideas we thought were really critical then, really haven’t sort of stood the test of time.

Although the WAC has incorporated the objectives of the plans into their own operations, it has not appeared to be used elsewhere, except when politicians want to quote it for their own reports (Carol Phillips, personal communication, August 1, 2017). The plan was included in full as an appendix item in the recently published Mayor’s Task Force on Heritage, Culture, and Arts (InterGroup Consultants & City of
Winnipeg, 2017). This new report could be an indication of renewed interest in a cultural plan for Winnipeg, however, there is little interest from stakeholders in repeating this process all over again if it is just going to be ignored.

5.1.3 Document Analysis Conclusion. *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) sets out a vision for the future that covers many areas, and provides direction for future development of the city and where its priorities will be. It functions well as a visioning document that allows for a high degree of flexibility and adaptation, but it is undermined by the ambiguity of the supporting documents intended to act as direction strategies. Without measurable objectives and timelines, it is impossible to gauge the success of the plan. I believe that these shortcomings are partially responsible for Winnipeg’s City Council failure to approve the *Warehouse District Plan* (City of Winnipeg, 2012), and *Ticket to the Future* (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011).

5.2 Reviewing the Medeiros Thesis

As previously discussed, Medeiros (2005) used a strength, weakness, opportunity, threat assessment (SWOT) of Landry’s (2008) “Cycle of Urban Creativity.” To review his analysis, I have conducted my own SWOT of the cycle of creativity. For each stage, I discuss Medeiros’ (2005) original findings and analysis, and any new developments that have emerged. Medeiros’ (2005) described the challenge in using the cycle due to a lack of policy in place at the time. *OurWinnipeg*’s (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) “Creativity” section provides an opportunity for a level of analysis that Medeiros did not have. However, as discussed previously, the directions and strategies in *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) are broad and ambiguous, making it difficult to draw connections between the intent of these strategies and outcomes that are seen. For example, there are strategies calling for excellence in cultural activities, support for cultural facilities and the creation of equitable opportunities for everyone to participate in arts and culture. Yet, there is no means of measurement, or indication of how this will be accomplished. While there is more to examine in 2017 than there was in 2005, I am not confident that the directions and strategies available
for analysis in *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) have improved my ability to analyze and understand what is happening in the Exchange District. Furthermore, none of the directions and strategies discuss the Exchange District directly, making it difficult to determine if what is happening in the Exchange District is connected to *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d). Rather than attempting to analyze the intent of the directions and strategies of *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d), and connect them to outcomes, I have instead elected to categorize them according to Landry’s (2008) “cycle of creative urban creativity,” and can be found in Appendix 06. This provides a level of understanding of how *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) fits into the cycle and allows for an assessment of areas of strengths and weaknesses. Attempting a deeper analysis that connects policies and outcomes to the cycle would require more resources than I have, and should be considered as an area to be considered for future research.

### 5.2.1 Stage One: Enhancing Ideas-Generating Capacity.

**5.2.1.1 Strengths.** Many of the strengths cited by Medeiros (2005) remain: existing events, organizations dedicated to fostering new ideas and projects, and Red River College (RRC). Red River College recently expanded its Exchange District Campus with the Paterson GlobalFoods Institute, which repurposed the Union Bank Tower and houses culinary, hospitality and baking programs, student residence, and Jane’s, an upscale restaurant run by the students (“About the Paterson GlobalFoods Institute,” n.d.; “Jane’s Restaurant,” n.d.). The college recently announced a third expansion, called the Innovation Centre, adjacent to the campus in the Exchange District, which will reuse an existing warehouse and construct a new facility (CBC News, 2017). The new centre will offer opportunities for business start-ups to partner with students, who will be given assignments to work with the businesses (CBC News, 2017). This new development will serve the first four stages of the cycle of creativity. Connecting innovation centres to education hubs like RRC allow for innovators and entrepreneurs to tap into each other’s ideas and resources, creating the kinds of synergies that Landry (2008) advocates for (stages one and two). By clustering these entrepreneurs together in a centre, the ability to network and share ideas becomes easier.
as the boundaries of distance are eliminated (stage three). By creating a physical space to work in, entrepreneurs and students can avoid the additional costs of expensive spaces for their endeavours (stage four).

CentreVenture Development Corporation’s (CentreVenture) housing competition is no longer in existence, but their website indicates that they are still offering housing programs, although it does not describe the specifics of what those programs are (“Housing Incentives,” n.d.). CentreVenture has expanded the programs it offers with the Push Program and the Face Forward program (“Face Forward,” n.d.; “PUSH Retail Support,” n.d.), which offer more support for stage two and stage three of the cycle, and will be discussed later. Overall, the existing strengths noted by Medeiros (2005) remain intact, and have become entrenched in the Exchange District, and the city.

5.2.1.2 Weaknesses. Medeiros (2005) identified a lack of communication and cross industry collaboration as a significant weakness in this area. Unfortunately, it is hard to establish the extent to which this has changed over time, and there is only some indication that collaboration has improved between industries (see below). Some analogies relating to communication between organizations did emerge through the interview process. Brian Timmerman (personal communication, July 31, 2017) noted that one department would do work on a street, only for it to be undone sometime after when roadwork was being done, or hydro lines needed work, and the whole street would be dug up again. There is some indication that collaboration is improving in some areas, but not to the level of it being considered a strength, as noted by Tricia Wasney (personal communication, August 1, 2017) in regards to the inclusion of the Winnipeg Arts Council and public art development projects in the city:

In terms of planning, we’re still not there yet, but we are a lot, much, much, much, much, further along in becoming more of an integral part of the city’s planning processes than we were three, or five years ago.
How things were five years ago was not elaborated on, but through the interview process I have been led to believe that city organizations are much more willing to pick-up the phone and contact each other and community organizations such as the WAC. Tricia Wasney and Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) did describe the successful inclusion of the WAC in the recent redevelopment of Lily Street, which included public works, PP&D, as well as local planning firm HTFC. The success of Lily Street was a topic that came up in a number of interviews, often as a casual remark of “did you see the new Lily Street?” I did visit the area of the Lily Street redevelopment, and the public art and streetscaping did look impressive. Scott Suderman (personal communication, August 10, 2017) described how residents and landowners in the area took ownership of the renewed streetscape by planting their own plants in the planters made available, or set-up chairs in the alleyway. This is a testament to the power of placemaking endeavours, and the success that comes from well planned, well communicated projects.

Despite the success of Lily Street, the interviews have led me to believe that communication is still not at a level that it could be. Organizations in the Exchange District appear to work independently from each other, without a common goal or purpose. The result is everyone working on their own version of how they think things should be, leading to an underutilization of the resources available, such as CentreVenture’s capital funding (see below). Thom Sparling is aware of this, and has been a strong advocate for a creative cluster strategy in the Exchange District to bring everyone’s resources together to work towards a common goal. If the communication can be improved between organizations in the Exchange District, and between municipal organizations, then resources can be better pooled together in pursuit of common goals. Otherwise, the Exchange District will be left with piecemeal approaches to development and innovation, which will likely not produce the same level of success.

An additional issue that has emerged through my research is the issue of sprawl in the city of Winnipeg, and its effects on the development of creativity and cultural endeavours in the Exchange District. Stephen Carrol described how the spread-out nature of the city has had a negative impact on the music
industry, particularly in terms of industry and audience development in participation; having to drive downtown is far and time consuming, and parking is a challenge (personal communication, August 2, 2017). Thom Sparling echoed this sentiment, noting that most new businesses and offices were being developed in the suburbs of the city (personal communication, July 26, 2017). This dispersal of businesses and commercial endeavours jeopardizes the ability for different industries to meet and collaborate, and becomes a barrier to seeing what else is happening in Winnipeg’s creative sector. This can be considered both a weakness and a threat. While having over concentration of cultural activity in one area is also considered a negative (see Markusen, 2006), there also needs to be some level of proximity to foster collaboration, and the “rubbing of shoulders” of industries, both formally (conferences), and informally (chance meetings, demonstrations).

5.2.1.3 Opportunity. Increased funding was noted as a major opportunity for the Exchange District, but this increase has not been sustained. Per capita funding for the WAC from the city declined by approximately 10% between 2008 and 2014 decreasing from $6.06 per person to $5.65 (Prairie Research Associates, 2014, pp. 2–3). A document released by Manitobans for the Arts titled “Investment in the Cultural Sector: Investment in Growth and Innovation” (2017), places the city’s per-capita cultural investment at seven dollars, the lowest in Canada, and almost half of the second lowest on the list, Windsor, ON. Meanwhile, provincial economic-development agencies and other support organizations have experienced major budget cuts, with one person going so far as to call it a “blood bath” (Cash, 2017). These cuts are likely to have negative consequences for the Exchange District, and creative industries across the province.

As for opportunities that presently exist, the Province of Manitoba is currently undergoing a review of its culture policies, and has just concluded a round of engagement that allowed people to submit their ideas for the new policies. This new policy development could allow for investment in a variety of areas, and spurn new ideas in the Exchange District. While funding has notably decreased since 2005, the
supports that do exist should be recognized, and do help foster new ideas and provide much needed assistance for new projects and entrepreneurs. The lack of funding, and costs associated with venues in the Exchange District, do provide an alternative for collaboration and partnerships to be created in the form of space sharing and cost sharing, which is what spurned the creation of Artspace in the late 1980s ("History,” n.d.), and could potentially be repeated.

5.2.1.4 Threats. The extent to which Winnipeggers’ still have a negative attitude towards the city, as described by Medeiros (2005) is hard to assess, and for this reason no claim will be made one way or the other. The threat of being isolated from other major centres is a reality that will always exist for Winnipeg, and is a threat that it will have to work hard and creatively to overcome. Creative Manitoba recognizes this challenge, and is working to develop strategies and policies for addressing this (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 25, 2017), which will be discussed with stage three of the cycle. Relating to this issue of isolation, Mike Falk discussed the need to bring in outside talent to the city, that the continued focus of everything local at the expense of quality can do more harm than good and limits exposure to new ideas, skills and styles (personal communication, August 1, 2017).

New threats have emerged since 2005. As previously discussed, the decreases in funding has hindered progress, though the Exchange District has had many successes despite this. The effects of the current austerity measures implemented by the Progressive Conservative Government are yet to be seen, but will likely have a negative outcome. The lack of economic strategy coming from the current provincial administration (Cash, 2017) should also be seen as a threat, as consistency and certainty about the future are required for the success of any industry. The largest threat, which can be applied to all levels of the cycle, is gentrification. The details of this gentrification are discussed in the analysis of stage four as it mostly relates to the affordability of space, but artists and some businesses are starting to leave the area because they are being priced out:
Compared to many cities, artists can live here pretty well. They can have a studio and an apartment or house, because it’s still relatively modestly priced. But, there’s been a lot of development in the Exchange in terms of condo redevelopment of old buildings into condos, building of brand new condos, and artists are definitely getting pushed out now. That old thing of this is the area that is known for the arts, and everybody likes to tout it, and tourism likes to tout it, when in reality, no artist can really afford any of these condos... so it’s not a place where artists can really live unless they just hunker down in their studios and live there, which still happens.

(Tricia Wasney, personal communication, August 1, 2017)

Stephen Carrol (personal communication, August 2, 2017) also described the departure of artists saying “especially in the Exchange, I know a lot of musicians have been forced out of this area.” Census data supports the claim that few, if any, artists still live in the Exchange District, though many do work there. Without artists and creatives in the area, there is no capacity to develop ideas. While it is possible that other creative industries and individuals will take their place, the risk is that the Exchange District could become a district known for the arts, but has no artists or creatives living or working there.

5.2.2 Stage Two: Turning Ideas into Practice.

5.2.2.1 Strengths. As previously noted, the availability of financing and supports from a variety of organizations has been a major strength in the Exchange District (Medeiros, 2005), but funding has been decreasing over time (Prairie Research Associates, 2014). Medeiros (2005) described the cooperation between the three levels of government as a major strength, but this too seems to be waning. Uncertainty over the new provincial government’s plans for arts and culture, and the economy, combined with budget cuts has caused substantial mistrust of the government’s plans and policies for the future (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017; Carol Phillips, personal communication, August 1, 2017). This distrust also extends to what is perceived as a dysfunctional city council and city bureaucracy (Thom...
Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017; Carol Phillips, personal communication, August 1, 2017). Reports on potential tighter provincial oversight and requirements over municipal budgets, although denied by the Province, indicate a strained relationship between the two levels of government (Santin, 2017; Santin & Kush, 2017). Also, recent riffs between the federal and provincial governments over healthcare funding and refugee claimants (Dacey & Glowacki, 2017; Kavanagh & Annable, 2017) indicate a lack of cooperation between the two governments, and could be an indication that future cooperation on projects should not be expected.

There are several new strengths in this area. Existing events such as JazzFest provide many artists a first-time opportunity to perform (Stephen Carroll, personal communication, August 2, 2017), and typically have a guaranteed audience at the public stage (Mike Falk, personal communication, August 1, 2017). Recent policy changes that require the inclusion of public art in public works projects and infrastructure, and the Mayor’s insistence that the policy be formalized, demonstrates an improvement in support for the arts (Tricia Wasney, August 1, 2017).

5.2.2.2 Weaknesses. Medeiros (2005) saw too many organizations providing funding and support as a potential weakness, particularly if the political regimes changed and the funding dried up. The number of organizations has not decreased, and the risk of mandate creep and duplication of services is certainly a reality, and undoubtedly can lead to some tensions between organizations. Additionally, Medeiros (2005) expressed concern that each organization had its own vision, and the lack of a central strategy hindered consistency and coordination for the delivery of services, an issue that remains. However, the high number of support organizations could also be identified as a positive, as the high number of organizations allows for greater access to a variety of different funding sources that can then be passed on to various projects in the city. Many of these organizations are sector councils, a program initiated to “improve the quality of the Manitoba labour force” through resource development and training (“Sector Councils and Industry Associations,” n.d.). The individual councils may overlap in some areas as a project may exist in multiple
areas. For example, a video game developer is likely part of the new media sector council, but also develops and uses music and employs actors in its products. Because of this, they may be eligible for some supports from other sector councils. Being overly rigid in the mandates of sector councils does not serve the interests of a cash strapped creative sector, and only adds unnecessary bureaucratic barriers to people obtaining the support they need.

The issue of no central location for resources and information has been somewhat addressed by the Exchange District Business Improvement Zone (Exchange District BIZ), which provides entrepreneurs with information on who to contact for different resources, and can provide information on current trends and available locations in the Exchange District (Brian Timmerman, personal communication, July 31st, 2017). The Office of Film and Cultural Affairs has turned into Film and Special Events, which offers an online portal for information on city services for arts and culture, including permits for special events, as well as “facilitate” for policy and planning to have a positive impact on cultural initiatives. Medeiros’ (2005) analysis that the office mostly provides referrals and was less focused on advocacy appears to be accurate, as not one of the interview participants or any other research has cited this office as a source of cultural policy or support.14

5.2.2.3 Opportunities. Interest in the Exchange District as a cultural and creative hub remains, as does interest in redevelopment of the Downtown. The Winnipeg Partnership Agreement is no longer active, but it supported 245 projects with a total of $75 million investment over its six year term (City of Winnipeg, 2010). As for current opportunities, the largest in the Exchange District is CentreVenture’s Marketlands redevelopment, which could be a major chance to remove “an impediment to the flow of the Exchange District” (Tom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) disagrees that CentreVenture’s redevelopment will help the Exchange:

14 Several attempts were made to contact this office, but efforts to arrange a meeting never succeeded.
I think that what they’ll do is knock the damn thing down and wait for some developer to do whatever they might do instead of taking that space and adapting it and reusing it and making an investment. Not only the retention of an important architectural statement but one that really could be rehabbed into something really interesting and useful and for, you know, people to live, work, play, artists to do what they do, all of that could happen in there.

These comments reflect a legacy of mistrust in the City, and of organizations such as CentreVenture. Angela Mathieson, the new CEO for CentreVenture, says she is 100% committed to the creative community in the Exchange District, and believes that it should be anchored there (personal communication, September 8, 2017). She could not comment on the future of the Marketlands site, but said that if a viable proposal was made for creative and artistic pursuits at the site, it would be considered (Angela Mathieson, personal communication, September 8, 2017).

5.2.2.4 Threats. The slow growth nature of Winnipeg’s economy identified by Medeiros (2005) may always be considered a threat at some level, but for now the outlook is hesitantly positive, as noted by Kurtis Kowalke (personal communication, July 25, 2017):

I think it will continue to be a slow-growth situation. I’m a little nervous and kind of watching carefully the pace and the interest in development. Sometimes it just follows the cycles of our incentive programs, but, looking back like a year ago, there was something like a dozen projects under construction in the downtown, which was mind blowing. Because in my lifetime, I don’t think you’ve seen that level of development all at once, and that’s pretty positive. There’s always the risk in a midsized city of saturating certain markets if you move too quickly all at once, and by the same token I think it’s important... to continue momentum and right now we don’t see nearly as many projects under construction... There’s a lot of potential ones waiting in the wings, it’s always a guessing game as to what percentage of those will actually advance to construction,
right? It’s never one hundred percent. There was a time when it seemed like fifty percent was optimistic, more lately it seems like seventy-five to eighty percent were kind of moving forward. There’s always lots of development ideas which is exciting and good, that there’s always, especially in the last number of years, a positive outlook [and] enthusiastic ideas.”

Winnipeg has been experiencing a small economic boom over the past few years, however, forecasts from the Conference Board of Canada (Arcand, Bougas, Diaz, McIntyre, & Wiebe, 2017) and the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2017) suggest that this will be slowing down over the coming years. Housing starts are expected to peak in 2017 at 5,341 after a significant increase from 2016 of close to 50% (Arcand et al., 2017; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2017). The sudden increase in 2017 is attributed to the introduction of impact fees on new construction (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2017). In 2018 a sharp decline in housing starts is expected in response to the increase in rising inventories, returning levels to what was seen in 2016, which will be sustained for the next several years (Arcand et al., 2017; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2017). Activity in the non-residential sector is expected to remain at a healthy level for the next two years as large-scale projects such as Sky City Centre, the St. Regis hotel site redevelopment and the Red River College Innovation Centre (Arcand et al., 2017). How the slowdown for the city and province will affect the Exchange District is uncertain, but I suspect it could mean a reduction in demand for both office and housing space, at least at the current prices. Appendix 11 contains details and forecasts for Winnipeg and Manitoba from the Conference Board of Canada and CMHC.

Medeiros (2005) discussed concerns over what could happen in the event of sudden economic downturns, which became a reality with the 2008 Financial Crisis. This is out of the scope of this project.

---

15 Defined by the Conference Board of Canada (Arcand, Bougas, Diaz, McIntyre, & Wiebe, 2017) as the sum of multiple (apartment, condominium, duplex, and triplex) and single housing construction starts.
but future research into how creative economies in the Exchange District (or Winnipeg more broadly) faired
with regards to effects on funding after the 2008 recession would provide insight into what happened.

Lastly, Medeiros (2005) saw a conflict between CentreVenture’s responsibility and oversight of
heritage preservation, and its mandate to encourage development in the downtown. Angela Mathieson,
CEO of CentreVenture, informed me that this is not the case, and that all funds for heritage preservation
are dedicated to that endeavour (personal communication, September 8, 2017). Marsha Christiuk
suggested that dedicating the funds available to a single project each year may have the added benefit of
taking on larger projects, but, would ultimately be considered unfair to everyone else that needed access
to the funds for smaller projects (personal communication, July 25, 2017).

Several other threats that could become a serious issue in the immediate to near future are the
increased competition from other areas in Winnipeg, and the lack of commercial (i.e. offices) interests in
the area. Whether or not these actually turn out to be legitimate threats will be hard to see, but so long as
there are cheaper spaces in the suburban regions of the city, or in new developments downtown, the
Exchange District will be challenged to attract new talent.

5.2.3 Stage Three: Networking and Circulation.

5.2.3.1 Strengths. Medeiros identified two major strengths in this area: the number of events like
the FringeFest that are hosted every year by various organizations, and the reputation of the Exchange
District as a centre for cultural and artistic activity. Both aspects are still strong in the Exchange District,
with many festivals,\(^{16}\) events, and pop-up events and performances occurring; people know what to expect
when they come to the Exchange District (Mike Falk, personal communication, August 1, 2017; Bob Somers,

\(^{16}\) There are over 200 festival days in the province of Manitoba each year (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2013).
There is no data for how many festival days are actually in the Exchange District.
The strengths of collaboration are best illustrated from some anecdotal examples from a local sandwich shop.

King + Bannatyne collaborated with Bronuts, the doughnut shop next door, for an entry into Le Burger Week, a competition for the best burger in the city; their entry was a burger that replaces the buns with doughnuts, and had a variety of fillings (“King + Bannatyne,” n.d.). As part of their marketing for the competition, they used social media apps to have people submit their photos of the burger and offered prizes for the best picture. Earlier in the summer, the restaurant partnered with another local restaurant for a one day collaborative pop-up that combined their unique flavours (“King + Bannatyne,” n.d.). These are just a few examples of collaboration that is happening in Winnipeg’s creative industries. Partnerships like this help promote the fun and exciting parts of creativity, provide inspiration for other projects, and build the capacity for future collaborative projects.

I would add to this the newly designed Old Market Square, and the improved/improving public realm in the area. These create opportunities for people to interact with one another, and for chance encounters to take place, which can often turn into business connections, or future collaborations. The Cube stage is often used as a promotion centre, and also as a central meeting ground for people. As an example, during my site visits I ran into someone I knew every time, including several people that expressed an interest in helping with my research in some capacity, often with suggestions on places or people to contact.

5.2.3.2 Weaknesses. The lack of data on creative industries in Winnipeg was cited as a significant weakness by Medeiros (2005). This is where the most progress has been made, as most local organizations seem to be attempting to quantify creativity and the arts in some capacity. Manitobans for the Arts, Creative Manitoba, Manitoba Music, and the Winnipeg Arts Council have all published data on the arts.

17 Even though I am vegetarian, I decided to try the burger for research purposes. It was surprisingly delicious.
The WAC’s *Encore* (2014) provides an overview of economic information, along with other qualitative data, that demonstrates the success of cultural and creative industries in the city (Prairie Research Associates, 2014). Economic Development Winnipeg has also put effort into profiling the creative industries sector, and ensuring it is included in its performance indicator reports (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2013, 2016; Economic Development Winnipeg Inc., n.d.).

A new issue that I have identified, and specifically relates to Landry’s (2008) call for the need of managers and marketers, is the lack of diversity within industries. Using the music industry as an example, Thom Sparling (personal communication, July 26, 2017) refers to the need for taste makers:

> We realize that we are not New York, we are not Toronto. Within the creative sector, you need the taste makers, you need the gatekeepers, almost as it were, the curators, and to a large extent the international entertainment industry and creative industry folks are not here.

Thom discusses the need for conduits into where these taste makers are, and to do that excellence in these fields must be exported, excellence that the Winnipeg market does not currently sustain on its own (personal communication, July 26, 2017). Complicating the issue is the need for relationships to form between artists and creatives, and the people with the resources and power to propel them forward:

> Unless you are in a band who almost relocates on a regular basis to Toronto, you don’t get to develop the personal relationships with the A and R guys at the record companies. And this is a little bit out dated but the point is still there. So, what happens is that when it comes down to making a creative decision and who you are going to invest your company’s money in, the music has to be amazing, the live performance has to be great, there has to be a kind of level of trust with the musicians that when you start investing in them they’re not going to turn and run or they’re not going to turn into some diva or whatever, right? So, you need to develop a certain relationship with the artist and it’s easier to work with your friends and the people that you know, and you kind
of come down to it and go okay well there's this amazing band from Winnipeg, but I don't really know them and there's this other band that's maybe not quite as amazing, but they're still pretty amazing, and I happen to know them quite well and I've gotten to know them over the last couple of years and their live show is awesome. I'm going to sign them because they are a known entity, as opposed to taking the risk on this unknown entity.

It is important for industries to develop relationships with the creatives, the entrepreneurs, and the artists, so that trust can form, but also so that the vitality of the industries can be recognized. Thom identifies this issue in various other industries, such as audiobooks. Only recently have they brought together the local authors, local voice actors and local recording studios to discuss producing audio books, a format that is starting to expand (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). The challenge is that the companies that control the audio book market are not in Winnipeg, which means that the relationships needed to move this industry forward are not formed (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017).

5.3.3.3 Opportunities: Medeiros (2005) saw the hype surrounding the Exchange District as an opportunity to profile the community for the purpose of enhancing its branding. No “brand” has emerged for the Exchange District, possibly because of resistance to the Exchange District as being one specific thing. Bob Somers (personal communication, July 12, 2017) explains:

I don’t think as a creative sector or a creative cluster that we should necessarily protect it. I think that the creativity of occupying those spaces comes from the people who are doing it, and if you told them ‘ya, this is where the creativity happens’ they’re going to abandon it. I feel like there’s a fear of trying to formalize that component a little bit. It’s more about the bricks and mortar than it is curating what happens on the stage... the moment you start prescribing those things to the creative sector, I think you start to lose them.
This sentiment was also reflected by Tricia Wasney and Carol Phillips, (personal communication, August 1, 2017) who each had their concerns about limiting the Exchange District to one type of thing, especially when so much goes on there. Counter to this sentiment was Thom Sparling’s work, which takes the position that if he doesn’t do something, like the creation of a creative cluster strategy for the Exchange District, then everyone will keep going their own directions, and the district will lose what makes it unique, what makes it the Exchange District (personal communication, July 26, 2017).

Although no brand has emerged for the Exchange District, organizations like Economic Development Winnipeg, the Exchange District BIZ, CentreVenture, and Creative Manitoba are developing strategies and programs for encouraging more industries to locate to Winnipeg, and the Exchange District. In recognition of the weaknesses stated above, Creative Manitoba is moving forward on strategies to encourage connections to the world outside of Winnipeg:

So, one of the thoughts was that, how do you bring the industry to Winnipeg on a regular basis and get to know some of these Winnipeg Bands? I mean, you can still send your bands off to do showcases, but typically what happens in a showcase event is that there’s a hundred and fifty or three hundred bands, and how do you get a little noise or how do you find the time, because those people are running around all over and looking at everything. So, one of the questions then becomes, do we start to develop a pattern of doing industry events, trade shows here? Do we then, need to look at, what are the facilities we need to do book trade fairs, music trade fairs, visual art trade fairs, IDM trade fairs? Or, how do we bring visiting artists here, who then go back and talk to their friends? Or they’ll bring a business person with them. So, we need to develop trade fairs, we need to develop artist residencies... how do we bring the world to Winnipeg so that they can take it back home with them? (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017).
Networking and circulating needs to foster connections and relationships between the creatives and entrepreneurs, and the people with the resources and power to develop the ideas. As Winnipeg is lacking in this area, it is necessary to develop programs and initiatives that brings the world to it.

**5.2.3.4 Threats.** Other cities will likely always be a threat to Winnipeg’s creative industries. The lack of planning and strategies bringing together Winnipeg’s assets make this issue worse. The sprawl of the city has dispersed industries of all types over a large geographical area, creating a barrier for connections and relationships to be developed. It is much easier to stay in a geographical bubble than venture out and see what is happening. The convenience of density and clustering is not present in Winnipeg, and shall continue to be a threat.

**5.2.4 Stage Four: Platforms for Delivery.**

**5.2.4.1 Strengths.** Medeiros (2005) described many strengths in this area, however this has become less of the case. Public art has increasingly been included in new public works projects and development, which has required a larger integration of the WAC in the planning process (Tricia Wasney, personal communication, August 1, 2017). There are many spaces that have been used for artistic/creative endeavours, and there are some places to showcase art, but the extent to which these are accessible to artists is debatable. The Cube Stage in Old Market Square has become a nexus during events, and allows organizations like the TD International Jazz Festival to put on free performances, giving artists the opportunity to play for a guaranteed audience (Bob Somers, personal communication, July 18, 2017; Mike Falk, personal communication, August 1, 2017). Indeed, this performance space draws in large crowds when used on the weekends, and even during the afternoons for performances during these special events. However, there is a deficit of mid-sized venues, that are accessible and affordable for performers or promoters to put on shows (Mike Falk, personal communication, August 1, 2017).
Other strengths are CentreVenture’s programs Face Forward and Push Retail Support. Face Forward is a program that provides grants to property owners that want to make improvements to their storefronts, within the design guidelines laid out within the guide (“Face Forward,” n.d.). CentreVenture’s Push Program, which offers artists and entrepreneurs an opportunity for a low-risk and low-cost trial of a location, is intended to develop into long term leases if successful (“PUSH Retail Support,” n.d.). This provides much needed aid for starting up new businesses, and also fills empty space in the Exchange District, and helps to advertise the potential the area has. Although these programs are not exclusive to the Exchange District, they provide significant supports to start-ups and businesses in the area.

5.2.4.2 Weaknesses. Unfortunately, the strengths of the Exchange District are being overshadowed by the weaknesses of the area, which, if left unaddressed, could cause long term problems. The Exchange District is still not well represented in planning documents, and is usually lumped in with strategies for the Downtown. This means that the unique aspects and challenges of the Exchange District are not necessarily realized, and may be altogether ignored. As previously discussed, no secondary plan has been approved, which was a major issue identified by Medeiros in 2005. Without a secondary plan providing a regulatory and policy framework for the Exchange District, there is no way of ensuring that future development meets the needs of the community, or is in line with a vision for the area.

The Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law (City of Winnipeg, 2004), is very permissive and allows for live-work areas (Marsha Christiuk, personal communication, July 25, 2017). However, there is some debate over the extent to which live-work places are developed, as described by Tricia Wasney (personal communication, August 1, 2017): “they talk about building live-work spaces, nothing like that has really been done in an effective way, not in an affordable way.” This could be attributed to the zoning by-law’s requirement that live-work spaces that are not directly accessible from the street require conditional approval from the city, an extra step that developers and landowners may find prohibitive, but may also be
a key requirement that ensures the safety of buildings. Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) elaborated on this:

There's this lingering myth about the Exchange District, I think from the nineties primarily, or maybe even earlier, when artist studios were everywhere. They were making do, and filling the buildings, but now it's exactly as Tricia has described, and there are buildings that could easily be adapted with sort of a minimal investment for safety primarily, but the owners sit on them. They'll sit on them empty rather than allow that to happen, and the city doesn't take any real action, no matter how many times they're petitioned, or the ideas are put forth, and not just from us, but from other interests or voices that share these concerns, and they don't do it.

Several issues have emerged in the Exchange District in terms of the availability of space for artists and creatives to work: artists are being priced out of the district, and the existing building codes and requirements are acting as hindrances for legitimate operations and residences to be set up. Thom Sparling’s research for Creative Manitoba has revealed that most artists are willing to pay $8 to $12 per square foot, but the building owners and developers expect to get $20 to $25 per square foot, especially once they are renovated, and spaces need to be renovated. Thom Sparling (personal communication, July 26, 2017) describes the complexity of the situation:

... [what] we found in the survey was eight to twelve bucks a square foot is what people are prepared to pay to have a creative space in the Exchange District, and if they can't find that they'll leave and they'll scatter and go to different places, and find wherever they can. But, when you take a renovated space, you take an empty building and you renovate it the landlord needs to charge twenty to twenty-five dollars a square foot over a ten-year period to recoup their investment. So, we've identified that there's this gap, and what was thought to be the solution was
we'll turn it into condos and we'll sell them and that's how we can recoup our money. And even those had to be incentivized to work.

But, what's happened is, is that you've kind of, we're in this weird space where the building owners feel they should be getting more money for their space than the people are prepared to pay for it, and the condos owner are not all really keen to have concerts going on in the Old Market Square all the time, and they don't want bands rehearsing in the building next door, so there's this kind of weird thing, but there is definitely a sense that the artists are being dispersed, and being pushed out of the district, which is ironic because [there is] hundreds of thousands of empty square feet of space. So, there's this expectation that somebody is going to rent the space for fifteen to twenty bucks a square foot, but fifty-seven percent of new office development in Winnipeg in the last five years has occurred in suburban areas.

So, there's this weirdness that the people who want to be in these spaces are the artists, yet the artists can't. There's this reconciliation that needs to happen to be able to get them in, and the city is starting to go, well you need to bring these buildings up to code, to have them occupied, and we'll sort of turn a blind eye on a few things, but, you know if you're really going to push the envelope, then we're going to come in and clamp down on you... We're at a very interesting juncture because year over year retail and restaurant sales are growing, and increasing so that every year they're greater than they were the year prior, and in some years jumping as much as twenty-five percent. So, what you're starting to see is this real booming restaurant trade in the district, there's an interesting retail thing going on, and, the artists are sort of being pushed out a little bit, but not really, but if you want to start looking at those heritage buildings and talking about heritage, then the heritage people say 'well no we need to do this, this and this, and the other thing,' and the building owners are going 'well that's way too restrictive and way too expensive for me to do that so that a bunch of artists can be in my space,’ but the business community doesn't
want to be in these buildings. It's quite clear... there's some questions, there's been great growth, there's been great reinvigoration of the neighbourhood, but there's a long way to go and a lot of big question marks.

The challenge of renovating buildings is an issue, as Brian Timmerman identified (personal communication, July 26, 2017). He described the challenges of meeting the requirements of heritage preservation codes, and that often the requirements are viewed as too stringent, and developers and property owners do not want to deal with the hassle, and sometimes you just get “demolition by neglect” (Brian Timmerman, personal communication, July 31, 2017). Heritage is given lip service, but when it comes down to development options it rarely gets support (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). Marsha Christiuk described the situation:

It’s not an easy sell when it comes to heritage and stuff in our city, where those kinds of things aren’t really supported. It’s very pro developer and pro ownership, like it’s very, you don’t want people telling you what to do... we’re always challenged, every single project there’s a challenge. It’s not an easy, some people are super supportive, they’re very excited about the heritage aspects. Other people just pretend that they’re not enlisted buildings, or ‘we never knew about it’ and then they just start wrecking at it.”

The issue of heritage preservation is not unique to Winnipeg, all cities face challenges when developing policies to protect heritage buildings. The challenge is how to find an equilibrium between development and heritage protection, that supports the needs of the community and the land owners. This can be contentious when the question of “whose heritage are we protecting?” is being asked. Are we protecting the heritage of Indigenous Peoples that once occupied the land, the landowners (current or former), the people who worked there, or people whose lives were affected by the events that unfolded in
the area? These are important questions to ask, and are of a much wider scope than can be addressed within this research project.

The issue of safety in buildings, and the reluctance of business owners to renovate spaces is quite real, as described by Zephyra Vun (personal communication, August 8, 2017), who rented a space under the table for a time:

My space was about three thousand square feet and one little entrance up a huge flight of stairs, hole in ceiling slash roof. Just sketchy old buildings. So many awesome, but in need of updating buildings, that a lot of people just aren’t willing to put money into. Which was actually the reason I left that space, was because I was paying somebody under the table to rent the second floor and he, the gentleman who I was renting from, was trying to build a restaurant on the main floor, and then the owners of the building got wind of what had to be done to bring it up to code and they just weren’t into it. So it was real hard, it was that issue, so the restaurant never happened because the owners of the building didn’t want to upgrade.

Marsha Christiuk (personal communication, July 25, 2017) also links the issue of heritage development to the need for safety:

…the problem is our building codes aren’t so easy. So, when people want to, like, I know a lot of people are apparently living illegally in some of the buildings, and, you know, you think, oh, what’s the big deal, but then you hear about something like in California where they’re living in that warehouse and lots of people died... so it’s a similar kind of thing. You wouldn’t want to put people in a position where they could [die]. And, I know I’ve been into some of those spaces where people build up like these fake walls, and then there’s all these extension cords, and you think, ya, this is not safe, but then, they’re trying to live in that creative community, where they can afford it, and now it’s not affordable these days living around there.
There is also a general problem of available residential space. Few people live in the Exchange District, and those that do are typically wealthy middle-class or upper-class professionals (Marsha Christiuk, personal communication, July 25, 2017; Tricia Wasney, personal communication, August 1, 2017). Despite that Winnipeg is still considered affordable to live in, development of condos in the Exchange has been reducing the availability of housing options, an issue identified by Tricia Wasney, who offered a possible solution:

One of the answers to that could be more apartments and less condos. Where people, with affordable rents, cause then people, artists and other people, who would like to live downtown and don’t have a lot of money can also live there (personal communication, August 1, 2017)

Marsha Christiuk shared this perspective:

I think it’s the affordability factor, I think there’s a lot of places to live I just don’t think that they’re affordable for like the creative community who typically don’t have jobs that pay the same as a doctor salary or even a professional salary. They’re starting out, but I think those are the people that want to live there. It would be nice to cater to people more in their sort of twenties or something, rather than people more in their forties or fifties. That’s who can afford to live there, unless you get a huge mortgage (personal communication, July 25, 2017).

Angela Mathieson offered a different reasoning behind the vacant spaces in the Exchange District. Many of the landowners have inherited their buildings and they have already been amortized (Angela Mathieson, September 8, 2017). Because of this, they are content with a few small businesses in them that provide some extra revenue, but have little interest in any further development or redevelopment (Angela Mathieson, September 8, 2017). This means that portions of buildings are left unused or in states of disrepair. In terms of renovating the spaces, the cost is minimal, and CentreVenture has programs in place
to help with those costs (Angela Mathieson, September 8, 2017). Regarding the affordability of spaces, Angela Mathieson suggests that it is an issue of income rather than increased rents (personal communication, September 8, 2017). Income has not kept pace with the cost of rent, and as funding for the arts becomes more scarce, the disparity will continue (Angela Mathieson, September 8, 2017). Although census data does not entirely support this, there has always been a disparity between income and rents in the Exchange District, there is a high degree of logic to Angela Mathieson’s argument. It starts to make a case for rent-geared to income housing in the Exchange District.

Although there are some funds available for heritage redevelopment, the issues discussed here are significant barriers to the continued success of the Exchange District. Some do see the gentrification of the Exchange District as a natural process that brings some good aspects, and makes the Exchange District a place for all people, and not just the artists (Mike Falk, personal communication, August 1, 2017; Brian Timmerman, personal communication, July 31, 2017). However, there is also the real threat that the Exchange District becomes a cultural district with no artists.

The lack of coordination and strategic planning between the arts community and creative organizations is likely the largest weakness. Members of the community know what is needed, but because they do not have a unified voice advocating for their needs (especially in terms of space), there are ongoing missed opportunities (Angela Mathieson, personal communication, September 8, 2017). Part of this could be rectified through the development of an arts and cultural plan or strategy. Unfortunately, the creative community in the Exchange District lacks a go-between that understands both planning and real estate, and the needs of the arts community (Angela Mathieson, personal communication, September 8, 2017). CentreVenture does not know what the arts community needs, and cannot access the same funding that arts and creative organizations can, but it does have programs that could be combined with funding from these other sources to help support the community in the Exchange District. Until the arts community develops a strategy that identifies its needs, it will continue to pass up these opportunities.
5.2.4.3 Opportunities. There is the potential for a new secondary plan, but there is a lack of faith in its ability to accomplish what is needed, as well as a lack of faith in the politicians, namely City Council, to follow-through with such a plan (Carol Phillips, personal communication, August 1, 2017; Thom Sparling, July 26, 2017). I asked Kurtis Kowalke (personal communication, July 25, 2017) about the development of another secondary plan for the Exchange District, and he described the barriers that such a plan would have:

Certainly not a secondary plan. The way we kind of look at it is you know, you've got your toolkit, right? You've got some hammers, and screwdrivers and you've got your saws and your drills and then you've got your sledgehammer, which is the secondary plan. So, when you're putting up a picture on the wall you don't start to use the sledgehammer for that, right? And that's kind of the analogy that we like to use is that, [if] none of your other tools can do the job, maybe you need the sledgehammer, but it's probably not the first thing you pick up when you're doing something. And, the reason I use the analogy is because [a secondary plan] is the heaviest in terms of time and resources. You've gotta spend two years doing it. It's very resource-intensive, the approval process is quite cumbersome, it has to go to like six different committees to get approved, and then it's quite rigid. If you want to ever make a change to it, it has to go back through those six committees to review that change. So, that's why it's the sledgehammer. It's the most cumbersome. Sometimes nothing else will work, but maybe that will work for you, but we have a whole toolkit of other things that are available to us that are a little more nimble... whether it is zoning changes, design guidelines, economic strategies.

Despite the resistance towards a traditional secondary plan, there is an opportunity to develop a plan that takes an approach beyond land-use, and focus on community assets, visioning, and strategies for developing the area by addressing what it is lacking, specifically affordable housing and work spaces. A secondary plan might be the tool that has enough ‘teeth’ to enforce affordable housing in the district.
An emerging opportunity is SpaceFinder Manitoba, a resource brought in by Creative Manitoba in partnership with ArtsBuild Ontario and Fractured Atlas, that provides a portal for artists and entrepreneurs to find available spaces to rent and use across Winnipeg (“SpaceFinder Manitoba,” n.d.). Trying to find spaces, and quantify what is available, and how much they cost, has been a barrier for artists (Zephyra Vun, personal communication, August 8, 2017), which this resource starts to address. A portal like this could also be used to pinpoint where open, unused space is in the Exchange District. The thousands of square feet of space not being used, mostly because of prohibitive renovation costs (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017) could be identified as opportunities for investment and redevelopment. And this is where CentreVenture’s support for the arts is the strongest opportunity for the creative sector in the Exchange District.

CentreVenture is one hundred percent committed to anchoring the arts sector and the creative sector in the Exchange District. To make investments in that, we need the arts sector to tell us what they want (Angela Mathieson, personal communication, September 8, 2017).

This is a bold statement, and one that runs counter to the assumptions that people hold about CentreVenture. CentreVenture has the resources, and the willingness to support creative spaces in the Exchange District, it only needs a viable strategy to work with. This opens up the opportunity to create a new partnership, develop a made for the Exchange District Creative Spaces strategy, and create opportunities for new spaces for artistic and creative pursuits.

5.2.4.4 Threats. Medeiros (2005) described rising costs as a threat, an issue that has already been discussed as a significant weakness/threat in the Exchange District. Other threats are the lack of high quality digital services in the area, such as fiber optic internet, and the costly nature of having it installed (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). Some firms have already left the area because of this (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017), which could be an indication that others are
unwilling to relocate to the Exchange District if such services are not provided. An emerging threat may be the development of other places in the city, such as the SHED, the Smart Park at the University of Manitoba, or The Forks. If these places offer cheaper, higher quality accommodations than the Exchange District, then market forces will drive new and existing firms to these locations. Conversely, these new developments, especially those in close proximity to the Exchange District, may attract more people to the district. The lack of coordinated strategies between the districts creates uncertainty on how they will interact with one another.

5.2.5 Stage Five: Building Markets and Audiences. Medeiros (2005) saw that it was difficult to assess this stage through a SWOT analysis due to the lack of a unified plan or strategy, an issue that still persists. He describes that due to a lack of leadership, organizations are not doing all they can to promote marketing and the development of audiences in the City (Medeiros, 2005). This has drastically changed over the course of the past twelve years, a point that has been made repeatedly in the above sections.

The Cube at Old Market Square has become a nexus point during events like Fringe Fest and the TD International Winnipeg Jazz Festival, that draws people in, and gives them a central place to engage with what’s happening and find out where they are going to next (Bob Somers, personal communication, July 18, 2017; Mike Falk, August 1, 2017). Thom Sparling at Creative Manitoba has identified the need to build export markets, as the local market is not enough to support the kinds of excellence needed to sustain creative industries (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). Winnipeggers are starting to “buy-in” to the creativity that’s happening in the Exchange District, slowly in some regards, rapidly in others. Organizations like Design Quarter are giving locals and outsiders an opportunity to take a “curated” tour of Winnipeg’s cultural assets created by design entrepreneurs (Zephyra Vun, personal communication, August 8, 2017; “About,” n.d.). Obstacles exist, but they are recognized by the individuals and organizations driving the Exchange District forward, and they are building its capacity to build the markets and audiences for
industries to succeed. However, without some sort of central strategy, developed from the bottom up, and executed holistically, the hard work and effort could be undone.

5.3 Other Observations

The SWOT analysis provides a useful tool for assessing the various projects and strategies at work in the Exchange District, but not everything is qualifiable under the categories above.

5.3.1 Diversity and Racism. The issue of diversity and racism did come up periodically through my research in Winnipeg, but only in subtle ways. Some organizations openly discussed the issue, while for others it did not come up at all. Admittedly, my research did not orient itself towards addressing issues of racism and diversity, something I do regret. As such, there were limited opportunities for participants to bring up the topic, and I did not have any questions to prompt the discussion. Future research will need to address this vital area.

In many ways, racism and diversity felt more like the dark secret that everyone knew about, but few people felt comfortable speaking about. Bob Somers (personal communication, July 18, 2017) recognized the issue in Winnipeg’s music scene, but also spoke optimistically about the changes he was seeing:

“It’s very white in a way, and it leaves out a lot of the character of who we are as a city, with our Indigenous cultures and all that, and we’re really starting to see that break down.

At the events I attended over the summer months, the audiences were dominantly white people, while the performers crossed multiple races and included Indigenous performers. I cannot say if there was parity in terms of the number of Indigenous performers compared to white performers or other nationalities. Considering that Winnipeg is a city that struggles with racism (see Macdonald, 2015 for an article from Maclean's that discusses Winnipeg's racism problem) it is unfortunate that audiences, and to
and performances, appear to be predominately white. As Bob Somers described above, it denies the city and its people what the breadth of the culture of the city really is.

Bob Somers (personal communication, July 18, 2017) also described how Manitoba Music is actively reaching out to Indigenous and the Francophone community in an effort to support diversity in the industry. Creative Manitoba has tried to be more inclusive, particularly with newcomers. Early responses were that newcomers did not feel represented in the Exchange District, but due to barriers like language, Creative Manitoba is reassessing their approach (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). Creative Manitoba does run programs for Indigenous artists, and facilitate gatherings and circles to discuss the issues faced by Indigenous artists and what their needs are for the future (“Indigenous programs,” n.d.). In speaking with both Thom and Bob on the topic, it was apparent that their organizations are working hard to create supports for overcoming systemic barriers created by racism, but two organizations on their own is not enough.

This has raised the question of what does it mean when a city’s arts, culture and creativity centre appears to be dominantly representative of only one culture? It is not that minority cultures or races are not present, it is that they appear to be only marginally present. As rents have increased in the Exchange District, marginalized peoples face additional barriers if they lack the financial capacity to afford setting up shop, or renting a place to live in the Exchange District. This in turn pushes their cultural beliefs and ideas further to the periphery of society, literally and figuratively. Winnipeg is an incredibly diverse city of many cultures, and Bob Somers saw hope in Winnipeg’s diversity, that the isolation of the city has generated a curiosity of each other, that people want to get to know each other, and music and by extension cultural events have been a catalyst in fostering this (personal communication, July 28, 2017). The extent to which this is reflective of what is happening in Winnipeg is difficult to determine through this research. Further research into arts, culture, and creativity in the City of Winnipeg must address the issues of diversity and
racism, and seek to understand how the systemic barriers that exist are affecting people and communities, and how they can be overcome.

5.3.2 City Council and Broken Faith in Planning. It may seem cliché to discuss issues between a city council and planning processes, but valid concerns have emerged that suggest future planning for the Exchange District has significant barriers to overcome. Several interview participants expressed frustration over the municipal and provincial government’s commitment to the Exchange District, and the cultural and creative industries in the city. This frustration is the result of the city’s failure to formerly adopt previously made plans, such as a secondary plan for the Exchange District or Ticket to the Future (Winnipeg Arts Council & Dialog, 2011). When Creative Manitoba started the development of its strategy for the Exchange District, they contacted the province for previous studies and work that was done, which produced a five-inch binder full of reports and plans (Thom Sparling, personal communication, July 26, 2017). According to Thom Sparling (personal communication, July 26, 2017), the information exists, plans are being made, but nothing happens, and he is not sure that a secondary plan would be useful without political will behind it. Thom expressed a lack of confidence in the city’s ability to adequately plan for creativity in the city, and address the issues at hand: “I feel that city hall is a very dysfunctional place, and the city bureaucracy is very dysfunctional” (personal communication, July 26, 2017).

Issues surrounding Ticket to the Future have been discussed above, and the failure of Winnipeg’s City Council to adopt the plan or take it seriously has significantly damaged the faith that such a process would be useful again, or that the outcome will be respected. Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) described her frustrations with the planning process:

When they go through an exercise like OurWinnipeg... you know, it goes into drawer thirteen. Every once and a while they give it a shake, but there is no utilization of ‘oh, that could work.’ There’s a lot of good work done for OurWinnipeg, and we certainly contributed to it and
took it really seriously... and, the politicians do not use that and thereby the planning department, as Tricia says, there is good people, but all they do is churn. They don’t see anything really, really happen. The results are negligible.

City planning departments and city councils are often targets of frustration and chastisement when things fail, and there are many factors that can affect whether or not something is approved or not. Planning is only one part of a very large machine. However, I believe the sentiments expressed by participants go deeper. They demonstrate a genuine lack of faith in the City to take its own planning processes seriously, which will be a barrier to future plan development.

5.3.3 Old Market Square and Placemaking. Old Market Square and the Cube Stage have been one of the most significant successes of the Exchange District. It has been discussed briefly, but the strengths of the design elements and its meaning to the Exchange District warrant further discussion. Bob Somers describes Old Market Square as the nexus of the Exchange District, the place you come to during major events to “go and share and talk about what you saw, what you heard, what you can move on to,” an element that is lacking with other events in the city (personal communication, July 18, 2017). He had this to say about the stage in Old Market Square:

To the credit of The Cube, I think being unique and creative and being something so that when there’s nothing there it still feels like there’s something there. And the Cube was designed really to have that lit quality to it so you’re still having some drama movement, all that kinda stuff to it when the lights turn on... We have an abundance of those outdoor stages...they all appear like stages, but they do feel vacant and I think that the issue with that is there is nothing to do with them, when there’s not a performance... The Cube might do it best. It still suggests something. You know it’s something special. There’s something to that stage (personal communication, July 18, 2017).
The Cube has become a landmark for the Exchange District, that draws people in as sound from performances spills out into the streets (Bob Somers, personal communication, July 18, 2017). The Cube Stage has also provided an opportunity for a variety of performances to occur there, either from the Winnipeg Jazz Fest, scheduled lunch time performances, or something else entirely. My own observations of the Old Market Square confirm that when there is activity at the stage, people are drawn in, spend time there, and there is considerable activity in the area. However, when the stage is not in use, the level of activity in the Exchange District noticeably drops, even at night. Programming at the stage, and the rest of the Exchange District, is an essential part of promoting life and activity in the Exchange District.

Image 1 People gathering around the Cube Stage at Old Market Square for Jazz Fest. Taken early evening. Bell 2017.
Image 2 A Comfort Zone was set-up in a tented area with a view to the Cube Stage. Taken pre-show. Bell 2017.

Image 3 Street performers at Winnipeg's Nuit Blanche next to the Cube Stage. Bell 2017.
### 5.4 Table Comparing Medeiros’ SWOT and Current SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medeiros’ (2005) Findings</th>
<th>2017 Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Enhancing ideas-generating capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Networking opportunities (internal and external) from events in the Exchange District</td>
<td>• Events and organizations dedicated to fostering new ideas and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantial number of arts, culture and creativity related organizations created opportunities</td>
<td>• Red River College program expansion (Paterson GlobalFoods Institute and Innovation Centre); connects students and entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CentreVenture housing competition</td>
<td>• CentreVenture housing initiatives, Push program, and Face Forward program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red River College campus that had programs in creative industries and created co-operative work placements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>• Poor communication and knowledge sharing between industries inhibits innovation</td>
<td>• Limited communication and knowledge sharing between organizations (some improvement from 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban sprawl’s negative impact on industry connections and audience development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>• Perception of Exchange District as creative hub</td>
<td>• Ongoing review of culture policies and opportunity to engage public and update old policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases in arts funding</td>
<td>• Sparse resources have resulted in collaborations and partnerships in form of space and cost sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red River College connecting students and entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td>• Winnipeggers’ negative view of city</td>
<td>• Reduced funding over time; significantly less than other urban centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Geographical distance from other urban centres</td>
<td>• Isolation from other major urban centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New mayor did not support arts, culture, and creativity initiatives</td>
<td>• Challenges of bringing outside talent and lack of exposure to new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Austerity measures from provincial government and uncertainty about future funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeiros’ (2005) Findings</td>
<td>2017 Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gentrification pushing out artists and other creative entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2: Turning Ideas into Practice

**Strengths**

- Number of institutions providing financial supports in many forms
- Exchange District’s reputation as natural creative cluster
- Support for heritage preservation
- Intergovernmental co-operation and previous successes in urban regeneration projects
- Existing funding from multiple sources (although there has been a net decline in funding)
- Existing events provide artists first-time opportunities to perform for large audiences
- Policy requiring inclusion of public art in public works projects
- Exchange District BIZ functioning as a central location for resources and information as well as City of Winnipeg online portal

**Weaknesses**

- Too many agencies leading to overlap and conflicting visions
- Potential complications if funding disappeared from agencies
- No centralized resource for information
- No clear policy direction
- Mistrust of provincial and municipal governments and perception of their dysfunction in a number of areas
- Mandate creep for some support organizations
- Conflicting visions for the Exchange District from stakeholders

**Opportunities**

- Interest in downtown regeneration
- Previous success legitimized need for planning to bring stakeholders together
- Continued interest in Exchange District as a creative and cultural hub
- CentreVenture Marketlands redevelopment, could offer space for artists or remove major impediment to flow of Exchange District

**Threats**

- Slow growth economy
- Over reliance on public funding
- Competition for funding between individuals and organizations
- Conflict between priorities for development and heritage preservation
- Slow growth economy
- End of current economic boom and return to slow growth
- Increased competition from competing districts for arts, culture, and creative industries
### Medeiros’ (2005) Findings
- Insufficient heritage funding

### 2017 Findings
- Riffs between provincial and federal governments could jeopardize multi-lateral agreements for the district
- Uncertainty over current provincial governments policies for arts, culture and for the economy (no long-term vision/plan)

### Stage 3: Networking and Circulating

#### Strengths
- Exchange District’s reputation within the city as a cultural centre
- Existing events that brought people together and foster interaction between people from different industries
- Continued expansion of large and small events in the Exchange District that attract people and business
- Increased collaborations between businesses
- Newly designed Old Market Square and improvements to the public realm (facilitates interactions)
- Improved economic data and research being done by local organizations on economic impacts of creative industries in the Exchange District and Winnipeg

#### Weaknesses
- Lack of understanding of creative activities and their benefits in the Exchange District
- Few statistics on creative activity in the Exchange District
- Lack of resources for organizations like the Exchange District BIZ
- Lack of diversity within industries; i.e. there are many musicians, but not many managers or record label representatives, which makes it hard to develop the needed relationships for success
- Currently no brand for the Exchange District (although this is contested as a requirement for the district’s success)

#### Opportunities
- Capitalize on hype to create a brand
- Organizations working to develop strategies and programs to address the weaknesses of the Exchange District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medeiros’ (2005) Findings</th>
<th>2017 Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td>• Competition from other cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban sprawl acts as barriers for people to easily commute to the Exchange District and check out what is happening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4: Platforms for Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Abundance of space, focus on live-work units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CentreVenture marketing warehouses as useable space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By-law zoning favourable to slow growth development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required inclusion of public art in public works and infrastructure projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cube Stage in Old Market Square allows for free public performances; also functions as a central gathering point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Face Forward and Push Programs that support new and existing entrepreneurs set-up and/or improve storefronts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>• No coordinated framework or secondary plan for the Exchange District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weak and reactive city planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Permit approval process not favourable for mixed use heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deficit of mid-sized venues that are accessible and affordable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor representation of the Exchange District in planning documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No secondary plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zoning by-law may be too restrictive for live-work spaces in upper levels of warehouse space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gentrification pricing out artists and small firms as incomes do not keep pace with cost of spaces for rent or purchase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor quality spaces that are not being improved by landowners and creates safety issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discrepancy between what tenants willing to pay for space, and what landowners will charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medeiros’ (2005) Findings</td>
<td>2017 Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Findings**     | · Heritage buildings can be challenging to rehabilitate, and only really receives lip service support  
                      · Lack of coordination, communication and strategic planning between arts, culture and creative community/organizations that has resulted in missed opportunities to create creative spaces |
| **Opportunities**| · Could create a secondary plan that is comprehensive and engages local stakeholders and community members  
                      · Exchange District Action Strategy Plan could use creative city approaches  
                      · Winnipeg Partnership Agreement offered additional funding |
|                  | · Potential for new secondary plan that goes beyond typical land-use policies  
                      · SpaceFinder Manitoba, which helps people find available space  
                      · Ample space available for an array of uses  
                      · CentreVenture committed to anchoring arts and creative sector in the Exchange District |
| **Threats**      | · No secondary plan  
                      · Lack of flexibility for creativity in existing land-use plans  
                      · Increasing property values (potential for gentrification) |
|                  | · Mistrust and lack of faith in planning processes and city council’s willingness to support arts, culture, and creativity in the Exchange District  
                      · Lack of quality digital infrastructure that is needed by tech based companies (e.g. fiber optic internet)  
                      · Developments in adjacent districts that could be more cost effective |
### Stage 5: Building Markets and Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations (no SWOT conducted)</th>
<th>Medeiros’ (2005) Findings</th>
<th>2017 Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community members in the Exchange District have bought in, rest of Winnipeg has not</td>
<td>• Active work being done by organizations to build internal and external audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to build internal and external markets</td>
<td>• The Cube stage is an active gathering point during events, which often hosts free performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lacking leadership and vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Comparison of Medeiros’ SWOT (2005) and Current SWOT
6. Discussion

6.1 Assessing the Cycle of Creativity

The cycle of urban creativity is a useful tool for understanding the strengths and weaknesses in a city’s strategies for creativity. Unfortunately for Winnipeg, it was difficult to draw direct connections between OurWinnipeg’s (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) direction strategies and outcomes. Regardless, it is apparent that the many organizations in the city are implementing programs that address the needs of the various stages of the cycle. Creative Manitoba recognizes the short comings of networks connecting Winnipeg to the outside world, and the need to build markets and exports and have responded by developing programs and strategies to address this. Manitoba Music and Manitoba Film and Music each recognize strengths that exist in songwriting and the need to continue nurturing the talent that exists in Manitoba. Whether these organizations are familiar with the cycle of urban creativity is unknown, but they are playing significant roles in ensuring that creativity is supported in Winnipeg.

Using the notion of a cycle makes for a good metaphor to explain the phenomenon, but I do not believe it is an accurate depiction of what happens in terms of the development of creativity. The stages are not discreet, some of them are more interlinked than Landry (2008) allows. Developing an idea into a real project often involves the immediate requirement of a place to display and work, while completely skipping over the need for collaboration with anyone else – some people enjoy the task of being their own marketer. Inversely, having certain work spaces may inspire the need for collaboration, which works in the opposite direction of the cycle. In some regards, this is being a bit too particular with the metaphor used, but assuming that there will be a cascade effect from conception to realization to dissemination may lead to insufficient policies for developing creativity in the city. The metaphor of the cycle also does not account for externalities that can affect the various stages of the cycle, which makes Medeiros’ (2005) use of a
SWOT analysis so powerful as it allows for the analysis of outside forces. The cycle should not be viewed as a closed loop system, as it is often depicted.

Landry (2008) describes the cycle as a feedback loop, with the fifth stage kick-starting the process all over again by inspiring people to pursue their own projects. I have not found any evidence supporting a link between the fifth stage feeding back into the first stage of the cycle. It is possible that the methodology used has not been sufficient for identifying this link, and therefore recommend that more research is necessary. An ideal study would involve the tracking of several projects throughout their lifespans, with follow-up studies conducted over three, five, and possibly even ten-year intervals. I had hoped that the passage of twelve years between Medeiros’ (2005) study and my own might reveal more information in this regard, but I cannot say that it has accomplished this.

Two questions pertaining to the cycle of creativity have emerged. The first questions the effectiveness of the tool for analyzing a district as compared to a city. The Exchange District currently has no policies that specifically govern it, or target it as a creative cluster. The zoning by-laws and heritage designation do not promote economic activity or creativity. Most policies and strategies apply to the city of Winnipeg (and even Manitoba), which puts the level of analysis above the district level. A more thorough study could identify the density of program use in the Exchange District, and conduct a comparison to see if there is more dense activity in one place, or if it is spread out across the city.

My second question asks, ‘is this a planner’s tool?’ Two perspectives can be taken on this. From a land-use approach, the answer is no. Land-use, built-form codes, and zoning are only applicable to the fourth stage, platforms for delivery. At best, the land-use planner can ensure that there is appropriate codes and zoning to accommodate uses that are creative in nature, but they cannot guarantee that it will happen. However, the land-use planner can make such prohibitive land-use policies and zoning that creative endeavours are near impossible in a district. A second perspective can look at planning through a
broader lens of community development, which opens a wider opportunity to apply the cycle of urban creativity. People are creative, inventive, and expressive. If the goal of planning is to develop robust and vibrant communities, then creativity must be a major part of that. And most importantly, this does not have to be creativity for the sake of economic gain.

6.2 Planning Fatigue

It is evident through the interviews that there is a fair amount of frustration with City Council and the planning process in Winnipeg. The Exchange District has been subject to many plans and studies, but never any action on them. Two major planning projects have been largely ignored by City Council, who is perceived as being fairly apathetic towards OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) by various stakeholders. While a handful of people believe that a new cultural strategy and/or secondary plan would be beneficial, those who have been involved in such endeavours before no longer see the use.

Alienation from the planning process is something that needs to be seriously considered by planners and policy makers. When trust is broken between the city and community stakeholders, it is incredibly difficult to earn back. I suspect that should the development of a secondary plan for the Exchange District or a cultural plan be pursued, those who have been involved previously will not exhibit the same zeal as they once did. Planners and policy makers must be cautious about exhausting the good will of communities. Developing a plan is an arduous task that can seem daunting for those less familiar with the craft. When these plans are developed and subsequently ignored, you are left with communities that feel their time and resources have been wasted. They see that no progress has been made. Planners can also become alienated when their work is continually dismissed.

This is not a new phenomenon, or even a unique one. Many planners have experienced this over their careers in some capacity or another. At issue is the lack of strong civic leadership and guidance. Neil Bradford (2005) discusses the need for civic leaders to find new ways to lead, focusing on collaborations to
address complex problems, rather than resorting to command issuing, or trying to avoid blame. Bradford (2005) describes how “patient leadership accepts that collaborative policy-making is not tied to the political tides but to the community’s rhythms” (p. 45) as progress takes time, often decades, not just four-year terms. He further explains that frequent “policy twists and turns” can harm capacity and commitment, and exhaust practitioners who lose interest (Bradford, 2005, p. 45).

6.3 Planning for Creativity or Planning for Communities?

Planning for creative or cultural districts is, in many ways, akin to good community planning. Suggesting that a creative district or cluster requires a special kind of development that is different from other communities is not accurate. All communities need good connectivity, a mix of building types and uses, publicly available amenities, and mixed-housing types that accommodate a range of income levels. Carol Phillips (personal communication, August 1, 2017) summarized this well in response to a question about policies addressing gentrification in the Exchange District:

I’ve always been an advocate for this kind of investment, but I kind of have backed off a little bit because if it’s good for artists, then it’s good for many others that need that kind of support. So, what is society doing about that? It can’t just be artists...

The emphasis placed on attracting talent, and generating creativity, has overshadowed the needs of communities that have arisen out of the consequences of the creative city paradigm, mainly the ill effects of gentrification. In many ways, the pursuit of creating creative cities and attracting talent has become a distraction from developing community plans that meet the needs of the people living there: housing that is affordable or soundproof windows for offices and housing near a public performance stage. The assumption that a rising tide brought forward by the wave of creative industries would raise all ships equally has wound up sinking a few along the way. The cultural vibrancy of the Exchange District has drawn the attention of investors and developers, and now the artists are starting to leave, and the very things that are
considered essential for creative industries – proximity, collaboration, venues for performance/display – are starting to disperse or even vanish. The issues of sustaining the community that has been built, of sustaining the creative industries, has not been discussed by its champions. It is as if they assumed that the power of the market would be enough to sustain this economy. The failure to assess and deal with the consequences of its resulting policy is a major fault of the creative city paradigm.

Packaged and sold as a new paradigm that will solve the economic ills of struggling cities, the creative city paradigm is neoliberal capitalism by a new name, sold as a sleek and sexy solution that is attractive to even the most skeptical of individuals – everyone wants to be creative. Yet, cities are still plagued by poverty, racial inequality, sexism, ecological issues, and financial crises. Some cities have fared better than others through their ability to adapt, or through the resilience of people and economic policy. Students of economic history know that this is a process that has happened time and again, which returns the discussion to Sir Peter Hall’s (1998) innovative milieu.

I would argue that Hall’s assessment of creativity and innovation through a lens of geopolitical economy has proven to be more useful, and more accurate, than other perspectives discussed in the literature review. Centres of creativity and innovation (e.g. Silicon Valley) have emerged at the forefront of their time for myriad of factors that go beyond policies that build hip places and beyond phenomenon that can be replicated by every other place in the world. Russia went from being a feudal backwater in 1917 to becoming a nuclear superpower within fifty years, which is an unprecedented rate of development. This did not happen because Moscow developed hip workplaces that attracted the creative class. Hall’s assessment includes the global situation of the end of World War Two and the beginning of the Cold War, which saw the Soviet Union make leaps in the development of war technology. From this vantage, the idea that creative people only go to interesting or hip places is a ridiculous concept that is not rooted in an understanding of economic history. It also helps us understand creativity in a different way.
If we start from the understanding that all communities require or benefit from a particular type of development to be successful, the kind that has mixed-use buildings, mixed housing, public amenities, etc. then a different approach to planning for creativity reveals itself. It starts with the belief that everyone is creative, in some capacity, and we all shape and are shaped by culture. If this is accepted, then I would propose that there are two realms of creativity. One, is the creativity for industry and innovation, with the goal of creative economic activity (i.e. Economic growth), and financial benefits (i.e. profits). Other benefits may come about from this form of creativity, such as the enjoyment of these products, but the primary driver is economic. There are local, national and global forces that influence the direction this creativity will take.

The second form of creativity is personal creativity. There is a fairly large academic body on this concept of personal creativity that refers to it as vernacular creativity Burgess (2006) describes vernacular creativity as “the everyday, the mundane, and the in-between” (p. 29), though not in a derogatory or condescending sense. The idea is that vernacular creativity does not have an easily defined context, and makes up a large portion of human creativity outside the realm of professional art (Burgess, 2006). There can also be large political connections to this form of creativity, as it is often democratized, and is accessible by all people, not relegated to the realm of high art (Burgess, 2006). Unlike the former, the objective is for personal enjoyment, personal benefit, or for communal benefit. An example would be my former neighbour that took up woodworking after he retired, and now makes carvings and other woodworks for his own enjoyment, and often gives them as gifts. Or, the community drumming group that has a weekly gathering in the local park to play drums and is open to anyone at any skill level. Creativity is recognized for its intrinsic value, and often intertwined with culture. These two distinctions of creativity are not mutually exclusive, they intersect, intertwine, overlap, and even feedback into each other. The important factor is the driving force behind them.
For all of its faults and shortcomings, this is where OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) demonstrates its forward thinking. It recognizes that creativity is an essential part of life, while also acknowledging that there is an economic component (creative industries). They are part of the same chapter, but the directions and strategies outlined within the plan make a distinction that economic gain is not necessarily the driving force behind the policies. Planning for creativity requires a recognition of these distinct forms of creativity, and the role they reach play in society. Different policies are required by each, depending on the outcome that is being pursued.

6.4 What Policies and Strategies Have Emerged as Successful?

At the beginning of this research I set out to answer two questions: “what policies and planning approaches have supported creative industries in the Exchange District?” and, “what policies and/or approaches support the entrepreneurs and workers that live and work there?” Three elements have emerged as working to support the development of arts, culture, and creative industries in the Exchange District:

1. The first is networking and promoting both internally and externally (including marketing, connecting with people, and importing and exporting products/services). This networking is essential for the success of arts, culture, and creative industries.

2. The second is for the presence and support of organizations that provide funding and other supports (in the form of training, networking opportunities, administrative resources, advocacy, etc.) to the arts, culture, and creative industries and entrepreneurs.

3. The third is that public spaces are essential because they can facilitate public performances (preferably free), they can provide space for public art, and public space can also be used as a vehicle to promote a wide variety of (free) programming over the course of the year (including winter).
There are three additional elements that I have identified as important for fostering arts, culture, and creative industries, but are not present in the Exchange District:

1. The first is that multilateral civic collaboration with strong civic leadership is important because it can get community members, organizations, and city organizations involved from the outset of a project.

2. The second is that arts, culture, and creative districts need to be well connected to the rest of the city, with multiple modes of transportation available.

3. Third, and perhaps most importantly, mixed-income, and mixed-type housing and workspaces, are essential for the longevity and dynamism of an arts, culture, and the creativity district.
7. Recommendations

Ideally, I would recommend the development of a new secondary plan for the Exchange District, which could extend to the surrounding area, and the development of a cultural plan for Winnipeg. A secondary plan, if executed well, could go beyond prescriptions for streets and buildings, and create a vision for the district, and address the concerns of residents and businesses alike. A cultural plan could establish a direction for the various agencies and support organizations in Winnipeg, develop a vision for how the city plans to protect and expand its cultural assets, ensure that people have the capacity to be creative, provide direction on space requirements and provide resources for the future of creativity and culture in the city. However, due to the negative experiences of the past, and the unlikelihood of Winnipeg’s City Council adopting such plans, the recommendations seem futile. Rather, I have opted to make recommendations that could potentially be incorporated into existing frameworks, and build towards reestablishing trust in the planning process, so that in the future, these plans can be established.

7.1 Recommendation One: Develop and implement an affordable housing strategy for Winnipeg’s Downtown.

Gentrification and stagnant incomes have resulted in a lack of affordable housing (and workspaces) in the Exchange District, which has become a major deterrent to successful creativity. As a community, it cannot grow or become vibrant if people cannot live there. Establishing policies that require new developments and redevelopments to have a percentage of rent geared to income units will help address this issue. The Manitoba Planning Act provides several policies that make this possible:

71(5) A zoning by-law for a new residential development may require that a specified percentage of the dwelling units within the development offer affordable housing to low and moderate income households.
A zoning by-law may allow for a modification of specified development requirements, including increased density of dwelling units, if a development provides the public benefits prescribed in the by-law, such as affordable housing.

(The Manitoba Government, 2005, pp. 64, 65)

The plan should require a mix of housing types, with emphasis on live-work spaces and mixed-use buildings. Additionally, building codes that are less rigorous should be explored as an exception in the Exchange District. It may be possible to remove some of the requirements that are not important for safety, which could aid in decreasing the costs renovating spaces and making them more affordable for artists and other creatives.

**Partnerships and Responsibility.** Winnipeg City Council, CentreVenture, Province of Manitoba, Planning, Property and Development, and local stakeholders in the Exchange District and downtown.

**Timeline.** Implementation within two years.

**7.2 Recommendation Two: Incentivize heritage building redevelopment, and de-incentivize empty buildings and empty surface lots.**

Programs already exist incentivizing development in the Exchange District. Efforts need to be made to promote them more, and to attract commercial and office space to the Exchange District. Policies need to be put in place to de-incentivize leaving buildings empty, and surface lots undeveloped. This could be in the form of higher taxes, or incentives to sell property to the city for redevelopment. Alberta is currently looking at a legislation that allows the taxation of empty sites (Stolte, 2017). The City of Winnipeg should watch the success of this legislation carefully to gauge if a similar thing should be advocated for in Manitoba. An inventory should be taken of available space and buildings, and goals set to fill this space by certain timelines, aiming for a minimum of 50% of empty spaces occupied and 35% of empty lots developed within fifteen to twenty years.
**Partnerships.** CentreVenture, City of Winnipeg, Planning, Property and Development, and Province of Manitoba.

**Timeline.** Implementation of policy within two to three years, goals met within fifteen to twenty years of implementation.

### 7.3 Recommendation Three: Recognize the uniqueness of the Exchange District in *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities.*

Currently, the Exchange District is only identified as part of the downtown in Winnipeg’s planning documents. Only the *Winnipeg Downtown Zoning-Bylaw* (City of Winnipeg, 2004) recognizes the Exchange District as a sector (though this is not explicit). The Exchange District is unique in terms of its heritage designation, its cultural and historical significance, and the needs of the people that live and work in the district. By setting the Exchange District apart in official planning documents allows for the creation of policies that recognize its needs, specifically heritage preservation and affordable housing. It will also allow for specific types of rejuvenation projects to be coordinated, such as the previously successful Lily Street project. It will also aid in repairing relations between the City and local stakeholders by restoring faith in the planning process.

**Partnerships.** City of Winnipeg, Planning, Property and Development, and local stakeholders.

**Timeline.** Current, in accordance with the review of *OurWinnipeg* (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) that is underway.

### 7.4 Recommendation Four: Support opportunities for cross-industry collaboration as well as outreach to other creative centres.

Creative Manitoba has identified that the lack of networking with creative centres and industry people outside of the city has been a major obstacle. I would also add that there is a lack of ongoing collaboration between industries within the city. Enhancing financial supports to organizations such as
Creative Manitoba and the Winnipeg Arts Council can help with fostering increased collaboration and marketing in this area. Metrics should be established for assessing money used for creating networking events, people/industry events brought to the city, and projects that are funded.

**Partnerships.** City of Winnipeg, Creative Manitoba, Winnipeg Arts Council, Province of Manitoba, Economic Development Winnipeg, and Tourism Winnipeg.

**Timeline.** Immediate.

### 7.5 Recommendation Five: Create a Creative Spaces Strategy for the Exchange District.

CentreVenture is committed to the arts and creativity in the Exchange District, but without a clear direction from the community it does not know how to invest in it. The development of a strategy that describes what is needed by the arts and creative community will help enable CentreVenture to support these spaces. The arts community also has access to additional funding to help in the development of these spaces, which CentreVenture does not have access to. The Artspace model has already proven successful, and should be looked to as a framework, and possible partner, for this strategy.

**Partnerships:** CentreVenture, Artspace, Creative Manitoba, WAC, artists, creatives, and entrepreneurs in the Exchange District.

**Timeline:** Immediate.

This is not an exhaustive list of recommendations that can be implemented to develop creativity in the Exchange District, but rather the most essential for the immediate future. Trust needs to be rebuilt in the planning process, and there needs to be demonstration from the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba that they have an interest in supporting culture and creativity in the city, and recognize the importance goes beyond economic gain. These recommendations can help rebuild that trust. This must go beyond prescriptions that encourage support, or encourage funding opportunities for the arts. It must be genuine buy-in.
Creative Manitoba is in the process of creating a cluster strategy for the Exchange District. I have reviewed an early draft of the document, and believe that it is an excellent strategy for addressing many of the needs of the Exchange District. Providing monetary and planning support to further develop this document will help improve the veracity of the strategy. However, it will need support from the City for it to be enacted and have authority to implement its policies. I am uncertain of the extent of collaboration on the document, but if funding could be provided to support expanded public and stakeholder engagement, the document will become that much stronger. I recommend support from the city planning department as the strategy has many aspects that could be strengthened from a planning perspective being applied.
8. Conclusion

The original questions guiding this research thesis was:

1. What policies and planning approaches have supported the development of creative industries in Winnipeg’s Exchange District?

2. And in particular, what policies and planning approaches support the creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work there?

These translated into two research objectives:

1. Draw on Nathan Medeiros’ (2005) research thesis, Planning for Creativity: The Case of Winnipeg’s Exchange District, to compare what has changed in the Exchange District since 2005, and assess what has been successful and what has not, focusing on planning processes, policies, and strategies that have been implemented since his study.

2. Make policy recommendations for the City of Winnipeg that will aid in the development of robust creative industries and support creative entrepreneurs and workers that live and work in the Exchange District.

In the twelve years since Nathan Medeiros wrote his thesis (2005), there have been substantial changes in Winnipeg, and the Exchange District. The development of an official plan that includes a section on creativity that provides direction strategies to be pursued, indicates that planners and policy makers recognize the importance of culture and creativity in the city. Although the strategies and actions in OurWinnipeg (City of Winnipeg, 2011d) and Complete Communities (City of Winnipeg, 2011c) tend to be ambiguous and vague, which leaves their effectiveness open to scrutiny, they do provide a framework for guiding future plans and development. Most importantly, the plans recognize the difference between culture and creativity for people, and for economic gain.
To answer the research question put forth in this thesis Three elements have emerged as working to support the development of arts, culture, and creative industries in the Exchange District:

4. The first is networking and promoting both internally and externally (including marketing, connecting with people, and importing and exporting products/services). This networking is essential for the success of arts, culture, and creative industries.

5. The second is for the presence and support of organizations that provide funding and other supports (in the form of training, networking opportunities, administrative resources, advocacy, etc.) to the arts, culture, and creative industries and entrepreneurs.

6. The third is that public spaces are essential because they can facilitate public performances (preferably free), they can provide space for public art, and public space can also be used as a vehicle to promote a wide variety of (free) programming over the course of the year (including winter).

There are three additional elements that I have identified as important for fostering arts, culture, and creative industries, but are not present in the Exchange District:

4. The first is that multilateral civic collaboration with strong civic leadership is important because it can get community members, organizations, and city organizations involved from the outset of a project.

5. The second is that arts, culture, and creative districts need to be well connected to the rest of the city, with multiple modes of transportation available.

6. Third, and perhaps most importantly, mixed-income, and mixed-type housing and workspaces, are essential for the longevity and dynamism of an arts, culture, and the creativity district.
While this research has been critical of many aspects of planning and policy in the City of Winnipeg, I feel the need to commend the City on the successes that it has had. The Exchange District is developing rapidly as a vibrant district; however, the question is, will it be the kind of arts and cultural district that the city needs? The many arts support and advocacy organizations have done an incredible job of ensuring that arts, culture, and creativity are a vibrant part of city life. Without these organizations, Winnipeg’s arts and culture scene would rapidly deteriorate. The success of street renewal projects like Lily Street demonstrate a willingness and capacity for great things to happen when departments and organizations collaborate. This will hopefully turn into a standard for future projects to live up to.

8.1 Lessons for the Planning Profession

In addition to the elements above that have been recognized as good policy or planning strategies, some key concepts have emerged from this research that I believe will be valuable to the planning profession. The cycle of urban creativity has proven to be a useful tool for assessing the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps in policy, and at understanding how outside forces are affecting creative and cultural projects. If there is a lack of policy in place, as is the case in the Exchange District, assessing the viability of each stage is difficult. A clearer set of criteria for each stage would help in assessing projects in a city that does not have policies or guiding strategies for creativity.

Key stakeholders in the Exchange District have become frustrated with the city ignoring two major planning initiatives that cost significant time and resources. The Exchange District has also been the subject of many government and academic led studies. This has resulted in stakeholders losing trust in the commitment of Winnipeg City Council to support the Exchange District or other cultural and creative projects. Faith in the planning process has also been lost. Future projects will be looked at with a degree of skepticism, and it will be hard to get buy-in from these organizations. This is an important lesson for future planning projects. When studies and plans are developed, but not approved, or ignored by city
council, stakeholders experience what can be called planning fatigue, where they are disinterested and distrustful of new initiatives due to their negative previous experiences.

Through this research project, two major themes emerged in regard to “planning” for creativity. The first, relates to the development of cultural or creative districts, such as the Exchange District. Landry (2008), Montgomery (2003, 2004), and Florida (2014) all prescribe, at some level, the need for amenities or the development of districts that have certain characteristics in order for cities to foster creativity. I argue that what these authors are discussing is what can be identified as simply good planning principles: walkability, connectedness, mixed-use, mixed-income, mixed-housing, neighbourhoods. These are not special for fostering or attracting creativity – most people want these things. From this, I support Sir Peter Hall’s (Hall, 1998) assessment of innovation as being linked to larger economic phenomenon, which can be linked to local and global phenomenon.

A second theme that emerged is the difference between creativity for people and communities, and creativity for economic prosperity. All people are inherently creative, some have the privilege and capacity to realize their creativity and use it. Others do not, but pursue it anyway, while some just cannot afford to (or have no desire to) realize their creativity. Policies and planning can recognize that all people have creative potential, and can create policies and strategies that build on this, and recognize this integral part of community development. Creativity is also important for economic prosperity, led by innovation and risk-taking.

8.2 Recommendations for Winnipeg

I have made four policy recommendations for the Exchange District. They revolve around recognizing the uniqueness of the Exchange District as a neighbourhood that has its own needs and assets. I also recommend that the City addresses the failure to adopt plans and strategies for culture and for the Exchange District, which has resulted in planning fatigue from major stakeholders. As well, I recommend
that the city reviews the mandates of its planning and public works departments, and its relationship with CentreVenture, with the goal to pursue proactive community planning, as opposed to the reactive planning that was identified by Medeiros in 2005, and myself during this research project.

8.3 Future Research

There are several gaps in the research that I have conducted, and I believe that pursuing research in these areas could improve our understanding of cultural and creative districts, and the creative city paradigm. Research with Indigenous peoples, new comers, minorities, and women in the Exchange District (and creative cities more broadly) is important and in fact essential. The fact that entire populations and narratives have been ignored in this research area speaks to the failures of the existing creative cities discourse but also points to the enormous potential to learn new stories, new creativities and counter-narratives. There is a major gap in this area, and local organizations in Winnipeg are attempting to find ways to address it. Research that pursues the development of various projects over time will help gain a better understanding of the cycle of urban creativity, and its usefulness as a policy tool. A longitudinal study of projects in multiple cities or regions would also provide rich data that could help assess Canada’s creative potential and weaknesses.

Conceptually, there is a good understanding of the emerging economic paradigm that favours creativity, innovation, and human capital over the brawn of manufacturing and industrial activity. What seems to be lacking, at least in policy circles, is the impact that this is having on the lives of people. There is a strong foundation of understanding how creative industries are functioning, and research in this area will continue to expand. There is a need to understand these changes from the lived experiences of people, and how this is positively and negatively impacting their lives. Research of this nature should take a bottom up approach, and seek to understand the importance of the economic aspects of creativity to human life, but also the personal and communal aspects of art, culture and creativity.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC07</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Creative Industries</th>
<th>Digital Sector</th>
<th>Cultural Sector</th>
<th>Telecoms</th>
<th>Gambling</th>
<th>Sport¹</th>
<th>Tourism²</th>
<th>All DCMS³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Reproduction of recorded media</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>Manufacture of electronic components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>Manufacture of loaded electronic boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Manufacture of computers and peripheral equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Manufacture of communication equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>Manufacture of consumer electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>Manufacture of magnetic and optical media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>Building of pleasure and sporting boats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>Manufacture of jewellery and related articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>Manufacture of musical instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Manufacture of sports goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.51</td>
<td>Wholesale of computers, computer peripheral equipment and software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.52</td>
<td>Wholesale of electronic and telecommunications equipment and parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>Retail sale of music and video recordings in specialised stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.64</td>
<td>Retail sale of sports goods, fishing gear, camping goods, boats and bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>Passenger rail transport, interurban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>Taxi operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>Other passenger and transport n.e.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>Sea and coastal passenger water transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>Inland passenger water transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>Passenger air transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Food and beverage service activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC07</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Creative Industries</td>
<td>Digital Sector</td>
<td>Cultural Sector</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>All DCMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>Book publishing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>Publishing of directories and mailing lists</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>Publishing of newspapers</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>Publishing of journals and periodicals</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>Other publishing activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.21</td>
<td>Publishing of computer games</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>Other software publishing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.11</td>
<td>Motion picture, video and television programme production activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>Motion picture, video and television programme post-production activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.13</td>
<td>Motion picture, video and television programme distribution activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.14</td>
<td>Motion picture projection activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>Sound recording and music publishing activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>Radio broadcasting</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>Television programming and broadcasting activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>Wired telecommunications activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>Wireless telecommunications activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>Satellite telecommunications activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>Other telecommunications activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>Computer programming activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.02</td>
<td>Computer consultancy activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.03</td>
<td>Computer facilities management activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.09</td>
<td>Other information technology and computer service activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>Data processing, hosting and related activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC07</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Creative Industries</td>
<td>Digital Sector</td>
<td>Cultural Sector</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>Sport¹</td>
<td>Tourism²</td>
<td>All DCMS³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.12</td>
<td>Web portals</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.91</td>
<td>News agency activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.99</td>
<td>Other information service activities n.e.c.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>Renting and operating of own or leased real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.21</td>
<td>Public relations and communication activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.11</td>
<td>Architectural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.11</td>
<td>Advertising agencies</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>Media representation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>Specialised design activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>Photographic activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>Translation and interpretation activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.11</td>
<td>Renting and leasing of cars and light motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>Renting and leasing of recreational and sports goods</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.34</td>
<td>Renting and leasing of water transport equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.35</td>
<td>Renting and leasing of air transport equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>Travel agency and tour operator activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>Other reservation service and related activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>Organisation of conventions and trade shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.51</td>
<td>Sports and recreation education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.52</td>
<td>Cultural education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.01</td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.02</td>
<td>Support activities to performing arts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.03</td>
<td>Artistic creation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.04</td>
<td>Operation of arts facilities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC07</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Creative Industries</td>
<td>Digital Sector</td>
<td>Cultural Sector</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>Sport¹</td>
<td>Tourism²</td>
<td>All DCMS³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.01</td>
<td>Library and archive activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>Museum activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.03</td>
<td>Operation of historical sites and buildings and similar visitor attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>Botanical and zoological gardens and nature reserve activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Gambling and betting activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.11</td>
<td>Operation of sports facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.12</td>
<td>Activities of sports clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.13</td>
<td>Fitness facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.18</td>
<td>Other sports activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.29</td>
<td>Other amusement and recreation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.11</td>
<td>Repair of computers and peripheral equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.12</td>
<td>Repair of communication equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Sport – the definition here does not match the sport satellite account. For a full estimate of the value of sport see the Sport Satellite Account. In this, sport overlaps with many of the other DCMS sectors, including significant overlap with Telecoms, Gambling and Creative Industries (Advertising and Broadcasting). While the exclusion of these areas from Sport reduces the value of “Sport” significantly, the impact of using the more limited SIC related definition of sport on the overall DCMS estimate is much less significant because of the areas already being included elsewhere in DCMS sectors.
2. Tourism – For all industries except tourism, the entire SIC shown is included in the estimate of DCMS GVA and the GVA for the relevant sector. For tourism, tourism industries are shown in the table but other data sources are used to determine how much of the SIC is included in the tourism (and therefore DCMS) estimate.
3. All DCMS – the all DCMS estimate is made up by combining the value for each SIC which forms part of a DCMS sector (except tourism where part of the relevant SIC is taken based on the Tourism Satellite Account methodology). Due to overlap between sectors it is not accurate to add up the sector totals without taking into account the overlap.
Appendix 03: Winnipeg Land-Use and Zoning Maps from OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities and

Winnipeg Downtown Zoning By-Law

Figure 2 Urban Structures Land-Use Planning for the City of Winnipeg (City of Winnipeg,
Figure 3 Transformative Areas Urban Structure (City of Winnipeg, 2011)
Figure 4 Downtown Urban Structure (City of Winnipeg, 2011c)
Figure 5 Downtown Zoning Map (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
Figure 6 Downtown Zoning Map 1 (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
Figure 7 Downtown Zoning Map 2 (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
Part 8: Zoning Maps
Map 4
By-Law No. 100/204

FIGURE 8 DOWNTOWN ZONING MAP 4 (CITY OF WINNIPEG, 2004)
Figure 9 Downtown Zoning Map 5 (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
Appendix 04: Excerpts from *Complete Communities* Explaining How to Interpret Document

**Each Section on the Urban Structure** (See Figure H) begins with a vision and/or high-level description of the applicable urban structure component and then moves to the details of how they are to be implemented. The sections are organized according to Figure H.

**Key Direction** (Figure a)
Each section has a key direction. It is meant to summarize the main thrust of the section and like a goal, it provides a description of the results that this City is hoping to achieve. It is from this direction that the rest of each section is based.

**Vision** (Figure b)
An inspirational statement regarding the area will evolve.

**Description** (Figure c)
This is the main body of the section. It outlines the characteristics of the area, how it fits into the Urban Structure and may outline examples of that part of the Urban Structure.

**Figure 10 Complete Communities Section Description**

**Supporting Directions** (Figure d)
Supporting Directions are based on the Key Directions and describe the City’s objectives concerning the component of the Urban Structure in more detail.

**Enabling Strategies** (Figure e)
The enabling strategies come from each supporting direction. They are the strategies that will guide the City to following the directions for each component of the Urban Structure.

**Tools** (Figure f)
Each enabling strategy has been assessed as to how they can be implemented. There are four categories of tools: Planning, Incentives, Capital Budget/Infrastructure, and Leadership/Partnership. Where an enabling strategy will use one or more tools, their corresponding symbols will be shown next to the strategy.

The details of the specific tools and actions that will be used to implement the enabling strategies have not been specified in this paper. They will be further defined through the Complete Communities ToolBox and through future work plans. (See Implementation Section)

**Glossary**
Complete Communities is a technical document which uses terms that may not be familiar to all users. For that reason, there is a comprehensive glossary at the back of the book to help the reader better understand and use the document.
### Appendix 05: Zoning Bulk Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Sector</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Warehouse Properties</th>
<th>Main Street Lombard Ave. Properties</th>
<th>Water Avenue Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height Minimum‡</strong></td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height Maximum</strong>**</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>150 Feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio Maximum</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front, Side, Corner Side Yards‡</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>5 foot front and corner side maximum***</td>
<td>5 foot front and corner side maximum</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Uses Interior Side Yards Minimum</strong>*‡**</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Uses Rear Yards Minimum</strong>*‡**</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Uses Rear Yards Minimum</strong>*‡**</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- * - no interior side yard is required when no doors, windows, or other openings are provided in the wall facing the adjacent property and in the adjacent property wall (see section 210)
- ** - for up to 50 feet in building height, 20 foot minimum rear yard may be calculated from the building wall to the mid-point of an existing public road or lane (see section 210)
- *** - applies to minimum 50% of building wall length
- **** - building heights may be limited by ‘Building Height Control Area: Legislative Core - Winnipeg’ Public Works Act restrictions [see subsection 210(13)]
- ‡ - not applicable to all or part of an existing structure converting to a residential use

Table 13 Character Sector Bulk Regulations (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Living Sector</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Waterfront Drive</th>
<th>South Broadway Sub-Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height Minimum‡</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height Maximum****</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>60 Feet‡‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio Maximum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front, Side, Corner Side Yards‡</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>5 foot front and corner side maximum***</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses Interior Side Yards Minimum*‡</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
<td>10-50 feet in height: 10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses Rear Yards Minimum***</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses Minimum**‡</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - no interior side yard is required when no doors, windows, or other openings are provided in the wall facing the adjacent property and in the adjacent property wall (see section 210)

** - for up to 50 feet in building height, 20 foot minimum rear yard may be calculated from the building wall to the mid-point of an existing public road or lane (see section 210)

*** - applies to minimum 50% of building wall length

**** - building heights may be limited by 'Building Height Control Area: Legislative Core – Winnipeg’ Public Works Act restrictions [see subsection 210(13)]

‡ - not applicable to all or part of an existing structure converting to a residential use

‡‡ - 100 feet on corner lots

Table 14 Downtown Living Sector Bulk Regulations (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riverbank Sector</th>
<th>Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum*</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front, Side, Corner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yards</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - building heights may be limited by ‘Building Height Control Area: Legislative Core: - Winnipeg’ Public Works Act restrictions

Table 15 Riverbank Sector Bulk Regulations (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple-Use Sector</th>
<th>Building Height Minimum‡</th>
<th>Building Height Maximum****</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Building Height Minimum‡</td>
<td>Building Height Maximum****</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue Main Street Properties</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Properties</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple-Use Sector</th>
<th>Front, Side, Corner Side Yards‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Front, Side, Corner Side Yards‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue Main Street Properties</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Properties</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple-Use Sector</th>
<th>Residential Uses Interior Side Yards Minimum*‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Residential Uses Interior Side Yards Minimum*‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue Main Street Properties</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Properties</td>
<td>Above 50 feet in height: 20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple-Use Sector</th>
<th>Residential Uses Rear Yards Minimum**‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Residential Uses Rear Yards Minimum**‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue Main Street Properties</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Properties</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - no interior side yard is required when no doors, windows, or other openings are provided in the wall facing the adjacent property and in the adjacent property wall (see section 210)

** - for up to 50 feet in building height, 20 foot minimum rear yard may be calculated from the building wall to the mid-point of the public road or lane (see section 210)

*** - front yard is not required for canopies; front yard is not required for exterior stairs, podiums, or seating areas less than 4 feet in height or signs less than 10 feet in height.

**** - building heights may be limited by ‘Building Height Control Area: Legislative Core – Winnipeg’ Public Works Act restrictions [see subsection 210(13)]

‡ - not applicable to all or part of an existing structure converting to a residential use

Table 16 Multiple-Use Sector Bulk Regulations (City of Winnipeg, 2004)
### Appendix 06: OurWinnipeg “Creativity” Section Directions and Strategies Categorized into the Cycle of Urban Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Enabling Strategies</th>
<th>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</th>
<th>Turning Ideas into Practice</th>
<th>Networking and Circulating</th>
<th>Platforms for Delivery</th>
<th>Building Markets and Audiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue to develop Winnipeg’s unique artistic identity and diversity of expression.</td>
<td>Continue to support artistic integrity though arm’s length allocation of arts grants and management of a civic public art program.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In partnership with arts stakeholders, develop and implement a long-range strategic cultural plan for the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage creativity and excellence in all aspects of cultural activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize artistic and cultural expression as a key component of sustainable and complete communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champion and support public art as a tool for placemaking and community identity, including encouraging the integration of art into new public spaces and public works projects and promoting and facilitating the incorporation of permanent or temporary art into existing public spaces and city-owned facilities, developments and major public works projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Enabling Strategies</td>
<td>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</td>
<td>Turning Ideas into Practice</td>
<td>Networking and Circulating</td>
<td>Platforms for Delivery</td>
<td>Building Markets and Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Act as a responsible steward for city-owned museums, archives and collections.</td>
<td>Collaborate with museums and others on initiatives to enhance facility and collection sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain an ongoing, city-wide management system that secures existing archives and identifies and retains essential contemporary documents and databases for future reference and research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support collaboration and networking related to cultural tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support a wide range of arts and cultural facilities.</td>
<td>Collaborate to provide, support or encourage the development, maintenance and establishment of sustainable funding strategies of arts and cultural facilities of different scales appropriate to their context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support the provision of equitable opportunities for all residents to participate in the arts through the development of accessible arts and cultural facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Enabling Strategies</td>
<td>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</td>
<td>Turning Ideas into Practice</td>
<td>Networking and Circulating</td>
<td>Platforms for Delivery</td>
<td>Building Markets and Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support and enable meaningful community expression.</td>
<td>Build the capacity of communities to express themselves through a wide range of programs that engage people of all ages and abilities through arts and culture.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work in partnership with arts stakeholders to integrate art and cultural activities into recreation programs and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support a wide range of cultural facilities and services that reflect community diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In partnership with communities, create environments that reflect their distinct artistic and cultural values.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support and develop cultural activities that enrich and extend personal and community development.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foster life-long arts learning opportunities.</td>
<td>Collaborate with community partners to provide opportunities for arts education at all ages and skill levels.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Enabling Strategies</td>
<td>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</td>
<td>Turning Ideas into Practice</td>
<td>Networking and Circulating</td>
<td>Platforms for Delivery</td>
<td>Building Markets and Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate in community-led arts education opportunities, using existing City services and resources to enhance access to arts programming.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote cross-cultural and inter-generational opportunities for arts activities and learning.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support opportunities to engage all children and youth in arts programming.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote City-owned museums as a venue for education and for engaging children and youth.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities to integrate art and culture into City operations.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursue opportunities to make access to, and participation in, the arts more affordable and equitable.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Promote awareness of the richness of Winnipeg’s arts and culture within and outside Winnipeg.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote artists, events, programs and facilities in partnership with Winnipeg arts and culture organizations, the Winnipeg Arts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Enabling Strategies</td>
<td>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</td>
<td>Turning Ideas into Practice</td>
<td>Networking and Circulating</td>
<td>Platforms for Delivery</td>
<td>Building Markets and Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council and Economic Development Winnipeg Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the local, national and international reputation of Winnipeg as a City of the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support the marketing of Winnipeg’s internationally-renowned festivals, institutions and artists through partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support the film and commercial production industry by providing assistance with permitting, locations and coordination with City services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through partnerships, promote opportunities that increase participation in the arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Grow support for creative industries and entrepreneurs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize and support the role that entrepreneurs and small and medium-sized enterprises have in the creative economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursue and encourage the development of creative, knowledge-based industries of all sizes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursue policies that recruit and maintain a creative workforce ready for current and emerging technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Enabling Strategies</td>
<td>Enhancing Ideas Generating Capacity</td>
<td>Turning Ideas into Practice</td>
<td>Networking and Circulating</td>
<td>Platforms for Delivery</td>
<td>Building Markets and Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support strategies that recognize and stimulate creative industries.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to develop and support the hard and soft infrastructure which sustains Winnipeg’s creative industries and activities.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish Winnipeg as a city of choice for artists and creative professionals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore and implement planning tools that make Winnipeg a more livable and desirable place for artists and creative professionals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize the importance of living, working and presentation spaces for professional artists and arts organizations and support strategies to enhance their sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Directions and Strategies Cycle of Urban Creativity
Appendix 07: Exchange District Boundary Map

Figure 12 Exchange District Business Improvement Zone Map (City of Winnipeg, 2008)
Appendix 08: Interview Participants

1. Bob Somers: President of the Manitoba Music Board of Directors, Principal at Scatliff + Miller + Murray (Urban and Landscape Design Firm)
2. Brian Timmerman: Executive Director of the Exchange District Business Improvement Zone
3. Angela Mathieson: CEO of CentreVenture
4. Zephyra Vun: Executive Director of Design Quarter
5. Edward Suzuki: Director, Market Intelligence Economic Development Winnipeg
6. Kurtis Kowalke: Senior Planner, City of Winnipeg
7. Marsha Christiuk: Senior Urban Designer, City of Winnipeg
8. Mike Falk: Artistic Director, TD Winnipeg International Jazz Festival
9. Carol A. Phillips: Executive Director, Winnipeg Arts Council
10. Tricia Wasney: Manager of Public Art, Winnipeg Arts Council
11. Scott Suderman: Transportation Facilities Planning Engineer, City of Winnipeg
12. Stephen Carroll: Manager, Music Programs at Manitoba Film and Music
13. Thomas Sparling: Executive Director, Creative Manitoba
Appendix 09: Letter of Information and Consent

Letter of Information and Consent Form

To Participant:

Study Title: Planning for Creativity in Winnipeg’s Exchange District

Name of Student Researcher: Paul Bell, School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Betsy Donald, Department of Geography and Planning, Queen’s University

I am Paul Bell, a master’s student in the School of Urban and Regional Planning (SURP) at Queen’s University, working under the supervision of Dr. Betsy Donald. I am conducting research into planning for creativity in The Exchange District in Winnipeg, MB. If you agree to take part, I will interview you for approximately one hour at a location of your choosing. We may use a public space, your office, or another location for privacy. With your permission, the interview will be audio-recorded and later transcribed. There are no known risks for taking part in this study. While there are no direct benefits to you as a participant, study results may help urban planners and policy makers better understand how to plan for music industries and public spaces.

There is no obligation for you to say yes to take part in this study. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to. You can stop participating in an interview at any time without penalty and may withdraw from the study up to Sept, 12, 2017. If you wish to do so, you may contact me at paul.bell@queensu.ca or 204-510-5592.

I will keep your data securely for at least five years at Queen’s University. Your confidentiality will be protected to the extent possible by replacing your name with a pseudonym for all data and in all publications. The code list linking real names with pseudonyms will be stored separately and securely from the data. Other than myself, only my research advisor, Dr. Betsy Donald, will have access to the private information. If you wish to be identified as a participant in this research, please indicate so on the attached consent form.

I hope to publish the results of this study in academic journals and present them at conferences. I will include quotes from some of the interviews when presenting my findings. However, I will never include any real names with quotes, and I will do my best to make sure quotes do not include information that could indirectly identify participants, unless you have given permission to be identified. During the interview, please let me know if you say anything you do not want me to quote.

If you have any ethics concerns please contact the General Research Ethics Board (GREB) at 1-844-535-2988 (Toll free in North America) or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
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If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at paul.bell@queensu.ca or 204-510-5592.

This Letter of Information provides you with the details to help you make an informed choice. All your questions should be answered to your satisfaction before you decide whether or not to participate in this research study.

Keep one copy of the Letter of Information for your records and return one copy to the researcher, Paul Bell.

By signing below, I am verifying that: I have read the Letter of Information and all of my questions have been answered.

Name of Participant: ___________________________

Signature: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Do you consent to being identified in this research?
Yes_____ No ________

Do you consent to have your company or organization identified in this research?
Yes_____ No ________

Do you consent to having the type of business/organization you are associated with to be identified? Yes____ No ________

If yes, how will your organization be identified? ________________________________
(Will be confirmed during the interview process)

Do you consent to our conversation being recorded? Yes____ No ________
Appendix 10: Interview Guide

Questions were tailored for each interview participant and their relevant area of expertise regarding the Exchange District. The following is an example of the typical format used for the interviews.

Introduction

Hello ________________________, thank-you for participating in this research project about music and public spaces in Winnipeg. Before we start, I would like to let you know that you may end the interview at any point, and may refrain from answering any questions that are asked. Before we start, are there any questions?

Base Questions

1. Can you describe your role in working with the Exchange District, and what kinds of directions/actions you are taking there currently?
2. What are some of the opportunities and challenges facing Winnipeg and the Exchange District when planning and developing creative industries?
3. What have been some of the successes of the Exchange District in fostering creative and cultural industries? What has not worked out in the Exchange District?
4. Has the exchange district developed as a cultural/creative hub organically, or was there a deliberate plan to accomplish this?
   a. As a creative cluster, how has planning supported this, and what are the plans for future development?
5. Currently, there is no secondary plan for the exchange district despite a few drafts back in 2011. Why is this? Are there plans to develop one in the future?
6. There are a few funds available for redeveloping heritage buildings in the Exchange (and Winnipeg broadly), but I have read a few reports that cite the lack of funding as an obstacle...how is this being addressed, it at all?
7. How important is the heritage of Winnipeg in the development of culture and creative clusters in the City?
8. What is the role of Old Market Square and other public spaces in the Exchange? How do they help support creativity?
9. Are we starting to see artists getting pushed out of the Exchange (higher rents etc.)? What can we do to address this? Should we address this?
Questions Regarding OurWinnipeg and Other Planning/Policy Documents

1. How are you involved in the development of planning documents like OurWinnipeg? Warehouse District Plan?
2. OurWinnipeg, how does it affect the work of Public Works? What does this mean for your office?
3. What kinds of policies do you think would be beneficial for the Exchange District in order to enhance its identity as a creative/cultural hub?
4. What would you like to see happen in future plan development in the Exchange?
5. What important lessons from the Exchange District should be shared with other communities?
6. How can public works be better consulted with relation to heritage and re-development in the Exchange?
7. How has city planning or organizations like CentreVenture included you or your organization in the development of plans for Winnipeg's Creative Sector? How does communication work between your office and these departments?
8. Are you familiar with OurWinnipeg? How have plans such as OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities helped, or hindered, developing a creative cluster in the Exchange District?
9. Ticket to the Future was developed as a cultural plan for Winnipeg, what is its current status? Why was it not enacted? Has any of it been used? Do you think there is hope for another one?
10. Whatever happened to Winnipeg's Film and Cultural Affairs Office? Any point, is there hope for a Creative and Culture Office again?

Public Works Specific Questions

1. What is the relationship between public works and heritage restoration in the Exchange?
2. What kinds of policies are at work here for your office?
3. What are the biggest challenges faced by public works in the Exchange?
4. What are the opportunities that the Exchange district offers?
5. Do projects like Lily typically involve large collaboration between different departments? Does anyone spearhead these projects? Who started it?

Concluding Question and Statement

1. What lessons or success from the Exchange District do you think should be shared with other places?
Thank-you for participating in my research, it is greatly appreciated. Before we end, is there anything else that you would like to add?
Appendix 11: Excerpts from Economic Insights Into 13 Canadian Metropolitan Economies – Autumn 2017

(Arcand et al., 2017)

Economic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP at basic prices (2007 $ millions)</td>
<td>35,555</td>
<td>36,437</td>
<td>37,610</td>
<td>38,983</td>
<td>39,538</td>
<td>40,066</td>
<td>40,659</td>
<td>41,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment (000s)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (per cent)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income per capita ($)</td>
<td>42,245</td>
<td>43,897</td>
<td>44,268</td>
<td>44,957</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>46,930</td>
<td>47,629</td>
<td>48,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (000s)</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing starts</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,654</td>
<td>5,341</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales ($ millions)</td>
<td>11,048</td>
<td>11,306</td>
<td>11,782</td>
<td>12,359</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>12,929</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td>13,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI (2002 = 1.000)</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Economic Indicator Forecast for Winnipeg, MB. From Arcand et al. 2017

Construction, Commercial Real Estate, and Income Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,034,593</td>
<td>929,569</td>
<td>1,096,643</td>
<td>1,138,492</td>
<td>1,654,602</td>
<td>1,810,772</td>
<td>1,958,112</td>
<td>1,595,990</td>
<td>2,001,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>663,785</td>
<td>539,078</td>
<td>733,800</td>
<td>730,946</td>
<td>929,824</td>
<td>951,925</td>
<td>1,102,800</td>
<td>973,980</td>
<td>997,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential</td>
<td>370,808</td>
<td>390,491</td>
<td>362,843</td>
<td>407,546</td>
<td>724,778</td>
<td>858,847</td>
<td>855,312</td>
<td>622,010</td>
<td>1,004,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>37,844</td>
<td>41,212</td>
<td>42,749</td>
<td>30,739</td>
<td>172,501</td>
<td>81,731</td>
<td>63,231</td>
<td>51,145</td>
<td>191,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>267,957</td>
<td>247,522</td>
<td>214,087</td>
<td>253,744</td>
<td>411,496</td>
<td>452,974</td>
<td>589,116</td>
<td>390,092</td>
<td>588,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin. and non-comm.</td>
<td>64,997</td>
<td>101,757</td>
<td>106,007</td>
<td>123,063</td>
<td>140,781</td>
<td>324,142</td>
<td>202,965</td>
<td>180,773</td>
<td>224,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office sector

| No. of square feet (000s) | 7,159   | 7,159   | 7,159   | 8,248   | 8,495   | 8,527   | 8,551   | 8,632   | 9,440   |
| Percentage change         | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     | 15.2    | 3.0     | 0.4     | 0.3     | 0.9     | 9.4     |
| Vacancy rate (%)          | 5.9     | 8.0     | 8.9     | 8.1     | 9.7     | 10.8    | 9.9     | 11.2    | 8.9     |
| Employment (000s)         | 100     | 100     | 97     | 93     | 98     | 95     | 89     | 92     | 93     |
| Percentage change         | 1.7     | –0.2    | –3.1   | –4.3   | 5.2    | –2.7   | –6.7   | 3.4    | 1.5     |

Bankruptcies

| Consumer     | 1,317  | 1,614  | 1,301  | 981    | 836    | 776    | 747    | 774    | 913     |
| Business     | 42     | 24     | 26     | 30     | 15     | 18     | 25     | 11     | 12      |

*Information and cultural services; finance, insurance, and real estate; business services; and public administration.
Sources: The Conference Board of Canada; Statistics Canada; Industry Canada; CBRE.

Figure 14 Overview of construction and Real Estate in Winnipeg from Arcand et al. 2017
## Real Estate

### Downtown office market (2016Q4)
- Class A vacancy rate: 8.9%
- Average Class A net rent ($/sq. ft.): $17.34

### Suburban office market (2016Q4)
- Class A vacancy rate: 8.4%
- Average Class A net rent ($/sq. ft.): n.a.

### Industrial market (2016Q4)
- Overall availability rate: 4.1%
- Average net rent ($/sq. ft.): $7.41

### Apartment market (October 2016)
- Two-bedroom vacancy rate: 2.8%
- Average two-bedroom rent: $1,073.00

Sources: CBRE; CMHC Housing Time Series Database.

---

Figure 15 Real Estate Market Vacancies and Average Costs in Winnipeg from Arcand et al. 2017

### Housing Starts

(2011 = 1.0)

---

Figure 16 Housing Starts in Winnipeg, MB. from Arcand et al. 2017