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DIY: Making space in Toronto’s ‘Creative City’

Loren March

Introduction

Since the early 2000s, cities around the world have been enthusiastically restructuring their policy agendas in hopes of becoming globally competitive, and cultural policy has become an increasingly important aspect of urban planning as cities strive to become ‘creative’. Culture is now strategically deployed in the interests of urban regeneration and increasingly understood to play a complex role in processes of gentrification and displacement. In cities such as Toronto and London, the perceived authenticity of arts communities has been capitalised upon in the production of landscapes of desire in post-industrial downtown spaces and disinvested neighbourhoods. Yet as grassroots arts ecologies are instrumentalised in urban redevelopment, they are also disrupted and displaced. In the case of downtown Toronto this has long been the case, as rising property values and rapid upscaling continue to pose serious challenges to the establishment of sustainable place-based scenes and sites of cultural production, necessitating a variety of survival tactics and forms of ‘making do’.

This chapter discusses a specific form of bottom-up ‘place-making’ which has long been an important aspect of Toronto’s arts scenes and now appears as a collective and individual response to intensifying gentrification, urban redevelopment and top-down arts-led regeneration in the city: ‘do-it-yourself’ (DIY). DIY emerges not only as a popular scene in the city, but also as an important political and spatial practice and survival tactic in the face of urban change. I discuss the history of DIY’s employment in creative scenes and contexts in Toronto’s downtown, and its emergence in the context of Creative City planning. This chapter is part of a larger research project I conducted on spatial production in DIY spaces in downtown Toronto in 2018. I draw upon observations from site visits, semi-structured interviews conducted with 16 DIY practitioners working in downtown Toronto, and vernacular photographs taken by these participants, as well as upon policy and
media analysis. I argue that DIY can be politically generative when taken up collectively and is an increasingly important form of self-provisioning as space in Toronto becomes less accessible, but that it is also potentially isolating for individual practitioners and can be more generally interpreted as an expression of precariousness.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section details Toronto’s particular evolution of strategic cultural policy and the deployment of Creative City discourse. The second explores DIY practices, touching upon cases in the Toronto and London arts scenes. Here I also trace the ongoing ‘crisis’ of creative space in Toronto, highlighting the emergence of unique models of organisational spatial provision in each city. The third section discusses Toronto’s largely invisible geography of DIY spaces, as well as the often elaborate spatial practices of artists working under persistent threat from processes of gentrification that they themselves often contribute to. I conclude with a discussion of the Toronto case and the broader implications of DIY practices.

**Becoming ‘creative’**

In the 1990s, when hype around creativity emerged, Toronto’s planning and governance paradigms were strengthening neoliberal urban trajectories that were already being fostered in the 1980s (Desfor et al. 2006; Kipfer and Keil 2000). Intensified doctrines of competition and a distinctly entrepreneurial approach to planning and governance were levelled against a long-standing angst about the city’s perceived ‘lag’ in urban investment and development (Kipfer and Keil 2002). Large-scale redevelopment and revitalisation, ambitious place-making initiatives and visionary megaprojects were pursued with gumption in hopes that they would increase the city’s competitiveness. There was a concerted push for deregulation and intensification of development in Toronto’s downtown. The removal of provincial rent controls in the 1990s allowed for a rapid turnover of tenants across many downtown residential areas, while the deregulation of zoning in formerly industrial or manufacturing areas permitted unbridled development to quickly move in, allowing a kind of ‘instant gentrification’ to take place (Teelucksingh 2009). These changes allowed for widescale demolitions, conversions into high-end studios and commercial galleries, and for rapid upscaling through the development of luxury lofts and condominiums, the marketing of which centred around lifestyle and drew upon the perceived authenticity of displaced cultural scenes (Crawford 1993; Palmer 2000).

The Creative City rhetoric, as it emerged in Toronto, fit nicely into the city’s push to achieve a more globally competitive image. The doctrine put forward in the work of Richard Florida (2002; see also Landry 2000; Landry and Bianchini 1995) was enthusiastically taken up in urban policy, in the style of ‘fast’ (Peck and Theodore 2015) policies that are easily transportable between cities. ‘Creative’ policies have been differently taken up by coalitions in cities around the world, generally attempting to position culture and creativity as development opportunities and
consumer amenities, but following place-specific trajectories with unique social outcomes and implications (Grodach and Silver 2012). In London, for instance, ‘creative’ policies emerged in the mid-1990s, promoting the development of cultural hubs and clusters and focusing on the targeted funding and provision of arts spaces in ways that are different than what we have seen in Toronto, with different results. There are, however, similarities. Take, for example, the lack of clarity around the meaning or definition of culture and creativity (Neelands and Choe 2010; Pratt 2005); the explicit instrumentalisation of creativity in urban regeneration (Moreton 2013); and the tensions that have been observed between these policies’ social goals of inclusion (culture for everyone) and their neoliberal economic goals promoting competitiveness, consumption, meritocracy and the citizen-consumer (Coates 2001; Oakley 2006).

In Toronto, the Creative City planning model largely provides a ‘brand identity’ and a ‘unifying language’ to gloss over what are rather conventional economic development practices (Grodach 2013). Its strategy is geared towards urban economic growth and the instrumentalisation of creativity for economic purposes, subjecting cultural production to performance evaluation while promoting a kind of ‘creative’ citizenship which entangles notions of authenticity and self-actualisation with participation in consumption and entrepreneurship, and the adoption of a ‘dutiful neoliberal lifestyle’ (Grundy and Boudreau 2008, 351). Culture is valued insofar as it supports economic growth (Catungal et al. 2009; Finch 2015). Emphasis is placed upon the development of major institutions and the production of spectacular and exclusionary consumption-oriented landscapes of privilege (McLean 2014; McLean and Rahder 2013). Little attention is paid to already existing grassroots arts ecologies, to informal spaces, to politicised or subversive forms of art or to the actual labour involved in cultural production (Finch 2015; Hracs and Leslie 2014; McRobbie 2011; Rantisi and Leslie 2010; Reid 2006). In its attempt to become ‘creative’ at the beginning of the 2000s, in an initiative known as the ‘Cultural Renaissance’, Toronto spent over $900 million on culture-led development downtown. The Creative City discourse conveniently complemented urban redevelopment, revitalising major cultural institutions and sites of tourism and producing designated cultural districts through targeted place-making initiatives.

**DIY as a place-making tactic**

In the face of widespread urban change, DIY has offered a means to stay in place. While the term DIY has increasingly come to have a specific meaning and to connote particular places, we can understand both Toronto’s and London’s creative scenes to have histories of using DIY tactics to establish spatial stability in the city. Urban theorist Kimberley Kinder (2016) observes that DIY is a necessary form of adaptive self-provisioning in situations of urban disinvestment, filling gaps where particular needs are not being met. As a coping mechanism not necessarily directed
towards effecting systemic social change, it is nevertheless meaningful. As an individual practice that connects with broader social networks, it offers real benefits to those who engage in it. In both North American and European cities, we can see an increasing turn to collective self-help and mutual aid practices to accommodate both informalised working practices and the rise in freelance labour (Merkel 2015, 2018) – an important yet severely unrepresented part of the creative industries in both London and Toronto (Bain and McLean 2013; Mould et al. 2014). As a creative practice itself, DIY is also frequently associated with amateurism, craft movements and folk traditions (Dawkins 2011; Hawkins 2017). Practitioners are not always professionalised or recognised institutionally.

In Toronto, DIY holds a considerable amount of cultural capital due to its connection with particular arts scenes. Scenes, as urban cultural theorist Will Straw (2015) points out, are ‘publicly observable clusters of urban sociality’ that ‘perform the often invisible labour of pulling together cultural phenomena in ways which heighten their visibility’ (2015, 483). They are dynamic, shifting and impermanent. Daniel Silver and Terry Nichols Clark (2015, 425) define them as ‘multi-dimensional complexes of meaning embedded in material, local practices’. Conceptually, scenes connote a fluidity and ‘slipperiness’ (Straw 2002, 249) that is lacking in terms such as ‘community’, while also designating a tangible and publicly visible ‘space of enlistment and convergence’ (Straw 2015, 478) wherein people connect around particular tastes, practices, people and cultural happenings. In Toronto, a number of place-based arts scenes have emerged around DIY practices and politics, as well as specific venue or gallery spaces, which have been generative of a sense of unity and collective politics.

Over the years, an extensive DIY infrastructure has been established in Toronto at the grassroots level, including performance spaces, labels, collectives, online networks and studios, although a ‘DIY space’ is commonly presumed to imply a venue. Such spaces became highly visible after a wave of high-profile venue closures in Toronto’s downtown in early 2017. In recent years, DIY community spaces have provided important safe, accessible gathering places and much-needed alternative programming for marginalised practitioners who have lacked recognition and representation, and the persistent threat of losing them has ignited concern that the city’s grassroots arts ecologies are not properly appreciated by policy-makers (Finch 2015; Ross 2017). Some DIY practitioners believe that the City of Toronto is ‘not really interested in the arts’ (Interview, 22 February 2018). Many perceive the City of Toronto to be out of touch with their needs, expressing frustrations and disappointment with local institutions. One noted: ‘I don’t know much about any of the city’s cultural policies … But do they impact me? Yes. Insofar as some of the venues I’ve performed in have been closed or shut down’ (Interview, 6 February 2018). Of the city self-identifying as ‘creative’, another observed: ‘It’s very cute. It’s very cute that they’re down to identify as that … but being creative involves doing things that they are very bad at, which includes turning a blind eye to DIY spaces and noise complaints and just allowing these things to exist’ (Interview, 22 February 2018).
DIY scenes posit competing imaginaries of what a ‘creative city’ might be (Finch 2015; Worth 2006). Such scenes in Toronto often differentiate themselves from dominant institutions and express a sense of alienation from the top-down Creative City framework and its orientation around consumption. Nevertheless, while they tend to take an oppositional stance, they are also faced with the difficult task of maintaining this stance as they become successful or drawn into the mainstream (Finch 2015). Much-needed attention from the public and policy-makers can be a double-edged sword and can be costly, as visibility draws attention to the ways in which many spaces operate outside existing legal frameworks, subjecting them to scrutiny and potential closure (Rancic 2016). Practitioners complain that the City of Toronto is more inclined to close DIY spaces than to assist in bringing them up to code. In recent years, many DIY spaces and studios have had to ‘go underground’, becoming ‘hidden’ and ‘less accessible’ to avoid inspection (Interview, 22 February 2018). The tension between visibility and invisibility will be discussed further below.

Despite the seemingly recent emergence of DIY, Toronto’s creative scenes have a very long history of engaging with it. Looking to cultural historian Rosemary Donegan’s (1986) accounts of the evolutions of different cultural scenes in Toronto’s downtown through the twentieth century, we can see DIY as a long-standing and deeply embedded collective practice that is reliant on place-specific factors. Such practices were employed by artists forming their own scenes in the Adelaide and Yonge Street areas at the end of the nineteenth century. Donegan’s work reveals how through the twentieth century there was an increasing shift away from the bourgeois club mentality of previous generations, towards a style that pushed back against the cultural forms of dominant cultural institutions. Through this period, place-based scenes established themselves in Toronto’s downtown around Gerrard Village, Yorkville and along Queen Street West (see Figure 15.1), achieving spatial stickiness by relying upon localised and largely informal horizontal networks.

Figure 15.1  Map of different place-based creative scenes in Toronto. Individual DIY spaces are not mapped here to protect the privacy of tenants (map by L. March)
of support, as well as a large stock of unused industrial buildings and affordable live/work spaces (Bain 2006; Bain and March 2019; Donegan 1986). Scenes also made use of key informal venues or ‘third-spaces’ (Rantisi and Leslie 2010), which acted as gateways into various parts of the scenes and were used for networking, horizontal philanthropic practices, organising and creative experimentation (Bain and March 2019). The Queen Street scene in particular has been described at length as a complex social world in which economies of giving and co-creation, resource-sharing, anti-capitalist/anti-state/anti-art-market political imperatives and organisation around self-governance were prevalent amid the usual rivalries, divergences, tensions and internal dramas of a scene (Monk 2016; Tuer 1986). Many practitioners countered the established institutions they did not see as serving them, creating a ‘parallel universe’ (Bronson 2014) of organisations, some of which took up especially strong stances against the existing state-supported arts bureaucracy (Tuer 1986), and many of which are now important cultural institutions and key stakeholders in the Creative City.

Similar phenomena can be observed in the scene that established itself in various clusters throughout London’s East End between the 1970s and 1990s. Like in Toronto, a large number of disused industrial buildings in the central city were able to accommodate a vast number of creative practitioners and a diverse range of creative practices (Green 1999; Harris 2012; Wedd et al. 2001). While artists were drawn to the existing infrastructure of these neighbourhoods, other factors were also at play which allowed place-based scenes to flourish. For example, in London, the ‘relaxed planning regime’ (Green 1999, 29) of the 1970s played a large role, allowing artists to more easily acquire real estate. Furthermore, through this period various forms of government funding were made available to artists in both cities, allowing practitioners to start artist-run centres in Toronto (Bain and March 2019) and to start studio provision organisations such as SPACE and Acme in London (Green 1999; Harris 2012). Once established, these scenes were able to collectively draw upon benefits shared within their place-based networks. However, by the 1990s the increasing visibility of London’s East End scene and many of its collective antics led to rapid gentrification and extensive reinvestment in places such as Hoxton, as the social capital of artists as well as their active court- ing of the market generated buzz and appeal (Harris 2012). As artists and other tenants were gradually priced out, the area went from being ‘the place to be’ (Harris 2012, 230) to being perceived as populated by ‘posers’ (Pratt 2009, 1056), while its artistic identity continued to be used as a selling point by developers and real estate agents. Similar waves of gentrification in Toronto’s Queen Street West have displaced artists and arts institutions alike, with members of the scene declaring ‘The Queen Street is dead! Long live Queen Street!’ (Monk 2007) years before it was deemed one of the world’s hippest neighbourhoods by Vogue magazine in 2014.

Spatial stability has presented a consistent challenge to lower-income artists in Toronto. While unique convergences of land uses, cheap real estate, available infrastructure, government support and market factors have contributed to
the establishment of place-based arts scenes in the downtown in the past, and DIY
tactics have sustained them, the space of the downtown has been dramatically
restructured over time in ways that have made this more difficult. Further compli-
cating this is the fact that artists must seek out affordable areas with appropriate
spaces to conduct their practices (Bain 2006), but tend to make these spaces attrac-
tive to higher-income groups, thus becoming implicated in gentrification and their
own potential displacement in varied complex, tension-filled and context-specific
ways (Bain and March 2019; Grodach et al. 2018; Ley 2003; Mathews 2010).

Already in the mid-1980s, the media were describing a ‘crisis’ of space for
artists in Toronto’s downtown, as practitioners were pitched into a kind of ‘battle’
(Wright 1995) against development that threatened their displacement. At the time,
many artists were living precariously throughout the downtown in industrial spaces
that existed in a legal grey area (Yawching 1986). The Toronto Arts Council warned
that there was a scarcity of affordable spaces and recommended that the City of
Toronto move to foster the development of studios and facilities for arts organisa-
tions (Hendry 1985). Whereas London’s own scenes produced organisations such
as SPACE and Acme, Toronto’s Arts Council formed Toronto Artscape Inc. as an
arms-length institution tasked with addressing the mounting spatial crisis. Artscape
proceeded by renovating donated heritage properties into arts facilities and studios.
A series of reports produced for the City of Toronto also encouraged the develop-
ment of policy around artist housing and live/work spaces, proposing the alteration
of existing zoning and building codes to allow for mixed uses (Bain and March 2019;
TAC 1987). With this support, Artscape became heavily involved in so-called creative
place-making initiatives, eventually becoming a major property developer, a central
voice advocating for the Creative City at the international scale and a partner in
many of Toronto’s revitalisation projects (Lehrer and Wieditz 2009).

Meanwhile, in the London case, formalised studio providers largely came
together as a sector in the early 2000s. The logics behind studio provision which
emerged during this period very explicitly instrumentalise the creative workspace
in urban regeneration and community development initiatives and are grounded
in economic and social benefit rationales (Moreton 2013). Studio providers in this
context are increasingly professionalised, repositioning themselves as property
developers, providing spaces that are carefully calculated based on affordability
but also on goals of revenue generation, while at the same time tending to rein-
force classic romanticised ideals of the artist’s studio: white walls, high ceilings,
self-contained spaces. As Moreton (2013, 422) observes, these provisioned studios
represent ‘a spatial reconfiguration of ideas about models of creative/culture-led
urban development, cultural labour and value measurement’, and the ability of
many artists to engage in their creative practices is now largely mediated by rela-
tionships with developers holding these ideas.

As property values in Toronto’s downtown have steadily increased and the
available stock of appropriate arts spaces has decreased, there has been a mount-
ing demand for the kinds of workspaces provided by studio provision organisations
These kinds of studios both set the standard for creative workspaces in the city and are increasingly the only option available. Yet these spaces are also costly, difficult for more marginalised practitioners to access and inappropriate or off-limits for those with more disruptive practices (such as musicians). These kinds of formalised workspaces have also been criticised for the role they play in gentrification and the production of exclusionary space (Bain and March 2019; Catungal et al. 2009; Ilyniak 2017).

DIY workspaces: Facilitating labour under the radar

In Toronto, some practitioners have engaged in oppositional politics, mobilising against top-down cultural planning and urban regeneration which has threatened to dislodge existing pockets of artists (Silver 2012). Several DIY scenes in Toronto, such as those centred around Unit 2 or the Blank Canvas collective, have at various points mobilised around issues of gentrification and displacement, and have built strong grassroots networks in order to maintain a hold in the landscape. As noted above, in 2017 a strong community reaction emerged against the mounting ‘venue crisis’, with artists speaking out at City Hall and organising community discussions around the issue. At the centre of much of the discourse were DIY community spaces, the places where people come together and where work is seen. The places where work is made were hardly mentioned in these conversations.

On the production side, contemporary DIY workspaces tend to be more individualised and thus to generate less political action. This fragmentation could potentially be interpreted as a reversion to the individual studio from collective spaces that emerged between the 1970s and 1990s, as the downtown’s stock of disused buildings with large, shareable spaces has dwindled, options for appropriate third spaces have been reduced through gentrification and the costs of renting from formalised studio collectives have in many cases become prohibitive. In comparison with DIY community spaces, DIY workspaces tend to remain relatively invisible in the landscape, often flying ‘under the radar’ (Interview, 24 February 2018). Many of these workspaces bend legal parameters and policy guidelines, necessitating a degree of secrecy about their existence. Many spaces are located in practitioners’ homes, an unglamorous and often underappreciated or delegitimised site of labour (Black et al. 2019) that often goes unrecognised as an essential part of the so-called Creative City. These spaces also fail to adhere to the aesthetic and functional standards now set by studio provision organisations. They adhere to no particular appearance or typology and are thus not identified as properly ‘creative’ spaces. Many of these spaces have been taken up as a last resort because a separate, designated studio space is too expensive. The DIY workspace exists out of necessity.

Artists working in these circumstances actively engage in practices to minimise the attention they might draw to themselves. These include altering work hours, building elaborate work setups to minimise noise and smell (see Figure 15.2),
meeting with collaborators exclusively in third spaces, changing media or the scale of their work and in some cases changing their practice altogether to reduce outside impacts. Practitioners are not only aware of impacts that might get them evicted (noise, fumes, etc.), but are also aware of the role they potentially play in gentrification. While it is clear that their presence cannot be erased entirely, many sacrifices and compromises are made. As a result, in addition to being precariously employed, many practitioners work in precarious spatial circumstances, wrestling with conditions that are less than ideal. Practitioners often settle for live/work conditions that are below par in exchange for being able to continue their practice; they are willing to put up with more because of their lack of alternatives. As one practitioner put it (Interview, 2 February 2018), ‘you find your space and you hang on and learn to love it, and you never leave it until you are evicted because it’s the only option you have’. This adds further imbalances to already uneven power dynamics with landlords, which in some cases results in feelings of fear, helplessness or paranoia about eventual eviction – affective states which can ultimately make or break a creative space (see Figure 15.3).

The intentional obscurity of DIY workspaces in the landscape complicates gentrification narratives that identify artistic visibility and aestheticisation as triggers that set its processes in motion (Ley 2003; Zukin 1982). Venue and community spaces are arguably often already involved in gentrification at the neighbourhood

Figure 15.2  A DIY recording studio assembled in a musician’s living room in a rental apartment. The studio, in this case, has taken over most of the common area in a shared residential space. Note the practitioner’s use of foam soundproofing materials and an added curtain to protect against noise and vibrations travelling into neighbouring apartments (photograph taken by research participant, 2018)
level, due to the often consumption-oriented nature of their activities and the ways in which these attract attention and stimulate desire, contributing to the production of affluent playscapes. The necessity of visibility in public struggles over these spaces can also draw them further into complicity with the gentrification processes whether they like it or not, as ‘buzz’ is generated around them. Meanwhile, with DIY workspaces, practices of individual resilience to avoid displacement in many cases involve extremely elaborate attempts to draw as little attention to oneself as possible. The aim is not to develop a neighbourhood more broadly into a mutually supportive artistic milieu, but instead to maintain a small place of one’s own through determined practices of secrecy. Their atomisation and obscurity make it difficult for individual DIY workspaces to generate any sense of community around them, or to catalyse political action around issues practitioners face while working within these circumstances.

**Conclusion**

Creative practitioners and cultural planners in so-called creative cities are often engaged in very different kinds of place-making, and there are many incongruencies between the concerns and interests of each. The impacts of ‘creative’ place-making strategies that focus on revitalisation threaten to drive out many of the very creatives they purport to be enticing into the city. Meanwhile, the formalisation of

---

**Figure 15.3** Boxes of supplies remain unpacked within this workspace, as the practitioner occupies the space with the presumption that she will soon have to move again (photograph taken by research participant, 2018)
more collective spatial arrangements has led to the proliferation of developer-like studio provision organisations, who hold gatekeeper positions and have unique power to shape urban cultural production. In the case of Toronto, practitioners who cannot access these spaces, or can no longer afford the exorbitant cost of living in the city, migrate to the urban peripheries (Bain 2013), or beyond to nearby cities such as Hamilton, where both artist-led and municipally driven property development are already dramatically reshaping lower-income, working-class neighbourhoods (Bain 2017, 2018). Those who stay are pressured to rapidly professionalise and play the competitive game of artistic entrepreneurship or resort to alternative practices and the more horizontal support networks of DIY.

In the case of Toronto, DIY is largely taken up out of necessity, as practitioners seek more stable living conditions or success within existing Creative City frameworks which have largely served to render space less accessible to them. In this case, DIY might be perceived as an example of practitioners reacting to the ‘individualisation of risk’ (Bain and McLean 2013; Gill and Pratt 2008) encouraged within Creative City discourse, and adapting to rapidly changing dynamics in Toronto’s downtown. These practices have tangible impacts on individual practitioners’ work and lives and speak to broader precarious conditions of labour in cultural production in the city which are distorted by ‘Creative’ policy rhetoric.

DIY community spaces offer a more visible and public centre of convergence for political action around arts spaces, with the social benefits they offer marginalised artists backing an excellent argument for increased policy support. DIY workspaces remain in the shadows, yet these spaces represent important individual efforts to exist outside dominant frameworks in the face of precarity. While artists increasingly seem to be rendered precarious and isolated in such spaces, their plight is increasingly one that is shared. There is a collective desire for support and action around the spaces of work. Even as this research was conducted, participants expressed a strong desire to potentially meet each other to discuss challenges they face, breaking with established tendencies to shroud their work in secrecy. This speaks to a potential to generate action around them. Yet the response of arts communities to the Creative City in Toronto overall is complicated and not entirely oppositional, as many practitioners are implicated in dominant institutional and state frameworks, and many have internalised the Floridian doctrine: ‘be creative or die’. Practitioners rarely respond with targeted resistance against ‘Creative’ policy frameworks that do not serve them.

In the meantime, DIY is an important form of self-provisioning which allows practitioners to remain downtown, offering them some freedom to engage with creativity on their own terms while the pressures of the art market and of top-down policy frameworks and conditions of precarity remain. More research into the range of emergent DIY practices in ‘creative’ cities is needed. DIY spaces offer means to survive current conditions in these cities while also posing alternatives, and they certainly deserve further recognition.
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Note

1. Unit 2 has notably also been involved in mutual aid organising throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, directing energy and resources towards providing needed support to queer, trans and gender-diverse people, and especially those who are Black, Indigenous or people of colour.
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