

MEETING NOTES

FOLLOW UP

Date	May 6, 2003
Time	6:00 pm
Location	Max Bell Arena
Purpose	Stakeholder Meeting - Extended Dance Event Bylaw Amendments

Prepared by: Trish Spencer (Law)

ATTENDEES:

Pamela McCluskey (Law) - **PMC**

Robert Andrews (Law)

Kent Pallister (Licencing) - **LICENCING**

Lucie (CORE) - **CORE**

Rave Community - (Approx. 40 various members) - **RAVE COMMUNITY**

-Specific Comments - **Dom & Tyson**

INTRO:

PMC:

- Review of the process around how a bylaw amendment happens
- We prepare draft bylaw and report, and in the end the decisions are up to Council
- Extended Dance Event goes to Standing Policy Committee on Operations and Environment on June 25
- Some/many won't be happy with draft bylaw, stakeholder ability to be involved in process is at committee;
 - That is when you can say good/bad
 - Reiterate - committee meeting; very important
- Can go ahead or stop there - up to Council or Committee
- Consultation process:
 - internal**
 - Fire, Engineering, Building Code Regulations, Planning, Transit
 - external**
 - Calgary Police Service, Alberta Gaming and Liquor
- We are doing the same thing with those stakeholders, exercise is balancing the needs of the internal and external agencies with the needs of the Rave Community
- At the end of the day: Law's instructions come from the Chief Licence Inspector

HISTORY

- Bylaw passed in 2000
- Quick process
- Had meetings within City Administration due to lack of knowledge about Rave scene

- Had meetings with predecessor of CORE, Regulation was not wanted but this was not an option
- Message from the Rave community was to regulate in a way which would:
 1. keep bylaw flexible, allow individual expression
 2. allow for varied sized 300-3000:
 - (a) therefore tried to make specific requirements a provision of each actual licence.
 - (b) How do you define these events - They are diverse, and value diversity.
 - (c) How to allow diversity but not capture everything - therefore 250 people provisions.
 - (d) At that time we were told bigger events were often put on by big outside promoters.
- Problem with the big promoters - if there are damages - no one to take responsibility and those events gave other events bad name
- Therefore we created broad charging provisions: "anyone who profits"
- We found quickly that some of the thing we did to try to make it flexible were sore spots in the community:
 - ie. -varied conditions, not uniform
 - requirement for Pay duty officers
 - application time frame, 45 days too long
 - \$250.00 licence application fee
- The Administration was directed to do annual review and amendments:
 1. too new;
 2. bad timing, no amendments.
- Current process because of:
 1. complaints from Rave community;
 2. Administration direction to review bylaw.
- Repeal of the bylaw is not an option
- What have we learned: Our process may have room for flexibility, especially written application process
- We are not seeing applications:
 1. 24 applications in our highest year;
 2. 5 applications last year; and
 3. 2 so far this year.

CORE:

- We thought the first document was great until we experienced the actual application of it, so our fear is that no matter what happens, it will be bad once it is applied.

LICENCING:

- Outdoor events: created problems with noise, but in the right location, we will still consider them.

PMC:

- We have focused on the venues:
 - So that we can address noise and neighbourhood concerns;
 - warehouses - are good because they are insulated, but bad because of the Fire Code etc.
- The new focus: we don't want to dictate the venue - you tell us the venue, we will tell you what you need in order to comply.
 - What we are attempting to create: tiered or graduated licence system, based on the number of people attending.
- The change since CORE last met with Licencing: do you need a licence for a Class "A" event? No, but you must notify of the event. (for EMS)

A= small event licence - No
 cost - No
 Notify - Yes
 AND the event must be in an approved venue.
 (*Land Use Bylaw* must allow for an entertainment use)
- Building Code: particular uses for number of occupants
ie. Bar - Cowboys maximum fire occupancy 700
 small bar maximum fire occupancy 150

RAVE COMMUNITY:

That is a problem for us because:

- There are not that many venues where this use can be reached affordably
- Venue: big numbers and big costs
- With small numbers, the financials don't make sense

PMC:

- Our desire is to make the smaller events easier to put on, not prevent them

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- If we get past 250 people, the event costs \$20,000.00
- Structure now - to go ahead, \$20,000.00 (rent) and \$3,000.00 (cops)
- The requirement for notification is great, it creates safety. You should do that.

LICENCING:

- If we are notified, yes we can check off that they are coded.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- If open (outdoor) event, would it automatically be "E"?

PMC:

- Be clear, Rave Bylaw is only one regulation also, be aware that you must comply with Parks Bylaw, Outdoor Concert Bylaw, health regulation etc.

LICENCING:

- A good example is the rugby party - Fire gave occupancy based on tents.

PMC:

- Tents equal structures, therefore Land Use compliance required, then structure is "A".

LICENCING:

- We will have to look at Land Use (and Parks) - therefore may need to be a change of use application.
- Extended Dance Event Bylaw does not create more regulations. These other regulations already exist and like everyone else - you have to go through the processes and comply with them.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- Then does the Extended Dance Event Bylaw amount to an amalgamation of various bylaws and rules?

PMC:

All regulations have to be followed, but the Bylaw gives you some breaks that no one else gets for "one off" events.

For example, the big new years party (@ Highfield)

- A full time position at The City was dedicated for 4 months - to coordinate it.
- Other outdoor events require very involved planning and City doesn't assist.
- Festivals in parks require lots of planning for months and we don't assist.

LICENCING:

- Snow Jam for example. Have to take into consideration: noise, licencing, insurance, certified blueprints of ramps & stages etc.
- If close to residential, no all night events will be allowed again.

PMC:

- We want to get it right because other municipalities are using our bylaw as a template.

RAVE COMMUNITY (DOM):

- Last party (mine) - Kent was very helpful.

PMC:

- Not sure of where outdoor events will fit but be aware of other requirements, such as requirement to be clean, health, water, washroom facilities, earplugs etc.
- Use of community halls (noise):
 - noise issues
 - qualifies as an assembly for the Fire Department
 - some have used Jack Setters Arena

LUCIE:

- Let's move away from outdoor to indoor.
- "Entertainment Establishment" - can we have a list? (**PMC:** No.)
 - will art or dance studio cut it?
 - if ever licenced for assembly could it fly with a Land Use change application?
 - do we have to pay application fee if greater than 250 to find out if fire occupancy is okay? (No)
 - each use different occupancy?

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- If already Coded for dance during the day, why not at night?

PMC:

To answer these questions:

- Call Planning for Land Use.
- 2 systems don't necessarily jive: for example, a laundromat may be ok to be a laundromat because has 7 parking spaces, BUT you can't turn it into a restaurant because parking requirements for a restaurant are totally different.

- Therefore
 1. Check Fire Code
 2. Check Land Use Bylaw
- In application of bylaw as it is now, licences have been issued for venues which would never have been approved for change of use. Planning has said use is ok for a "one off" event. But if there is a second use, must bring full change of use application. (Complicated)
- Land Use Bylaw creates land use districts. So find venue - go to Land Use to find out land use districts. Ask Planning - you won't be able to tell for sure without asking. For example, in an "I2 designation, entertainment use is discretionary.

LUCIE:

- Next issue #3 - Police costs.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- How did multicultural centre operate with out licence.
- That was illegal.

PMC:

- Under the proposed regime, certain categories will not have requirements for pay duty officers, (as of today A & B won't need them). Once you get to a certain size you will need them.

LICENCING:

- In the past, we have followed the opinion of experts - with respect to Fire, EMS, St. Johns Ambulance etc.. If there are minimum requirements everyone will have to live with them.

PMC:

- Minimum would be in the bylaw, and would be 4 pay duty officers for events greater than 799 people.

RAVE COMMUNITY (TYSON):

- Perception is that cops are taking advantage of overtime.

RAVE COMMUNITY (DOM):

- No, I totally disagree, there should be CPS at every event re: safety concerns.
 - I do 3500 person shows
 - Officers are on their own time.
 - You guys assume people will show respect, not the case.
 - They should be at every show.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- Will cops now set the standard for A&B events and require 4 officers? They won't tell us for sure why they set the numbers they set, and they rely on rumours to determine how many pay duty's should be needed.

PMC:

- This proposal is - No pay duties at A & B events but Calgary Police Service may reject it.
- Anything over 800, would require a minimum of 4 pay duty officers and Chief Licence Inspector may use past experience to require more PDO's.
- We cannot make any promises; it is a touchy subject and CPS may say NO to this proposal. Council is unlikely to pass a bylaw that does not have the support of CPS.
- You may want PDO's even if not required for A&B events, but if this proposal flies you won't be required to.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- We are afraid that if we notify, we don't trust police to act in good faith, even though we trust fire and EMS etc.
- Will you get back to us regarding licencing process for "B" events, if police will be notified?

LICENCING: Yes.

PMC:

- Our hope is for "B" events to proceed as follows: send in the form, check designations (building etc.), if approved venue notify EMS and Fire, and go ahead. That would be a win for you.
- Be clear, fire approval is as the venue is, not revised or decorated.

- Policy - events that we want to encourage from everyone's perspective are the events in category "B" : neighbourhoods, CPS, the venues, CORE, EMS. We want to make these events possible.
- Big change in this proposal is over 800 and 1500 people events.

LICENCING:

- \$1,500.00 application fee does not guarantee success.
- Also use Provincially licenced security if that agency has that licence.

PMC:

- Known Constitutional issues: in PMC's opinion, current bylaw would withstand challenge.
- Proposed changes would make it Charter friendly.
- Bylaw currently recognizes a Rave as an expressive event.

PMC:

- Wants solutions from round table. Would appreciate suggestions to help and make "B" events easier to have, and recognize economic realities and we can try to protect benefits from Police.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- Focus: NO PDO's at smaller events. Kent should provide us protection from CPS abuse as in 1st event.

PMC:

- Or strict requirements with respect to private security. You have to address CPS concerns.

RAVE COMMUNITY:

- Would rather spend \$3,000.00 on 25 security guards than on 4 cops.
- Any word from the Aldermen? **(PMC: No)**
- More progressive people on Council? **(PMC: Don't know how it will go)**
- Been floated? **(PMC: No)**

REITERATION: The proposed amendments go to the Standing Policy Committee on June 25th, 2003, and that is your chance to be heard.