

**CITY OF LONDON**  
**CREATIVE CITIES TASK FORCE**  
**NOTES FROM MEETING 03**

Meeting held on November 4, 2004 at 4:04 p.m. in the City Hall Councillor's Lounge.

**PRESENT:**

Task Force Members: Controller G. Hume (Chair), Councillor J. Bryant, Councillor C. Miller, J. Adams, C. Bryan, J. Glaser, P. Hoffer, C. Kehoe, G. Kerhoulas, J. Nicholson, B. Ohl, M. Sinclair, M. Williamson, J. Winston, R. Wood, L. Zajac

Working Group Members: T. Adkin, R. Gloor, A. Halwa, L. Wall, J. White

**ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Armistead, J.M. Fleming, J. Purser (secretary) and five members of the public including 4 Fanshawe College students who were in attendance for the first hour

1. Chair's Opening Remarks      Controller Hume began the meeting by listing the topics for discussion: more Big Ideas, soft ideas, culture and funding.

2. Discussion              Councillor Bryant mentioned that people need to have a sense of ownership of their communities and there is a need for more art focused gatherings. She said that art is seen more as a commodity rather than as a core issue in our community. Councillor Bryant switched her focus back to the issue of education by saying that we need to get Londoners engaged and that we should invest more in our schools. As an example she mentioned that orchestras and other artists should get out into the schools.

Controller Hume read out comments about the creative cities initiative received back from some London students. The consensus of the comments was that students generally do not stay in London and are not interested in London.

L. Zajac remarked that students will not stay if they cannot find jobs here.

B. Wood commented on how self contained the university is, so that the students may have no reason to leave the campus.

C. Kehoe asked if it is possible to get statistical information on the number of students who return to London to live.

J. Winston remarked that most university towns experience the same problem. Students return home to their roots and to the job opportunities.

B. Wood commented that some communities south of the border take a pride of ownership in their universities by wearing their colours, etc.

J. Winston asked if London mirrors the UWO profile. He posed the question "How many lawyers, MBA's etc. can London absorb?" He suggested that there may be better employment opportunities in London for Fanshawe College graduates.

G. Kerhoulas suggested that figures show approximately 20% of UWO students remain in London and about 80% of Fanshawe College students remain. He also indicated that

students need more co-op programs in their early years and at least in their second year.

J. Adams suggested that Hamilton, Windsor and Waterloo do not have the same problems because UWO is a different type of university. He said that London needs to 'capture' the entrepreneurs, the artists and the engineers.

A Fanshawe student remarked that young people in London may not feel that London is their home and that they do not feel a sense of community here.

Controller Hume suggested London needs a civic strategy to attract foreign entrepreneurs.

C. Bryant recommended that we need to inventory all the good things about London so they can be promoted and advertised.

Councillor Miller suggested that London can be proud of its museums and that some communities have grant opportunities for immigrants. She said that we need to do a better job at telling people what we do and what is going on in the city.

Controller Hume then turned the discussion towards money and financing making reference to the recommendations found on page 42 of Toronto's 'Culture Plan for the Creative City' publication.

J. Nicholson suggested that London should 'piggyback' with other communities to advocate these ideas to the Province.

J. Adams said that we need to see a visible leadership by London on these recommendations in the Toronto plan.

Councillor Miller asked about the viability of having an arts lottery.

J. Winston said that we need a strong Arts Council with clout. He suggested that the Arts Council should receive some of the proceeds taken from slots gambling.

J. White suggested that funding can really help increase artistic productivity. He said that artistic investment can return a big bang for a buck.

J. Glaser mentioned the Elsie Perrin Williams fund as a possible source.

B. Wood mentioned Toronto's Culture Division and suggested London's Arts Council profile be raised to be more meaningful to City leaders.

Councillor Miller said that we would be competing with housing for funds and she suggested subsidized housing with studio space for artists.

C. Bryan asked about incentives for business entrepreneurs. He mentioned the Windsor situation where heritage buildings have had their taxes reduced.

A discussion took place surrounding the recent Globe and Mail article about the ideas coming out of China - the adult fitness playgrounds for example.

Councillor Bryant mentioned London's three 'energy centres' and how we should try to make them work. She said we need to clean up the city and emphasize the smaller things like adding small parks and trees and emptying the garbage cans. Councillor Bryant showed a report describing what things people look for when buying real estate.

M. Williamson mentioned a recent conference in Toronto called 'Building a Community that Cares'. There were good ideas for converting buildings into community spaces. She also mentioned a Canada help loan program for creative initiatives.

Controller Hume asked the group to discuss what 'umbrella word' should we use to describe our creative city initiatives. Should 'culture' or 'cultural' be our umbrella word?

Councillor Bryant suggested the word 'culture' might box us in and she offered 'revitalize' or 'energize' as in 'Energizing the Forest City'.

Others suggested using 'creative' or 'creative revolution' or 'creativity and innovation' or 'how to grow a creative city'.

Next  
Meeting

Public Meeting at the Aeolian Hall at 6:00 p.m. on Monday November 22, 2004.

Task Force meeting in the City Hall Council Chambers at 4:00 p.m. Thursday December 2, 2004.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.