

Neighbourhood Cultural Mapping: Lessons Learned from a Pilot Project in Bayshore

Ben Dick

Volume 5, numéro 1-2, 2015

Special Double Issue on Cultural Mapping in Planning and Development Contexts

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1076978ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v5i1-2.1466>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Centre d'étude en gouvernance, Université d'Ottawa

ISSN

1911-7469 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce document

Dick, B. (2015). Neighbourhood Cultural Mapping: Lessons Learned from a Pilot Project in Bayshore. *Culture and Local Governance / Culture et gouvernance locale*, 5(1-2), 83-99. <https://doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v5i1-2.1466>

Résumé de l'article

Le projet de Bayshore est le premier de trois projets pilotes de cartographie culturelle initiés à la ville d'Ottawa. Une cartographie culturelle à l'échelle de la ville a révélé que le quartier de Bayshore était moins doté au plan de ressources culturelles que d'autres quartiers de la ville. De plus, les indicateurs révèlent que le quartier en question est également un quartier à faible revenu qui est confronté à plusieurs problématiques sociales et économiques. Cependant, des entretiens auprès des résidents du quartier nous offrent une autre perspective. Ces entretiens révèlent notamment que les ressources culturelles de Bayshore sont sous-estimées puisqu'elles sont souvent intangibles. Il est révélé que les résidents du quartier tirent profit de la diversité du quartier le plus culturellement diversifié de la ville. Bayshore se caractérise par une diversité de réseaux sociaux informels et par une grande diversité de commerces et de restaurants. Cette grande diversité serait un facteur qui participerait au développement d'une grappe créative dans un quartier voisin. Cet article met en évidence plusieurs constats qui nous invitent à revoir et repenser comment la culture est construite et modélisée dans le cadre des projets de cartographie culturelle.

© Ben Dick, 2015



Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

Neighbourhood Cultural Mapping: Lessons Learned from a Pilot Project in Bayshore

Ben Dick
City of Ottawa, Canada

Abstract: The cultural mapping project in Bayshore was the first of three neighbourhood cultural mapping pilot projects in Ottawa. City-wide cultural mapping in Ottawa had shown Bayshore to have few cultural resources, and socio-economic indicators had shown Bayshore to be a low-income neighbourhood that faced many problems. However, discussions with neighbourhood residents told a different story. Bayshore has many cultural resources, though they are often intangible. Its residents benefit from the neighbourhood's cultural diversity, as it is one of the most diverse neighbourhoods in the city. Informal networks have been established in Bayshore that provide support to new immigrants, and a wide variety of specialty stores and restaurants have been established nearby to serve this diverse community. The neighbourhood's diversity may also be supporting the development of a creative cluster nearby. The Bayshore project forced the City's cultural mapping team to re-think the way culture is defined and categorized.

Keywords: neighbourhood cultural mapping, intangible cultural assets, informal networks, cultural diversity, creative cluster

Résumé : Le projet de Bayshore est le premier de trois projets pilotes de cartographie culturelle initiés à la ville d'Ottawa. Une cartographie culturelle à l'échelle de la ville a révélé que le quartier de Bayshore était moins doté au plan de ressources culturelles que d'autres quartiers de la ville. De plus, les indicateurs révèlent que le quartier en question est également un quartier à faible revenu qui est confronté à plusieurs problématiques sociales et économiques. Cependant, des entretiens auprès des résidents du quartier nous offrent une autre perspective. Ces entretiens révèlent notamment que les ressources culturelles de Bayshore sont sous-estimées puisqu'elles sont souvent intangibles. Il est révélé que les résidents du quartier tirent profit de la diversité du quartier le plus culturellement diversifié de la ville. Bayshore se caractérise par une diversité de réseaux sociaux informels et par une grande diversité de commerces et de restaurants. Cette grande diversité serait un facteur qui participerait au développement d'une grappe créative dans un quartier voisin. Cet article met en évidence plusieurs constats qui nous invitent à revoir et repenser comment la culture est construite et modélisée dans le cadre des projets de cartographie culturelle.

Ben Dick is a researcher/cultural planner with the City of Ottawa, Canada. He also held a cultural planning position with the City of Peterborough. Ben holds a master's degree in political economy from Carleton University. His research interests include cultural planning, cultural mapping, neighbourhood development, and place-making. E-mail: ben.dick@ottawa.ca.

Culture and Local Governance / Culture et gouvernance locale, vol. 5, no. 1-2, 2015. ISSN 1911-7469
© Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa, 55 Laurier Avenue East, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5

Mots clé : cartographie culturelle d'un voisinage, ressources culturelles immatérielles, réseaux informels, diversité culturelle, groupement créatif

Introduction

In recent years there has been tremendous growth in municipal cultural planning and mapping in the Province of Ontario, Canada. A province-wide review of municipal cultural planning led by Greg Baeker and Kat Runnalls in 2008-2009 found 24 municipalities that had created or were planning to create a municipal cultural plan. Dozens of other municipalities had incorporated elements of cultural plans into other municipal plans. In some cases this even included Official Plans, the most comprehensive land use planning documents produced by Ontario municipalities (Baeker & Runnalls 2009).¹ Shortly after this study, the Government of Ontario introduced the Creative Communities Prosperity Fund (CCPF) to support municipal cultural planning and mapping in the province. This led to a further expansion of both these practices, but especially cultural mapping.² As of 2009, only 10 of the Ontario municipalities that had a cultural plan had also completed a cultural map, but during the four-year life of the CCPF more than 60 Ontario municipalities used these grants for cultural mapping projects (Jeannotte 2015). The City of Ottawa was one of the Ontario municipalities that had a municipal cultural plan but no cultural map prior to the creation of the CCPF. The City applied for and received a grant through this program for cultural mapping.

Since Ottawa is the national capital, the federal government runs several major national cultural institutions in the city, including the National Arts Centre, the National Library and Archives, the National Gallery of Canada, and others. This had led at least some policymakers to believe that only a very minimal role for the City in supporting culture was needed because of the high level of federal support in the city. However, the mandate of the national cultural institutions is to promote *national* culture, not local culture.³ As Ottawa grew into a major urban centre,⁴ there was a growing sense that it was time for the City to take a more active role in promoting Ottawa's unique local culture. The City's first foray in cultural planning was the *Ottawa 20/20 Arts and Heritage Plan* (AHP), which was adopted by Ottawa City Council in April 2003 (City of Ottawa 2010b). The AHP included a series of strategic directions, policy statements, and actions. A five-year action plan was created for the years 2003-2008. There were longer-term actions as well. The AHP was to be reviewed and renewed every five years. The first update of the AHP, known as the *Renewed Action Plan for Arts and Heritage*, was approved by City Council on February 8, 2012. This new action plan covers the years 2013-2018. It is meant to build on Ottawa's strengths and reflect its unique identity. It is hoped that the renewed action plan will build pride in Ottawa as a culturally vibrant

¹ For a broader discussion of the changing role of municipalities, see Baeker (2010).

² The Bayshore Neighbourhood Cultural Mapping Project was part of a series of City of Ottawa cultural mapping initiatives that were partially funded through the Creative Communities Prosperity Fund.

³ This is not to say that the national cultural institutions in Ottawa play no role in supporting local culture – they do. For example, the National Arts Centre's Fourth Stage is used for community programming. However, this is not the primary focus of these institutions.

⁴ According to the 2011 Census, with more than 900,000 residents it is the second largest city in Ontario and the fourth largest in Canada by population (Statistics Canada 2011a).

city, and help to strike the right balance between Ottawa's dual role as the national capital and the home of more than 900,000 people (City of Ottawa 2010b).

Cultural planning in Ottawa is complicated by the fact that it is a very large and diverse municipality. After having been the home and territory of the Algonquin Anishinabeg First Nation for countless generations, Ottawa has gone through many changes over the past two centuries. Founded in 1826 as Bytown and incorporated as Ottawa in 1855, the city has had its boundaries expanded through numerous annexations and amalgamations. The largest and most recent amalgamation was in 2001. After amalgamation, the new City of Ottawa included: the former Region of Ottawa-Carleton; the former cities of Ottawa, Nepean, Kanata, Gloucester, Vanier, and Cumberland; the former townships of West Carleton, Goulburn, Rideau, and Osgoode; and the former village of Rockcliffe Park. In all, there are eleven historic townships in the present City of Ottawa.⁵ To put the physical size of the new, amalgamated City of Ottawa into perspective, the cities of Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary, and Edmonton (the core cities in five of the six largest metropolitan areas in Canada by population) could all fit within the City of Ottawa's boundaries! Since the city was built in pieces through many annexations and amalgamations, Ottawa has over 100 neighbourhoods and villages in urban, suburban, and even rural areas. Ottawa has one of the largest urban Aboriginal communities in Canada, a minority official language community that makes up roughly 15% of the city's population (Statistics Canada 2011a), and is the second most common destination for new immigrants in Ontario (City of Ottawa 2015). Few cities boast such a diversity of neighbourhoods and communities.

As a result of this diversity, there is a growing realization in Ottawa that a 'one size fits all' approach to urban planning is not desirable. Neighbourhood-level planning is needed. The City's Planning and Growth Management Department established the Neighbourhood Connections Office (NCO) to support neighbourhood-level planning initiatives.⁶ There is also support for neighbourhood planning within the broader community. The Ottawa Neighbourhood Study (ONS) – a partnership between researchers at the University of Ottawa, the United Way (a charitable organization), the municipality, and various other public, private, and third sector partners – began a research project several years ago that has identified over 100 distinct neighbourhoods within the city. They have compiled a large amount of statistical data and created profiles for each of these neighbourhoods.⁷ The City also recognized the need to do cultural mapping at a neighbourhood-level, and its most recent CCPF application included plans for three pilot neighbourhood cultural mapping projects. These would be separate from, but complementary to, the other neighbourhood planning and research initiatives, most notably the ONS.

Bayshore was selected to be the first of the three pilot neighbourhood cultural mapping projects. The Bayshore neighbourhood is bounded by the Ottawa River to the north; the Queensway (a major highway) to the south; Doane Street, Firwood Crescent, and Bellfield Street to the east;

⁵ The new city was created by the *City of Ottawa Act, 1999*, enacted by the Government of Ontario.

⁶ For more information on the City of Ottawa's Neighbourhood Connections Office, see: www.ottawa.ca/en/city_hall/improveneighbourhood/index.htm.

⁷ For more information on the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study, see: <http://neighbourhoodstudy.ca>.

and Holly Acres Road to the west.⁸ This is a neighbourhood that faces many challenges. As of the 2006 Census, approximately half of all children in Bayshore were living in a family with an income below the Low Income Cut-Off (LICO), a statistical measure of poverty used by Statistics Canada. Bayshore does not have a grocery store, and since many of the residents do not have access to a vehicle, accessing grocery stores in other parts of the city can be a challenge. The same situation applies to many health and community services and, although the neighbourhood is in close proximity to the Ottawa River parks and trail system, there are few recreation facilities in Bayshore compared to other Ottawa neighbourhoods (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011b). Bayshore residents spend a large portion of their income on housing (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a).⁹

Bayshore had not really factored into the City's previous cultural planning activities. None of the stakeholders who were interviewed during the development of the Renewed Action Plan lived or worked in Bayshore, and the neighbourhood has few conventional cultural facilities or recognized heritage sites. The city-wide cultural mapping work – which was the largest component of the City's cultural mapping project and resulted in the creation of the *Ottawa XYZ* website – showed few cultural resources in the neighbourhood.¹⁰ The cultural resource framework that was used to create the map on the *Ottawa XYZ* website focused entirely on tangible cultural resources using a conventional¹¹ definition of culture.¹² But culture plays an important role in Bayshore. The neighbourhood is a very close-knit community where residents gather for weekly potlucks and soccer games. Its residents benefit from the neighbourhood's cultural diversity and opportunities for civic engagement. Informal networks have been established in Bayshore to help new Canadians of diverse backgrounds to establish themselves in their new country. The neighbourhood's diverse mix of residents has supported the development of a varied mix of restaurants and specialty stores along Carling Avenue on the north side of the neighbourhood. As this article will show, the Bayshore project highlighted the limitations of the City of Ottawa's approach to cultural mapping. It showed that cultural mapping projects – particularly those that are framed by a pre-defined template for categorizing cultural resources with heavy emphasis on tangible cultural resources – can grossly

⁸ These are the boundaries for Bayshore used by the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study (ONS). While these boundaries are not universally accepted, for this study the researchers felt that it was best to use the ONS boundaries so that the ONS statistical data could be used. To see a map of the Bayshore neighbourhood (as defined by the ONS), go to <http://neighbourhoodstudy.ca/Bayshore>, then click 'View Map'.

⁹ The Ottawa Neighbourhood Study created profiles for each neighbourhood, including Bayshore, using its initial set of data (derived primarily from the 2006 long form Census). For the 2011 Census, the mandatory long form was replaced with the voluntary National Household Survey (NHS). The ONS team has updated many of its datasets using NHS data, but since it is a voluntary survey the data are not as reliable (especially at the neighbourhood level) and not comparable to the 2006 data. For this reason, the original Bayshore profile (using 2006 data) is still referenced frequently throughout this paper.

¹⁰ To see Bayshore's cultural resources, as defined by the City of Ottawa's Cultural Resource Framework, go to <http://ottawaxyz.ottawa.ca/map-search/>. Under 'Search by Location' enter 'Bayshore'. The map should zoom to the area surrounding the neighbourhood.

¹¹ I am using the phrase "*conventional* definition of culture" to refer to the way in which culture has been understood by local governments, particularly in Ontario. A discussion of what this definition entails follows later in this article.

¹² See Appendix A for the Cultural Resource Framework used to create the *Ottawa XYZ* map.

understate the level of cultural activity in a neighbourhood. The project forced the City's cultural mapping team to rethink the way culture is defined and categorized.

The project

The cultural mapping team reviewed the profiles and data for each of the over 100 distinct neighbourhoods identified by the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study within the city of Ottawa. Specifically, they were interested in the following considerations when selecting neighbourhoods for the cultural mapping project:

- Rural, suburban, urban
- Geographic distribution
- Socio-economic status
- Established vs. emerging culturally
- Potential neighbourhood partners (Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), community associations, etc.)
- Languages – English, French, other
- Inclusion of Indigenous/Aboriginal peoples
- Inclusion of new Canadians
- Diversity distribution
- Ease of gathering data (tangible and intangible)
- Neighbourhood improvement plans underway
- Community design plans underway
- Ottawa Neighbourhood Study engagement
- Existing engagement with community
- Support of local councillor
- Number and distribution of tangible cultural assets across all cultural mapping categories

Three pilot neighbourhoods were selected: Vanier, Bayshore, and Carp. Two of these neighbourhoods, Vanier and Bayshore, are in the 5th quintile in terms of socio-economic status. This means that their residents are, on average, among the lowest income earners in the city. Carp, in contrast, is in the 1st quintile, meaning that its residents are amongst the wealthiest people in Ottawa. The three neighbourhoods include a predominantly urban area (Vanier), a predominantly suburban area (Bayshore), and a predominantly rural area (Carp) that are in three distinctly different parts of Ottawa. Each of these communities was once in a different municipality, but was amalgamated into the City of Ottawa in 2001.

Bayshore was picked to be the first of the three pilot projects. The analysis of this neighbourhood included a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. The ONS relied almost entirely on quantitative data. Much of this data was from the Census, but other sources were used as well.¹³ Similarly, other cultural mapping work in the City of Ottawa had involved primarily

¹³ For a discussion of the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study's data sources and methodology, see: <http://neighbourhoodstudy.ca/about-the-project/>.

quantitative data (i.e., the number and distribution of tangible cultural assets). This data, as the team would learn, did not provide a complete picture of culture in the neighbourhood, but was still valuable to the study. Qualitative data was collected through a series of conversations with service providers, community leaders, business managers/owners, and residents in Bayshore. Interviewees were selected with the help of Bayshore Community Association board members and staff at municipal facilities in the area. The City's Equity and Inclusion Lens was also used when selecting interviewees (City of Ottawa 2010a).¹⁴ The researchers were looking for situations in which the 'on the ground' testimonial of residents seemed consistent or inconsistent with the quantitative data, as well as situations in which the conversations with residents were able to answer some of the questions raised by the quantitative data. These discussions were also helpful for understanding how residents feel about their community and its cultures and identities, and for understanding the role that culture plays in Bayshore. The neighbourhood cultural mapping pilot projects were initiated with the help of a graduate student researcher from the Institute of Political Economy at Carleton University.¹⁵

Key concepts: Culture and cultural resources

Culture has been described as "one of the most complicated words in the English language" (Williams 1976, p. 76). One of the most challenging aspects of municipal cultural planning and mapping is defining *culture*. The way that culture is defined at the outset of a municipal cultural planning project can shape the resulting plan. Having a very narrow definition of culture can lead to cultural plans that further marginalize already marginalized groups, while having a very broad definition of culture can be unmanageable in policy terms.

Culture is often associated with art. In fact, sometimes the words arts and culture are used almost interchangeably. However, this understanding of culture may be too narrow and can be problematic. Robyn Dowling (1997) explained that the way culture has been conceptualized by local governments has tended to favour the 'high arts' (opera, symphony, etc.), which has led to the further marginalization of already marginalized forms of culture. Stevenson (2005) has argued that cultural plans in the U.K., Australia, and elsewhere often end up looking like fairly traditional arts policies – just with a different name.

Raymond Williams, considered the 'father of British cultural studies', offered a much more inclusive definition of culture. He saw culture fitting into three broad categories: art, cultivation of the mind, and way of life (Williams 1976). The third category is particularly broad. It could include almost anything a person does in their day-to-day life – from eating at a restaurant to watching a hockey game (Mercer 2003). Franco Bianchini (1996) felt that it would be difficult for governments to make sense of this broad definition in policy terms. As a result, many municipalities have created cultural resource categories as a 'middle ground' between Williams' very broad (possibly too broad) definition of culture and the very narrow 'culture as art' definition (Kovacs 2011). In Ontario, the most commonly used framework for categorizing cultural resources has been one that was

¹⁴ This guide was developed by the City in partnership with the City for All Women Initiative (CAWI). It is meant to be a tool to guide the City's efforts to promote equity and inclusion in all the work it does. The Cultural Development and Initiative (CDI) team recently received an award recognizing its use of the lens.

¹⁵ The graduate student researcher eventually became an employee of the City of Ottawa.

developed by Greg Baeker, then adapted for inclusion in Municipal Cultural Planning Inc.'s cultural mapping toolkit (MCPI 2010). Baeker's framework had eight categories: creative cultural industries; creative cultural occupations; community cultural organizations; cultural spaces and facilities; intangible cultural assets (i.e., stories, traditions, customs, etc.); cultural heritage; natural heritage; and festivals and events.¹⁶ Unfortunately, only seven of the eight categories were included in the cultural mapping toolkit (intangible cultural resources were left out). Also, it is not clear how other resources that might be considered part of a local culture would fit in this framework (i.e., sports, food, agriculture, religion, language or dialect, etc.). Nevertheless, Baeker's framework certainly encompasses a much broader understanding of culture than the 'culture as high art' definition, while still providing a manageable framework for policymakers.

Ontario's broad cultural resource framework seems to be resulting in broad cultural plans, at least in small to mid-size cities. Research by Jason Kovacs has shown that municipal cultural plans in mid-size Ontario cities tend to address a wide range of issues – everything from social inclusion to making aesthetic improvements in the city (Kovacs 2011). Many of these plans address the intangible aspects of culture, specifically in regard to heritage (Kovacs 2011, p. 331). The stakeholders involved in creating these plans represented many different groups within the communities, as opposed to privileging the more established players in the cultural sector (Kovacs 2011, p. 334). When these plans do address the arts they typically include a broad range of artistic disciplines instead of just the 'high arts'. For example, the City of London used a definition of art that includes all of the "products of human creativity" (City of London 2005, p. 6). Meanwhile, small rural communities in Ontario have been the most likely to attempt to map, or at least document, intangible cultural resources. Research by M. Sharon Jeannotte found that two-thirds of municipals with populations under 20,000 that received CCPF money included intangible cultural resources in their cultural mapping projects (Jeannotte 2015). This was in spite of the fact that the intangible cultural resources category was left out of the cultural resource framework in MCPI's cultural mapping toolkit.

Not all municipal cultural plans in Ontario have been as inclusive as those reviewed in Kovacs' study. Some cultural plans are much narrower because they were created with a very specific goal in mind, for example, to become a 'global city'.¹⁷ The basic idea behind the global cities movement is that cities must become more competitive as capital and labour (especially skilled labour) become more mobile because of improvements in transportation and communication technology and because of liberalization of trade rules. This idea follows Richard Florida's creative class theory. The 'creative class' is described by Florida as people who are "compensated monetarily for their creative output" – in other words, 'paid to think' (Florida 2002b, p. 4). These people, according to Florida, are the engines of modern economies, and they are very mobile. Cities that can attract and retain the creative class will be the most competitive cities in the twenty-first century knowledge-based global economy (Florida 2001a).

¹⁶ An explanation of Baeker's Cultural Resource Framework is available on his firm's website: <http://mappingauthenticity.com/work/resources/concepts/cultural-mapping/>.

¹⁷ For example, see the City of Toronto's last two municipal cultural plans: *Culture Plan for the Creative City* (2003) and *Creative Capital Gains: An Action Plan for Toronto* (2011). The term *global city* is used often in these documents.

Municipal cultural plans with a heavy focus on the so-called ‘creative class’ can be problematic. For example, Joshua Long (2009) found that this approach to cultural planning can actually threaten the unique character of a city instead of enhancing it. His research showed that development efforts centred on the creative class in Austin, Texas, a city with a world-renowned music scene, are leading to over-commercialization and threatening the sustainability of the city’s creative industries. Another criticism comes from Nathaniel Lewis and Betsy Donald (2000), who argue that there is a big city bias in Florida’s work, and that smaller cities and towns are made to appear as inevitable losers in the creative economy. A third, and very common, criticism of Florida’s theory is that his approach can lead to gentrification and the further marginalization of already marginalized groups (Zimmerman 2008). The creative class theory is a form of ‘trickle-down economics’ – let the creative class flourish and benefits will trickle down to everyone else. Florida’s analysis tends to look at the aggregate benefits to a community of developing a strong creative class, as opposed to using class analysis to examine whether or not a stronger creative class actually benefits everyone else.

While a full critique of Florida’s creative class theory is outside the scope of this paper, the point here is simply to show the potential problems with narrowly focused cultural planning. This can be seen, for example, in Ontario’s largest city, Toronto. In Toronto, the desire to be a global city became a central theme of its cultural planning in the late 1990s and into the 2000s. In 1997 the former cities of North York, East York, York, Scarborough, and Etobicoke were folded into Toronto creating a municipality with close to 3,000,000 people. The City’s first municipal cultural plan after amalgamation, *Culture Plan for the Creativity City*, was created as part of a larger project that has been referred to as Toronto’s ‘Cultural Renaissance’. The Cultural Renaissance involved large investments from all levels of government and the private sector in several major cultural facilities in Toronto, including the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Four Seasons Centre for the Performing Arts, and others. The goal of these projects has been to transform Toronto into a global city that is able to attract capital and labour in the global economy. However, Mary Yu’s research has pointed to a number of other (unintended) consequences. For example, she has shown that the heavy focus on ‘elite’ cultural facilities has led to higher ticket/admission prices for many of these facilities, thus making them even more inaccessible to lower-income members of the community. Her research also found that the plan led to gentrification because it was used by developers to justify high-end development in what had previously been lower-income neighbourhoods (Yu 2009). Research by Michael Noble has called into question the plan’s heavy focus on the downtown. He found a number of examples of inclusive cultural and creative activities taking place in Toronto’s inner suburbs that may actually be threatened, not encouraged, by Toronto’s municipal cultural plan (Noble 2009).

It would be unfair to say that cultural planning in Toronto has been focused *entirely* on elite downtown cultural facilities. For example, their most recent municipal cultural plan, *Creative Capital Gains*, includes recommendations aimed at insuring there are affordable cultural spaces available and that the municipality’s support for culture is distributed throughout the city, not just the downtown (City of Toronto 2011). Nevertheless, the research by Yu, Noble, and others points to the problems of narrowly focused ‘creative city’ building and highlights one of the fundamental questions of cultural planning: Whose culture counts?

In Ottawa, 'elite' cultural facilities have not been as central to the City's cultural plans as they were in Toronto due to the fact that many of Ottawa's largest, best-resourced cultural facilities are the national cultural institutions. The City's cultural plans have focused on the local cultural sector, but still, limitations have had to be placed on what is included in its cultural planning and mapping projects. For the purposes of creating the *Ottawa XYZ* website and fulfilling the requirements of the City's CCPF grant, decisions had to be made to limit the cultural resource framework to tangible cultural resources that fit a fairly 'conventional' (narrow) definition of culture. The need to insure that a cultural mapping project ultimately results in a tangible product – a cultural map – is not unique to Ottawa (Kovacs 2009). Senior bureaucrats and city councillors expect a tangible product. When grants from other levels of government are involved there are often strict reporting requirements, as was the case with the Creative Communities Prosperity Fund. The point here is not to question grant reporting requirements and other accountability measures. Those are necessary. The point is simply that there are reasons (valid or not) for a municipality to follow a narrower approach to cultural planning, especially in view of the practical challenges with using a broader definition of culture in a cultural mapping project.

Bayshore from the outside: Key findings from the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study and city-wide cultural mapping¹⁸

One of the most significant findings of the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study, although it certainly comes as no surprise to anyone who has spent time in Bayshore, is that many recent immigrants live in the neighbourhood. About 45% of residents were born outside of Canada, with more than a third being recent immigrants (five years or less in Canada). These are the highest concentrations of immigrants and recent immigrants in Ottawa (Statistics Canada 2011b). The majority of these immigrants are from Asia or the Middle East (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a). More than half of Bayshore residents are part of a visible 'minority' meaning that, in this neighbourhood, being part of the majority makes one a minority (Statistics Canada 2011b).

Bayshore residents are fairly well educated. More than two-thirds of residents aged 25 to 64 have at least some postsecondary education. However, poverty is a major issue in the neighbourhood. The unemployment rate in Bayshore was the fourth highest in the city according to the 2011 Census (Statistics Canada 2011b) and roughly half of the children in the neighbourhood were found to be living below the LICO (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a). Few Bayshore residents own their home. Most rent either an apartment or a townhouse that is owned by Ferguslea Properties Limited and managed by Minto who is one of the leading property management firms in Ottawa.¹⁹ Many Bayshore residents (41%) spend more than 30% of their income on housing. This

¹⁸ The purpose of this section is not to give a complete overview of the findings of the Ottawa Neighbourhood Study (ONS) for Bayshore. The ONS was an extensive study that compiled a large amount of data for each neighbourhood in Ottawa. This section provides an overview of the findings that were deemed relevant to the neighbourhood cultural mapping project. For a complete overview of the ONS findings for Bayshore, see: <http://neighbourhoodstudy.ca>.

¹⁹ The ONS found that more than 70% of the residents of the area that *they* defined as 'Bayshore' were renting their home. However, the way Bayshore is defined by many of the residents that the researchers spoke with *only* includes the properties owned by Ferguslea and managed by Minto. Those are also the boundaries used by service providers in Bayshore, such as the Pinecrest-Queensway Community Health Centre.

can leave a family with insufficient funds for other essentials, such as groceries, and puts the family at risk of having to leave their home if their rent increases (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a). Therefore, it is not surprising that Bayshore residents tend to be more mobile than residents of other Ottawa neighbourhoods (Statistics Canada 2011b). However, despite having to move frequently, they were just as likely as other Ottawa residents to report that they feel a sense of pride in their neighbourhood (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a). Also, the percentage of registered voters who voted in the last mayoral election is over 33% higher in Bayshore than the city average, which may be an indication of high civic engagement (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011b).

There are very few 'formal' cultural organizations in Bayshore. Ottawa's city-wide cultural mapping database contains approximately 2,000 cultural resources, but very few of these are in the Bayshore area. There are not many designated heritage sites in the area, none of Ottawa's major cultural facilities are located there, and the City has not commissioned any public artworks in the neighbourhood. Also, the ONS found no formal religious organizations within Bayshore's borders (Ottawa Neighbourhood Study 2011a). This is despite the fact that this neighbourhood contains the highest concentration of Muslims in Ottawa (Statistics Canada 2011b). However, one interesting finding of the city-wide cultural mapping work was a cluster of creative businesses along Queensview Drive. Though not technically within the boundaries of Bayshore, it is less than one kilometre from the neighbourhood. These businesses are mostly in the film/television/animation industries.²⁰ Conventional wisdom in Ottawa was that creative enterprises typically located either in and around the downtown, where they could be in close proximity to one another and near the city's academic institutions, or in Kanata (a suburb on the far west end of Ottawa), where many large high-tech companies have built campuses. It was interesting to notice an emerging creative cluster in a part of the city that had few other tangible cultural resources.

Bayshore from the inside

The Ottawa Neighbourhood Study showed an impoverished neighbourhood, struggling with many of the problems that are common in low-income neighbourhoods. Meanwhile, Ottawa's city-wide cultural map showed little of interest in and around Bayshore, aside from the creative cluster on Queensview Drive, which is technically outside the neighbourhood. However, numbers and figures never tell the whole story. A closer look at Bayshore presents a more complete picture of the importance of culture in the neighbourhood.

Bayshore's apartments and townhouses are relatively affordable compared to housing in other parts of Ottawa. This is certainly one of the reasons why many new immigrants have found a home in this neighbourhood (personal communication with a Bayshore area service provider, July 12, 2012). However, it must also be noted that the rich cultural diversity of Bayshore combined with the strong sense of community felt by the residents and numerous community activities and opportunities for engagement make it a great place for new Canadians to live. This point was reiterated by everyone we spoke with in Bayshore. Many of the residents talked about Bayshore's community pot luck suppers, English as a Second Language sewing classes, sporting events, and other community events and projects. None of these fit into any of the defined cultural resource

²⁰ See Queensview Drive on the *Ottawa XYZ* map, at: <http://ottawaxyz.ottawa.ca/map>.

categories of the *Ottawa XYZ* map but they help welcome people from diverse backgrounds into the community and create a sense of belonging. As one resident put it, “It’s a place where you can feel free to be yourself” (personal communication with a Bayshore resident, July 11, 2012).

Bayshore has lots of opportunities for community engagement (Bayshore Community Association, Bayshore Advisory Committee, etc.) and lots of community events (Bayshore Fun Days, potlucks, soccer games, etc.). Although it is a community of renters, Bayshore residents tend to be longer-term renters, and civic engagement (at least at the neighbourhood-level) does appear to be higher than what would normally be expected in a renters’ community (personal communication with a Bayshore area service provider, July 12, 2012). The residents’ strong sense of attachment to their neighbourhood was demonstrated a few years ago when Minto began referring to the neighbourhood as “Accora Village” instead of Bayshore as part of a re-branding project. There is a ‘Bayshore stigma’ in Ottawa, since the neighbourhood is often associated with crime and poverty – not strong selling points for the landlord. But the residents of Bayshore view their neighbourhood differently. They have become so attached to Bayshore that a number of them even began pounding on the windows where a meeting of the Bayshore Advisory Committee (a group organized by Minto) was taking place, chanting “Bayshore, Bayshore, Bayshore, ...” following the name change (personal communication with a Bayshore area service provider, July 18, 2012). But again, neighbourhood attachment is not something that can be easily placed on a map, and there is nothing on the *Ottawa XYZ* cultural map that would lead one to believe that this is a neighbourhood in which residents would protest a name change.

The Queensview Drive creative cluster began in 1997 when a local film company, Affinity Productions, lost its space in Hintonburg, an area near central Ottawa that is gentrifying. Affinity moved to an old warehouse on Queensview Drive (an industrial road) where they found a sympathetic landlord who offered them space they could afford. Initially, they were there in spite of, not because of, the nearby residential neighbourhood. It was a challenge for Affinity to attract talent to the area during its early days on Queensview Drive. Now, the area is becoming a selling point. A senior manager at Affinity described how the diverse cluster of restaurants and specialty stores along Carling Avenue, on the north side of the Bayshore neighbourhood, has become an attractor (personal communication with a senior manager at Affinity Productions, October 2, 2013). These businesses have been built up by the diverse community of Bayshore. So although the creative cluster is technically outside the boundaries of Bayshore, the neighbourhood is contributing to its development – something that, again, is not apparent from the City’s conventional approach to cultural mapping.

Affinity has grown and spun off subsidiaries that also work in the area. Other creative enterprises have also emerged along Queensview Drive, including the award-winning animation company, Pip. In all, about a dozen creative businesses now operate in the area (personal communication with a senior manager at Affinity Productions, October 2, 2013). As mentioned earlier in this article, Richard Florida talks about the importance of attracting and retaining creative workers. He claims that there are “3 T’s” needed to support a creative economy: technology, talent, and tolerance. Florida has created a “Tolerance Index” (a combination of the Gay Index and measures of foreign-born residents and segregation) for measuring a community’s openness and acceptance of different people. According to Florida, in order to attract the best talent and create

new ideas, communities need to be welcoming and inclusive places.²¹ Bayshore is certainly a welcoming community, including more new Canadians from diverse backgrounds than any other neighbourhood in Ottawa. The Queensview Drive cluster is still fairly young. Affinity has been there less than 20 years, and most of the creative businesses have appeared within the past decade or so. It will be interesting to see if this cluster continues to develop alongside Bayshore.

Conclusion

Bayshore does indeed appear to be a culturally vibrant neighbourhood, though this is difficult for the City's cultural mapping team to quantify. The researchers found Bayshore to be a community that is rich in cultural diversity and that has many opportunities for community engagement. As mentioned earlier, the neighbourhood's informal networks have helped new Canadians of diverse backgrounds to establish themselves in their new country, and the neighbourhood's diversity has helped foster a cluster of interesting restaurants and specialty stores along Carling Avenue, which are now contributing to the emergence of a creative cluster along Queensview Drive. Everyone we spoke with in Bayshore felt that it is a special place with its own unique identity.

Despite the apparent importance of culture to Bayshore, the City of Ottawa's cultural map, as seen on *Ottawa XYZ*, shows hardly any cultural resources in the neighbourhood. This discrepancy highlights the limitations of the City's conventional approach to cultural mapping. It is not simply a case of the *Ottawa XYZ* map 'missing' cultural resources, but rather that cultural resources have been defined and categorized by the City in a way that overlooks key aspects of neighbourhood culture, particularly in Bayshore. The original intention of the neighbourhood cultural mapping projects in Bayshore, Vanier, and Carp was to pilot an approach to investigating the ways in which cultural resources interact within a neighbourhood to create a 'cultural ecosystem'. That continues to be the ultimate goal of these projects. However, the first of the neighbourhood cultural mapping projects, Bayshore, has forced the City's cultural mapping team to rethink the way culture is defined and categorized. Methods for recognizing and studying intangible cultural resources must be established.

Moving forward

The City of Ottawa's approach to cultural mapping has already broadened somewhat since the Bayshore project. The *Ottawa XYZ* website features a stories section which provides a space for documenting and sharing intangible culture. This section includes stories from each of the pilot neighbourhoods. Articles are also posted on the site, which can address aspects of culture that are not visible on the map. These features were not fully developed when the website launched (as noted earlier in this article, the cultural mapping team had to deal with the practical challenges of meeting deadlines and grant requirements), but it is hoped that they can be expanded in the future. As Jeannotte's research has shown, Ottawa is not the only Ontario municipality to see a need to deviate from the approach to cultural mapping described in the MCPI's toolkit (Jeannotte 2015). Perhaps now is the time to develop an expanded toolkit for cultural mapping in Ontario, with a

²¹ An explanation of the Tolerance Index can be found in Florida (2012). Neighbourhood-level data for Ottawa was not available at the time of writing, so it is not known where Bayshore scores on this index.

greater emphasis on community-driven approaches to neighbourhood cultural mapping that recognize the importance of intangible cultural resources.

References

- Baeker, G. (2010). *Rediscovering the Wealth of Places: A Municipal Cultural Planning Handbook for Canadian Municipalities*. Union, ON: Municipal World.
- Baeker, G. & Runnalls, K. (2009). *2008-2009 Municipal Cultural Planning Survey Project: The State of Municipal Cultural Planning in Ontario*. Toronto: Ministry of Culture, Government of Ontario.
- Bianchini, F. (1996). Cultural planning: An innovative approach to urban development. In J. Verwijnen & P. Lehtovuori (eds.), *Managing Urban Change* (pp. 18-25). Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki.
- City of London. (2005). *The Creative City Task Force Report*. London, ON: City of London.
- City of Ottawa. (2003). *Ottawa 20/20 Arts and Heritage Plan*. Ottawa: City of Ottawa.
- City of Ottawa. (2010a). *Equity and Inclusion Lens: A User's Guide*. Ottawa: City of Ottawa.
- City of Ottawa. (2010b). *Ottawa 20/20 Arts and Heritage Plan Renewal Steering Committee Terms of Reference – Background*. <http://ottawa.ca/calendar/ottawa/citycouncil/occ/2010/04-28/cpsc/02%20-%20ACS2010-COS-PRC-0005%20TOR%20-%20Annex%20%20ENG.htm> [15 August 2012]
- City of Ottawa. (2012). *A Renewed Action Plan for Arts, Heritage, and Culture in Ottawa (2013-2018)*. Ottawa: City of Ottawa.
- City of Ottawa. (2014). *Ottawa XYZ*. <http://ottawaxyz.ottawa.ca> [7 October 2015]
- City of Ottawa. [2015]. Immigration Ottawa – a portrait of Ottawa. <http://ottawa.ca/en/immigration/why-choose-ottawa/portrait-ottawa> [22 August 2015].
- City of Ottawa Act, 1999*. www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/99c14e [2 October 2015]
- City of Toronto. (2003). *Culture Plan for the Creative City*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2008, February). *Creative City Planning Framework*. Prepared for the City of Toronto by AuthentiCity.
- City of Toronto. (2011). *Creative Capital Gains: An Action Plan for Toronto*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- Dowling, R. (1997). Planning for culture in urban Australia. *Australian Geographical Studies*, 35(1): 23-31.
- Florida, R. (2002a). Bohemia and economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2: 55-71.
- Florida, R. (2002b). *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.
- Florida, R. (2012). *The Rise of the Creative Class: Revisited*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2015). Cultural mapping in Ontario: The big picture. In N. Duxbury, W.F. Garrett-Petts & D. MacLennan (eds.), *Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry* (pp. 99-116). New York: Routledge.
- Kovacs, J. (2009). *The Cultural Turn in Municipal Planning*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Planning, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON.
- Kovacs, J.F. (2011). Cultural planning in Ontario, Canada: Arts policy or more? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(3): 321-340.
- Lewis, N.M. & Donald, B. (2000). A new rubric for 'creative city' potential in Canada's smaller cities. *Urban Studies*, 37(4): 639-649.
- Long, J. (2009). Sustaining creativity in the creative archetype: The case of Austin, Texas. *Cities*, 26(4): 210-219.
- Mercer, C. (2003, May 15). Making culture, diversity and development walk and talk together: Cultural mapping and cultural planning. Report presented at the seminar "Diversity and Coexistence: The Role of Cultural Policy for Global Development," Stockholm, Sweden.

- Municipal Cultural Planning Inc. (MCPI). (2010). *Cultural Resource Mapping: A Guide for Municipalities*. Toronto: MCPI.
- Noble, M. (2009). *Lovely Spaces in Unknown Places: Creative City Building in Toronto's Inner-suburbs*. Toronto: Cities Centre, University of Toronto.
- Ottawa Neighbourhood Study. (2011a). Bayshore profile (original). (Original data no longer online.)
- Ottawa Neighbourhood Study. (2011b). Neighbourhood maps. <http://neighbourhoodstudy.ca/neighbourhood-maps-2011/> [24 March 2014]
- Statistics Canada. (2011a). *2011 Census*. www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/index-eng.cfm
- Statistics Canada. (2011b). *National Household Survey, 2011*. www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/index-eng.cfm
- Stevenson, D. (2005). Cultural planning in Australia: Text and contexts. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 35(1): 36-48.
- Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana.
- Yu, M. (2009). *The Making of a Creative City: An Analysis of Toronto's Culture Plan and Cultural Planning in Toronto*. Unpublished master's thesis, Canadian Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Zimmerman, J. (2008). From brew town to cool town: Neoliberalism and the creative city development strategy in Milwaukee. *Cities*, 25: 230-242.

Appendix A: Ottawa XYZ Cultural Resource Framework

1. Heritage Properties:

This includes buildings and sites of historical and cultural value, including heritage designations.

- a) Local: These are properties that the City of Ottawa has designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- b) National: These are properties that have been designated national historic sites.

2. Heritage Districts:

These are properties that the City of Ottawa has designated as Heritage Conservation Districts under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

3. Festivals:

This includes events and festivals that occur on an annual or regular, predictable basis that involve, promote, and/or celebrate art, heritage, and/or identity.

- a) Fairs and Food
- b) Comedy
- c) Electronic Arts
- d) Fashion
- e) Film and Video
- f) Heritage
- g) Identity
- h) Literature
- i) Multidisciplinary Arts

- j) Music
- k) Neighbourhood
- l) Theatre and Dance
- m) Visual Arts

4. Facilities:

These are buildings and sites that host cultural activity on a regular basis and are open to the public.

- a) Dance Education: This includes instruction in all forms of dance.
- b) Music Education: This includes instruction in all forms of instrumental and vocal music.
- c) Theatre Education: This includes instruction in all forms of theatre, speech, and drama, including acting for film.
- d) Visual Arts Education: For the purposes of this sub-subcategory, visual arts are being broadly defined to include: drawing/sketching, painting, sculpture, print-making, mixed media, crafts (i.e., pottery, glassworks, jewellery-making, etc.), photography, and other art forms that produce a tangible (visual) work.
- e) Galleries: These are spaces that present various visual forms of art.
- f) Studios: These are spaces that provide space for artists from any discipline (which could include hobbyists, amateurs, and professionals at any stage of their career) to create their work, excluding studios that are primarily for educational purposes, as those are included in the “Arts Educational Venues” subcategory.
- g) Archives: These are places that preserve and store original historical documents and records on behalf of past, present, and future generations.
- h) Cultural Centres: These are places that celebrate the identity of a community, and usually act as a gathering place for that community.
- i) Museums: These are places, open to the public, that acquire, conserve, research, communicate, and exhibit material evidence of people and their environment (artefacts). Also included here are interpretive centres – a special type of museum that is usually associated with a cultural or natural heritage site.
- j) Fairgrounds: These are places that celebrate rural culture and heritage, primarily through hosting an annual rural fair, but also by serving as a place for rural community events throughout the year.
- k) Nightclubs and Bars/Cafes: These are spaces that regularly host live performances, though their primary role may be related to food and drink.
- l) Outdoor: This includes public squares, plazas, and parks that regularly host performances.
- m) Theatres: These are facilities that are designed to host artistic performances and/or rehearsals.

5. Organizations:

These are organizations that are incorporated as not-for-profits, and that deliver activities related to the arts, heritage, festivals, and/or fairs. Initially, only organizations that receive funding from the City’s Cultural Funding Program have been included, and they are categorized based on the program from which they were funded. We hope to expand this list over time.

- a) Arts
- b) Heritage
- c) Festivals/Fairs

6. Businesses:

This includes businesses and not-for-profit organizations involved in the creation, production, manufacturing, and distribution of cultural goods.

- a) Education: These are businesses that provide arts education in any art form.
- b) Supplies: These are businesses that sell supplies used for the creation and practice of various forms of art.
- c) Bookstores: These are businesses that sell books and other literature.
- d) Broadcasting: This includes for-profit radio and television broadcasters.
- e) Commercial Galleries: These are art galleries that display works of visual art that are for sale.
- f) Film and Video: These are businesses involved in the production, editing, distribution, and screening of film, video, and animated productions.
- g) Gaming: These are businesses that develop video and computer games.
- h) Heritage Trades: These are businesses that work to restore and preserve objects, buildings, and sites of historical significance, and are recognized as trained, qualified experts in their field.
- i) Photography: These are commercial photographers that do creative work.
- j) Publishing: These are businesses that publish a variety of literature and media, including books, periodicals, magazines, and newspapers.
- k) Recording: These are businesses that produce and record music.

7. Cultural Umbrella and Service Organizations:

This includes organizations that represent arts, heritage, festival/fair, and ethnocultural interests through services, advocacy, coordination, funding, and other forms of support. They are categorized by the area/jurisdiction that they cover (local/regional, provincial, national).

- a) Local/Regional
- b) Provincial
- c) National

8. Natural Heritage:

This includes areas that have been recognized (locally, provincially, nationally, or internationally) as having significant natural features, that are in public ownership, and that will not be unduly harmed by public use. They are categorized by their highest level of designation.

- a) International Designation
- b) National Designation
- c) Provincial Designation
- d) Local Designation

9. Public Art:

This includes works of visual art that were commissioned to be displayed in public places, such as parks, community centres, libraries, or recreation facilities. Initially, only municipal public art commissions (from the City's Percent for Art policy) have been included, but we hope to expand this list over time.