The social and cultural values of live music: Sustaining urban live music ecologies

Arno van der Hoeven[a],[*], Erik Hitters[b]

[a] Erasmus Research Centre for Media, Communication and Culture, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3062 PA Rotterdam, the Netherlands
[b] Erasmus Research Centre for Media, Communication and Culture, Erasmus University, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an overview of the social and cultural values attributed to live music ecologies in urban environments. It is grounded in a qualitative content analysis of live music reports and strategies from Australia, the United States, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Scotland and the Netherlands. Contributing to the emerging scholarly literature on urban live music ecologies, this study enhances the understanding of the social and cultural merits of popular music concerts to cities. To date, the ways in which the social and cultural values of urban live music ecologies can be supported has received too little attention, because the emphasis in the public discourse has been on the economic impact of music-making. In our analysis, we found three different dimensions for social value (social capital, public engagement and identity) and three for cultural value (musical creativity, cultural vibrancy and talent development). Furthermore, we discuss how these values can be supported through specific cultural policies and urban planning interventions.

1. Introduction

Popular music concerts are a vital element in urban cultures (Homan, 2010). Cohen (2012, p. 587) defines live music as "events that bring musicians and audiences together in one place at one time and involve performance on vocals or other music instruments and technologies, or with music recordings". In recent years, the concept of live music ecologies has gained ground in academic and policy circles to describe the networks of venues, festivals and social actors that constitute live music performances (Behr, Brennan, Cloonan, Frith, and Webster, 2016). Both researchers and policy makers in cities seek to understand how urban live music ecologies can be optimised in order to achieve economic, social and cultural goals. Live music is understood as a valuable asset because, among other benefits, it can help to attract tourists to cities, offers a sense of belonging, and contributes to a thriving cultural environment (Hudson, 2006; Martin, 2017; Wynn, 2015).

This paper specifically focuses on the social and cultural values of live popular music for cities. Various authors argue that these values are often overshadowed by economic considerations (Behr, Brennan, and Cloonan, 2016; Brown, Getz, Pettersson, and Wallstam, 2015; Hutter and Throsby, 2008; Martin, 2017). The public discourse on the value of live music has a strong emphasis on the economic impact of the music industry in terms of job creation, increased tourism and consumer spending (e.g. Australasian Performing Right Association, 2011; Carter and Muller, 2015). This discourse has been important to provide local politicians and policy-makers with evidence of live music's relevance. However, less is known about the ways in which the social and cultural values of urban live music ecologies can be understood and enhanced. This has partly to do with the fact that social and cultural values are more difficult to measure (Behr, Brennan, and Cloonan, 2016). Therefore we pose the following research question: What are the social and cultural values attributed to live music ecologies in urban environments? Furthermore, we will examine which policy conditions can support the achievement of those values. This enables us to contribute to the emerging literature on urban music ecologies by enhancing the understanding of the social and cultural merits of live popular music. The study answers the call for comparative research on urban live music policies (Baird and Scott, 2018) as it synthesises best practices from a wide range of geographical settings. It thus provides insight into how 'healthy' music ecologies may be achieved and effectively supported.

We will answer the research question by analysing grey literature (e.g. music reports and strategies) from Australia, the United States, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. The analysis of these documents offers a rich perspective on the relationships between social and cultural value, live music performance and urban development. They are often commissioned by the

---

* Corresponding author.
  E-mail addresses: vanderhoeven@eshcc.eur.nl (A. van der Hoeven), hitters@eshcc.eur.nl (E. Hitters).

music sector to understand and prove the relevance of public investments in the local live music infrastructure. The reports that we analysed thus shed light on the ways in which a range of different actors (e.g. local governments, consultancy firms and music industry organisations) addresses the benefits of live music to cities. While some mainly focus on the economic impacts, most of these reports open up a wider perspective on the values of live music. Moreover, these documents also discuss the policy interventions required to support local music ecologies.

The paper is divided into four parts. In the first part, we discuss extant literature on the value of culture and music for urban policy. It then moves on to the methodological background of this study. Next, we discuss a conceptualisation of the social and cultural value of live music and the indicators of these values (i.e. the concrete spaces, activities and characteristics that reflect these values). We present three different dimensions for social value (social capital, public engagement and identity) and three for cultural value (musical creativity, cultural vibrancy and talent development). Finally, we discuss a range of urban planning interventions that could support those values.

2. Theoretical perspectives

Live music ecologies are subject to urban policies and political decision making processes (Lobato, 2006). While some policies might have a direct effect, for example in the case of subsidies for venues, other policies have indirect consequences (Behr, Brennan, Cloonan, et al., 2016; Cloonan, 2011). Examples of the latter are urban planning decisions that have knock-on effects for live music performing, such as the availability of public transport for concert-goers (Whiting and Carter, 2016). Furthermore, liquor laws and licensing conditions have an important impact on the live music industry, because they regulate where alcohol can be sold and at what times (Homan, 2017). Live music ecologies are thus affected by a range of policies and regulatory actors, addressing potentially conflicting interests such as maintaining public order, supporting the cultural sector and fostering economic growth (Ballico and Carter, 2018).

As will be discussed in this literature review, live music's reliance on policy-making implies that it is connected to wider debates about the value of culture (Behr, Brennan, and Cloonan, 2016; Lobato, 2006). If politicians and civil servants develop policies that affect the live music sector, they inevitably need to assess its various potential positive and negative effects. This concerns a process of valuing in which different social actors (e.g. politicians, real estate investors, venue owners) make claims about live music's perceived merits, reflecting the interests of the various parties involved (Martin, 2017). In order to understand this relationship between policy-making and the social and cultural value of live music for cities, we now turn to literature on valuing culture, the instrumentalisation of culture in urban policy, and research on urban live music policy specifically.

2.1. The value of culture

Important contributions to the debate about the valuing of cultural goods have been made in the field of cultural economics. As Throsby (2001, p. 19) argues, the notion of value connects the fields of economics and culture as an expression of worth:

> In the economic domain, value has to do with utility, price and the worth that individuals or markets assign to commodities. In the case of culture, value subsists in certain properties of cultural phenomena, expressible either in specific terms, such as the value of a musical note or the value of a colour in a painting, or in general terms as an indication of the merit or worth of a work, an object, an experience or some other cultural thing.

While there is consensus in the field of cultural economics about economic value as a measure of the various financial profits that

cultural goods generate, the concept of cultural value raises questions of definition (Angelini and Castellani, 2017). According to Throsby, the concept of cultural value can be disaggregated in several constituent elements such as aesthetic value, spiritual value, historical value and, important for the analysis in this article, social value. While Klamer (2004, p. 150) largely agrees with Throsby's distinction between economic and cultural value, he understands social value as a separate category that concerns a sense of belonging, identity and social distinction:

> Confusion occurs because "cultural" in the anthropological sense refers to social values, that is, values pertaining to the relations between and among people. I use "cultural" to express a value that transcends social, relational, or, for that matter, economic values.

In this article we follow Klamer's tripartite distinction between cultural, social and economic value, because we find it important to analyse the artistic qualities of a cultural good as separate from its social and economic merits. Indeed, the intrinsic values of culture are often overlooked. Following McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, and Brooks (2004), the intrinsic values refer to "effects inherent in the arts experience that add value to people's lives" (p. 37), such as joy, pleasure, emotional stimulation and meaning. Emphasising this intrinsic value of culture is vital if we consider how culture is increasingly used in cities to achieve particular social and economic goals.

2.2. Instrumentalising culture in urban policy

Previous research has indicated that in the public rationalization of cultural policy in most Western countries, the emphasis has shifted from social legitimacy in the 1960s to a much more rational and instrumental legitimacy over the last three decades (Pratt and Hesmondhalgh, 2005). This shift is most apparent at the local level (Hitters, 2007; Bianchini and Parkinson, 1994; Blomkamp, 2014; Evans, 2009). The many directly available alternative policy objectives to which funds can be allocated, increases the need to justify spending on culture. Consequently, local political advocates who aim to support culture with public funds tend to emphasise the many positive external effects of culture in spatial and socio-economic development (e.g. Bianchini and Parkinson, 1994; Evans, 2009). As part of urban regeneration strategies, culture is increasingly used to create a new cosmopolitan image. In an atmosphere of growing interurban competition, increasing mobility of capital and the waning importance of physical location factors, cities now profile themselves by investing in the cultural and creative sectors. Zukin (1995, p. 1–2) was one of the first to draw attention to this new 'symbolic economy' of culture for cities: "With the disappearance of local manufacturing industries and periodic crises in government and finance, culture is more and more the business of cities – the basis of their tourist attractions and their unique, competitive edge".

Since the start of the new millennium, cultural policies progressively adopted programmes of investment in the "all inclusive" creative industries, embedded in wider urban planning policies revolving around the promising concept of creative cities (Grodach, 2017). A focus on creativity, popular culture and events could provide an answer to the multicultural, creative and young population of the city that increasingly became estranged from traditional cultural provisions. This resulted in an expanding field for cultural policy, with a diffusion of the boundaries of legitimate (high) culture to a policy including community culture, popular music, creative industries, festivals and the media. Especially the staging and promotion of cultural festivals has become an accepted planning tool for urban economic development and city branding (Jakob, 2013). However, the expanding domain of cultural policy, together with severe financial cutbacks, resulted in increasing competition over public support. We can observe a layered structure of policy objectives emerging, with cultural infrastructure policy at the primary level, aimed at the development of a professional cultural domain on the axis between art and popular culture. Secondly,

a policy of economic return is added, to enhance the image of the city and strengthening it as a cultural and a creative city. On the third level, social issues of participation, education and citizenship come to the fore, using creativity and popular culture in order to tackle specific urban problems and to add to the city's attractiveness as a creative city.

2.3. Music policy and the city

Popular music is often used in the growing number of urban events that are organised to foster inclusivity, social cohesion or to revitalize urban space (Cohen, 2013; Holt and Wergin, 2013). The term 'music cities' is gaining currency in both academic literature and policy circles to describes places that have a rich music culture and the right conditions to support music-making (Baker, 2017; Terrill, Hogarth, Clement, and Francis, 2015, p. 10).[1]

Research on live music policy underscores the different values that can be attributed to this cultural good. A wide range of positive effects of live music for its environment have been observed in the literature: It can boost the local economy through the marketing of urban places (Oakes and Warnaby, 2011), enables the development of talent and skills (Wynn, 2015), attracts tourists (Hudson, 2006), contributes to a sense of identity and belonging (Cohen, 2012), and fosters pride in local musical achievements and a shared music heritage (Van der Hoeven and Brandellero, 2015). Homan (2010) describes this central role of live music in urban culture as follows:

> The suburban or inner city rock pub, jazz restaurant or dance nightclub has always played an important role not just in the lives and careers of individual musicians, but in the life of cities. The famous jazz clubs of New York or the 'swinging' London nightclubs of the 1960s remain vivid examples of how music venues can come to represent distinct regional experiences, as signifiers of a wider cultural milieu.

Similarly, Frith (2007, p. 9) observes that the live music experience is essential to the mythology of popular music, with each city having specific legendary venues alleged to express the local 'musical soul'. Finally, from the perspective of creative industry discourses that value culture for its contribution to innovation, music venues can be seen as places where people are involved in networking and the exchange of ideas (Lobato, 2006).

Of course, live music can also have negative externalities such as noise and violence near venues or festivals (Homan, 2010). Furthermore, the positive effects of live music can, inadvertently, result in undesirable developments. For example, rising rents and property values in attractive neighbourhoods with a thriving cultural life can lead to the displacement of low-income groups (Gibson and Homan, 2004). Even the musicians who contributed to lively neighbourhoods in the first place might eventually be affected by such processes of gentrification (Cohen, 2013). This is the case when rehearsal spaces, affordable housing or even venues are threatened to be replaced by new land uses that generate more profit (Holt, 2013; Shaw, 2013).

In the existing literature we can identify a number of factors that enhance live music's positive role in local settings. Gallan (2012) highlights the importance of booking agents in supporting 'healthy' live music ecologies. He argues that these cultural gatekeepers form a vital bridge between the public task of contributing to local creative scenes on the hand and running a successful business on the other hand. In

particular small venues with a clear artistic profile are perceived as contributing to musical experimentation, talent development and community building (Gallan and Gibson, 2013; Shaw, 2013). However, such venues focused on 'alternative' music genres generally lack the resources to cope with rising rents under conditions of gentrification and the costs associated with stricter safety regulations (Holt and Wergin, 2013). Therefore, small venues often need financial support from local governments in other to continue the programming of (local) upcoming artists and subcultural genres. Furthermore, Shaw (2013) argues that governments could provide low-rent buildings for creative uses, implement planning principles that require initiators of new buildings adjacent to existing music venues to install adequate sound-proofing (i.e. to avoid noise-complaints), and to reduce forms of land rezoning in which (sub)cultural activities need to give way to profitable residential land use. Another important policy condition to support live music ecologies is the availability of late-night public transportation (Whiting and Carter, 2016). Finally, restrictions on noise levels and safety regulations are ambiguous policy measures as they might protect the liveability of cities for residents, while at the same time making the organisation of concerts more difficult (Homan, 2010; Whiting and Carter, 2016). This underscores once more how the valuing of live music is a balancing act between competing interests.

Although this literature review shows that various researchers have considered specific social and cultural benefits of live music for cities, an integrated analysis of these impacts and required policy conditions is lacking. A conceptualisation of these sociocultural values is necessary to understand how live music can contribute to urban development. Therefore, we seek to contribute to the existing scholarship on live music policy by supplementing it with literature on urban cultural policy and a cultural economics perspective on the value of culture.

3. Methodology

We conducted a qualitative content analysis on music reports and strategies in order to assess the social and cultural values attributed to live music ecologies. This method is a technique to inductively categorise the themes present in existing material (Herzog, Handke, and Hitters, 2019; Hijmans, 1996). The qualitative content analysis allowed us to explore how a range of different actors (e.g. policy makers, consultancy firms and music industry support organisations) discuss the relevance of live music for its urban environment.

The sample we analysed consisted of reports and strategies from the Netherlands, the UK, the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia and Scotland (see Appendix A for an overview of this material). We used a purposive sampling strategy (Boeije, 2010), implying that the reports were not randomly selected but chosen for their relevance in connection to the research question. Together they offer a wide range of perspectives on the contributions of live music to urban places. We aimed for a diverse sample in terms of geographical locations and size of the music industry. Our sample thus includes both countries with a central position in the global music industry (e.g. the UK and the US) and more peripheral countries (e.g. South Africa and the Netherlands). While a majority of the reports focus on specific cities, others have a broader geographical scope (i.e. a national or international orientation) or a thematic focus (i.e. festivals and small music venues). The sample includes reports that were commissioned by local, regional and national governments or music industry support organisations. Scientific publications were excluded from the content analysis, because we seek to study how music professionals and policy makers understand social and cultural value. However, we did include research reports that primarily target a non-academic audience and commissioned reports written by academics.

By using the Atlas.ti software, we coded the reports in order to find recurring themes in this data. Coding is a process of segmenting and labelling texts in order to compare them (Boeije, 2010). As our theoretical framework in the coding process, we used working definitions of

---

[1] The term music cities is used in various contexts: UNESCO Cities of Music is a title awarded by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (www.citiesofmusic.net, accessed 27 June 2018), the Music Cities Convention is a conference organised by a consultancy firm (www.musiccitiesconvention.com, accessed 27 June 2018) and the Music Cities Network is a public/private network of music city stakeholders (www.musiccitiesnetwork.com, accessed 27 June 2018).

social and cultural value that were grounded in the literature discussed above. Social value was understood as the contribution of live music to the social relationships between people, a sense of belonging and collective identity. Under cultural value we categorised the codes that dealt with the artistic qualities of live music, the symbolic meanings expressed through the performance of an artist, and creativity as reflected in a rich diversity of genres and artistic experimentation. In other words, this concerns - to use Klamer's (2004) definition of cultural value - the qualities of live music that go above and beyond economic and social value.[2] By tentatively defining social and cultural value in such general terms, specific dimensions of these values could still inductively emerge from our analysis.

The coding process was conducted in successive stages (Herzog et al., 2019; Braun and Clarke, 2006).[3] In the first stage of open coding we focused on the range of values that were attributed to live music. Furthermore, we coded the concrete indicators of these values, challenges to the values, and policy interventions to address those challenges. For example, a live music ecology can be valued in terms of 'talent development', an associated indicator is 'performance opportunities for young artists', a challenge is the 'declining income of musicians' and a policy intervention is a 'price floor' (i.e. a minimum remuneration). While this first step of open coding was conducted by the first author independently, the next steps were done by both authors. After the open coding, we started to discuss and draw connections between codes and merged codes that referred to similar issues. Finally, we further categorised codes about the value of live music by forming dimensions of social and cultural value and linking these to concrete indicators. To this end, all codes from Atlas.ti were printed, so what we could move around the codes, discuss them and establish categories and themes. In case of doubt, codes and emerging patterns were checked against the original segments from the reports.

The values and indicators that resulted from this analysis will be discussed in the following section and illustrated with relevant quotations from the reports. We only address findings that relate to our focus on urban live music ecologies, thus excluding the impacts of music on a personal level. In the final section about urban planning for live music we discuss challenges to live music ecologies and possible policy interventions to address these.

4. Social and cultural values attributed to live music ecologies

In our analysis, we found three different dimensions for social value (social capital, public engagement and identity) and three for cultural value (musical creativity, cultural vibrancy and talent development). In this section, we will define each value dimension and discuss their concrete manifestations in live music ecologies (i.e. indicators of the values).

Connecting the values to indicators is relevant because social and cultural value are generally considered difficult to express in words – let alone measure (Behr, Brennan, and Cloonan, 2016; Parkinson, Hunter, Campanello, Dines, and Smith, 2015). As one report observes:

"Music is an experiential medium and live performance is its most elemental form. Trying to articulate this intuitively understood value, however, quickly reveals complexity as live music informs identity, leaves longstanding memories and helps create meaning across communities and cultures."

(Carter and Muller, 2015, p. 6)

The indicators we discuss comprise both aspects that can be

quantified (e.g. the number of venues) and qualitative descriptions of how specific values are reflected in live music ecologies (e.g. a local live music heritage).

4.1. Social values

4.1.1. Social capital: bonding and bridging

The first dimension of social capital addresses the ways in which live music enhances a sense of belonging and allows people to connect to each other. Live music ecologies that support the social capital of urban communities function as spaces where different groups of people can develop social networks and meet each other. This implies that they support live music participation for all ages, genders, and communities. Many of the analysed music reports discuss the positive impacts of live music on social capital, sometimes in quite celebratory terms:

"These benefits associated with enhanced social networks are privately accrued. However, the sense of belonging that is generated through improved social networks also has a spillover effect to the wider community, as the positive feelings experienced by patrons are likely to influence their interactions with other community members. For example, through their involvement in the live music scene, young people may feel less isolated and may therefore be less likely to engage in antisocial behaviour."

(Deloitte Access Economics, 2011, p 37)

"Culture can foster social bonding and inclusivity. People meet each other at cultural organisations such as a music venue, work together as volunteers and through music they learn about each other's culture."[4]

(Van Vugt, 2018, p. 32)

While it is of course true that music brings people together, these quotations seem to be rather optimistic about live music's positive effects on social capital. In fact, the common distinction between social bonding and bridging also applies to live music. While bonding refers to within-group cohesion, social bridging concerns social ties between heterogeneous groups (Grazian, 2009).

This distinction reminds us of the active work that needs to be done to make live music ecologies more inclusive. Social inequalities in cities in terms of, for example, gender, income and ethnicity tend to the present in live music ecologies as well. According to Grazian (2009, p. 915–916):

"…despite the insistence among sociologists and urban observers that nightlife necessarily contributes to the social capital and public life of cities, three generalizable empirical findings offer grounds for skepticism on this score: the racial and class barriers to participation imposed by nightlife enterprises and their patrons; the normalization of gender differences and the routine harassment of women within such scenes; and the lack of inclusiveness surrounding local nightlife in urban neighborhood communities."

This underscores that cultural events tend to particularly strengthen bonding instead of bridging social capital (Wilks, 2011). To address this issue, many live music organisations support initiatives that seek to make live music ecologies more inclusive. Examples are policies against sexual harassment of women at concerts and projects striving to achieve a better representation of female artists in the music industry.[5]

4.1.2. Public engagement

While the previous dimension focused on live music's role in sustaining social relationships between people, public engagement concerns the ambition of live music organisations to make a positive impact

---

[2] We used the code 'economic value' for all references to financial benefits and the relevance of live music for cities in monetary terms. Texts segments that exclusively focused on economic value were not further analysed, because this is beyond the scope of the analysis of this paper.

[3] All codes associated with the dimensions are available upon request.

[4] All Dutch quotations have been translated by the authors.

[5] For examples of such projects see saynothnks.nl and keychange.eu (accessed 27 June 2018).

on cities and their inhabitants. This wider public role includes activities that even go beyond music programming. Many venues and festivals actively support and work with communities in their urban environment. They feel the responsibility to engage with the citizens in their vicinity or want to show that the venue is not just a 'nuisance maker' in the neighbourhood (Parkinson et al., 2015).

Public engagement can take many shapes and forms such as fundraising or providing opportunities for citizen participation through volunteering. The report on small music venues in the United Kingdom (Parkinson et al., 2015, p. 21) finds that "in around half of the respondents' venues, community engagement took the form of providing space for activities such as dance, language classes, religious societies, choirs or reading groups." Furthermore, live music events can be spaces for protest and political debates. Many live music venues and festivals provide a stage to counter-cultural movements and communities. The report about the impact of British music festivals (Webster and McKay, 2016) discusses that festivals might experiment with alternative lifestyles, seeking to reduce their carbon footprint. Finally, venues and festivals could collaborate with charities or organisations that represent the interests of minority groups.

4.1.3. Identity

Live music ecologies play a vital role in the attachment to place. This is the case when citizens derive a sense of identity and cultural pride from local live music scenes. For example, a music venue can define the character of a street or neighbourhood. Legendary venues are part of the unique cultural heritage of cities. Not only the aesthetic qualities of these iconic venues are cherished, but also their artistic legacy such as well-known bands that began their careers there. The following quotations illustrate how the authors of the reports connect this sense of identity to national and international recognition.

Music is part of Hamilton's economic prosperity and its identity – locally, nationally and internationally.

(Priel, 2014, p. 2)

The Victorian live music industry is a source of community identity and pride, with positive legacy effects generated through publicity and exposure of particular venues, artists and/or music forms. Legacy benefits may spike following a specific 'event' but are often ongoing, as evidenced by Victoria's long-standing reputation as a live music hub.

(Deloitte Access Economics, 2011, p. 40)

Live music can be part of a city's heritage, offering a sense of pride and belonging to people. This heritage includes both physical elements (e.g. iconic venues) and intangible practices (e.g. annual performances and musical traditions). Indicators of a strong connection between identity and the live music of a place are a distinctive local musical style, a well-known music heritage and/or music heroes that represent a city. As evidenced by research in the field of popular music studies and geography, the music produced in a particular city often plays a vital role in city marketing and the ways in which people experience this place (Cohen, 2012; Hudson, 2006). On a similar note, citizens identify with iconic musicians who represent the city at home and abroad. National and international recognition of a local music ecology, for example in the press and music journalism, further affirms this sense of identity.

4.2. Cultural values

4.2.1. Musical creativity

This first dimension of cultural value concerns the intrinsic value of live music, or what could be described as 'music for music's sake'. The report about small music venues in the United Kingdom argues that this intrinsic value needs to be defended against a reductionist economic approach, even if cultural value is hard to measure (Parkinson et al.,

2015, p. 39):

A key aspect of this is recognising that a great deal of the music that passes through the small venues circuit is not made in pursuit of mainstream commercial success - and is unlikely ever to achieve it - but is performed for its own sake, and for the enjoyment of the audiences it attracts.

Similarly, one report (Terrill et al., 2015, p. 10) cites a music industry professional to argue that a good measure of musical creativity is: "listening to a child telling their mom and dad that they want to be in the music industry and parents not saying, 'you need to get a real job.'"

This dimension of musical creativity also highlights how live music inspires people. Ideally, spaces for live music allow people to discover new genres and styles. As the UK Live Music Census describes this ambition:

Live music can be inspiring for both audiences and artists alike because it stimulates the discovery of new music and genres and can spark people's own creativity. For some respondents, live music events give an opportunity for the appreciation of performers' talents, an opportunity to see favourite artists 'in the flesh', and can give a deeper understanding of the music. (Webster, Brennan, Behr, Cloonan, and Ansel, 2018, p. 66)

The fruits of this musical creativity support the dimension of identity discussed above (Van der Hoeven and Brandellero, 2015). Cities are often known for their contributions to the development of particular genres (e.g. beat music from Liverpool and Grunge from Seattle), fostering a sense of local pride and identity.

In order to support musical creativity it is important that music organisations book upcoming artists, a diversity of genres, and original music instead of just cover bands. Furthermore, it is vital to have spaces for experimentation in a city. As Grazian (2013) argues, cities are fertile grounds for alternative forms of music such as experimental jazz and underground hip-hop. Their density and diversity provide the critical mass of participants that alternative scenes need to thrive. In order to benefit from low rents, this musical experimentation usually takes place in small-scale venues located in peripheral neighbourhoods or vacant buildings (Grazian, 2013). As the next two dimensions will illustrate, these spaces are also important in terms of talent development and cultural vibrancy in cities.

4.2.2. Talent development

Live music organisations provide spaces for people to develop their skills and talents. This is vital to support musical creativity in a city. Indeed, most reports focus on the development of musical talent, but live music organisations can also help, for example, technicians and designers to gain hands-on experience.

However, many reports identify challenges with respect to talent development. In fact, a study among musicians shows that the precarious nature of working in the music industry leads to various mental health problems (Gross and Musgrave, 2017). Musicians often have a low income while the costs of living (e.g. housing rents) are rising (Terrill et al., 2015). Furthermore, there are declining opportunities for beginning musicians to perform (Van Vugt, 2018). This is, among other reasons, a consequence of the closure of small venues which cannot bear the costs associated with soundproofing, new regulations and rising rents. Finally, it is found that audiences are less willing to pay for seeing emerging talent, because they prefer to hear the familiar sounds of cover bands instead (Parkinson et al., 2015; Webster et al., 2018).

To address these challenges, the reports discuss many conditions that support talent development. A first set of conditions focuses on the necessary spaces for incubating talent. Beginning musicians and less established performers need rehearsal spaces, places to network with other musicians and music industry representatives, and performance spaces in small size venues so that they can develop their skills and grow their audiences (Ansell and Barnard, 2013; Terrill et al., 2015).

This asks from music stages that they dare to take risks and book emerging talent. Secondly, the reports discuss concrete actions and policies that can be implemented such as a fair remuneration for musicians through a price floor (Deloitte Access Economics, 2011), involving local talent in city activities (Van Vugt, 2018), career development scholarships and grants, and training and coaching of musicians (Ansell and Barnard, 2013; Terrill et al., 2015). Finally, to support talent development it is vital that live music organisations collaborate with local music schools and other educational institutions to provide internships and performance opportunities (Parkinson et al., 2015; Webster et al., 2018).

4.2.3. Cultural vibrancy

Live music is a vital element in the cultural life of cities. The dimension of cultural vibrancy concerns live music's connection to the wider cultural ecology and its contributions to a thriving cultural sector. While the dimension of musical creativity focuses on live music itself, this dimension captures the role of live music performance in relation to urban culture in general. The next two quotations illustrate how live music is positioned as part of the cultural ecology of cities:

> "Melbourne wouldn't be the exciting city it is without its rich musical culture. Diverse, eclectic and outward looking, Melbourne is a melting pot of musical styles, events and activities. With its rich cultural history dating back to the mid-1800s, a vibrant live music scene, acclaimed recording and broadcast industry, and wide range of venues and performance spaces, music makes a huge contribution to the social, cultural and economic fabric of our city."
>
> (Leppert and Doyle, 2014, p. 6)

> "The interaction between popular music and other innovative art forms such as video, design and fashion has always been strong and is expressed through various means. […] Music venues have an important role as innovators in the local art offerings."
>
> (Van Dalen, Van der Hoek, and Vreeke, 2009, p. 77)

Indicators of a vibrant live music ecology are the number of spaces for music-making and the extent to which a diversity of genres and styles is performed on music stages. An attractive live music ecology contributes to the richness of cultural offerings in a city. Furthermore, in a vibrant live music ecology, music organisations are connected to other cultural actors in the city. As observed in the UK live music census report (Webster et al., 2018), many music venues provide space to promote cultural activities by other organisations. Collaborations between cultural organisations enable crossovers and the mixing of different audiences. For example, many Dutch cities host annual Museum Nights in which museums extend their opening hours to the night. These events generally include music performances, thus bringing together the worlds of the arts and popular culture.

The cultural vibrancy in a city can be enhanced by increasing the number of cultural offerings and the diversity of genres that live music organisations host. Finally, a street performance and busking programme like the one in Melbourne (Leppert and Doyle, 2014) ensures that people can enjoy live music in public space.[6]

Although thriving live music ecologies are beneficial to cities, it could lead to the displacement of musicians and live music scenes when rents in gentrifying areas are rising. As Ballico and Carter (2018, pp. 212–213) observe: "Significantly, strategies, which work to enhance the vibrancy of cities, and often position arts and culture activity as being a vital component – often displace and/or cause tensions for the spaces in which cultural and creative activity takes place during and after such regeneration". This calls for urban planning strategies that do not instrumentally reduce cultural vibrancy to an economic agenda, but also

enhance the social and cultural value of live music.

5. Urban planning for live music

To support the dimensions of social and cultural value discussed above, it is vital to have the right conditions for vibrant urban live music ecologies. Indeed, urban policies should not just mitigate the negative impacts of popular music (e.g. noise and anti-social behaviour near venues), but also enhance its positive impact on the urban environment. As discussed in the literature review, a too restrictive regulatory environment limits the possibilities for live music performances to take place (Homan, 2010; Whiting and Carter, 2016).

Of course, the seven countries included in the sample of this study have a wide range of different local policy and planning conditions. Yet, in our analysis we encounter various similarities in the kind of challenges faced by these live music ecologies. In particular the fate of small music venues is a dominant issue across the reports. This highlights the importance of acknowledging the value of live music in urban planning, so that all segments of live music ecologies can be sustained. Many reports stress that more attention needs to be paid in urban planning to live music's values. An example of that sentiment is this call in London's Grassroots Music Venues Rescue Plan (Davyd et al., 2015, p. 4):

> "But most importantly the Taskforce calls for a change in the way we think about music venues. Grassroots music venues are cultural spaces, risk-takers, hubs of innovation and place-makers. They need to be recognised as such in policy documents. Music venues also need to enter the day-to-day conversations of economists, planners, licensers, police, tourism experts, culture professionals and music industry decision makers."

In this final section we further discuss those challenges and the solutions proposed in the reports.

Small, independently-run, music venues, are considered vital elements in urban live music ecologies (Webster et al., 2018). Indeed, they are a foundation for the different social and cultural values discussed in the previous section. It is in the smaller venues that musicians generally start their careers and develop their skills. Furthermore, small music venues are often more focused on niche genres or specific music communities (Parkinson et al., 2015). As places for emerging musical creativity, they enhance the social capital of participants in local scenes. These venues therefore contribute to the diversity of cultural offerings in any given city.

Yet, such venues are in a vulnerable position due to their small scale and independence from larger chains. Rising rents following on from gentrification and increased costs associated with soundproofing or security measures weigh heavily on their budgets. Furthermore, a growing population density in cities results in tensions between residents and neighbouring venues. Complaints about noise from people in new residential buildings can pose a threat to the existence of inner-city venues and festivals. As one of the reports sums up the challenges:

> "A reduction/restriction in ability to programme live music can lead to loss of business for the venue and there are many examples across the UK where a venue closes within a couple of years of an official complaint because of the knock-on effects of the imposed operational changes or costs involved in installing soundproofing. Every venue that closes represents the loss of a local business, loss of jobs and loss of money in the local economy, as well as depriving musicians of places to play and audiences of the live music experience."
>
> (Music Venue Trust, 2015, p. 4)

The picture that emerges from the music reports is that live music in cities cannot be taken for granted. They stress the need to integrate live music policy in urban planning decisions, so that their diverse values to cities and communities can be supported. To this end, the reports suggest a range of interventions in urban planning and the built environment, financial tools and cultural policies. Of course, the

---

[6] http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/arts-and-culture/film-music-busking/street-entertainment-busking/Pages/street-entertainment-busking.aspx (Accessed 21 November 2018).

effectiveness and feasibility of such measures is contingent upon the local policy contexts. The divergent social, cultural and economic priorities of governmental departments add further complexity to the implementation of these measures.

To support live music in cities the reports propose various infrastructural measures and policies for the built environment. A permanent infrastructure could be installed for outdoor concerts (e.g. lighting gantries and stages in public parks) so that hosting festivals or individual concerts becomes less costly (Live Music Taskforce, 2017). Furthermore, particular areas could be designated as music zones or cultural districts, with a higher sound tolerance in these places (Government of South Australia, 2016; Live Music Taskforce, 2017). For example, an area of several blocks in Austin was approved as The Red River Cultural District by Austin City Council. This designation offered a solution to loading and unloading issues faced by musicians and strengthens the promotion of this area (Terrill et al., 2015). Another option focused on building classifications is to designate venues with a strong legacy as heritage buildings, recognising their historic significance in the built and cultural landscape of cities (Terrill et al., 2015). An example is Toronto's The Silver Dollar Room, a venue which received heritage designation status in 2015. Nevertheless, this musical landmark was demolished in 2018 to be replaced by a 5-storey mixed use building. This development was approved under the condition that the new building includes the reconstruction of the Silver Dollar Room with some of its original elements (e.g. the scale of the venue, the bar and the sign on the façade).[7]

A potential planning solution to the challenge of noise complaints is the agent of change principle. This measure implies that the responsibility for noise management is on the newcomers (i.e. 'the agents of change') in an area. For example, the developer of a new residential building near a venue must ensure that adequate soundproofing is installed (Terrill et al., 2015; Webster et al., 2018). This urban planning method is generally heralded as a solution to amenity issues, but a study of its implementation in Victoria shows that the site-specific context remains important in how the agent of change principle works out in practice (Lee, 2016). Sometimes it can be more cost-efficient to upgrade the sound insulation of the venue instead of a noise attenuation treatment to the facade of a new residential complex. Although the principle protects existing live music spaces as it opens the dialogue between venue owners and developers (Ross, 2017), it could make it difficult to increase the number of venues or to expand them (Terrill et al., 2015). In those cases the music venues are the agents of change, which puts the responsibility for noise mitigation on them.

Next, a diverse set of financial measures to support independent music venues is proposed. An example is micro-loans for these spaces (Terrill et al., 2015), such as The Music Venue Assistance Program in Austin.[8] These low interest loans can be used to enhance the sound quality of venues and to reduce sound impact on neighbours. Another example is the levy on live music tickets used in France, a model which is also proposed for the UK in a report (Webster et al., 2018). Such a levy could redistribute money from large venues to the smaller ones. This implies that small venues would receive money from the large music stages, because they contributed to the careers of the artists that eventually moved on to play big gigs. Furthermore, some reports propose tax breaks for small venues (Parkinson et al., 2015; Webster et al., 2018). These financial measures rely on the rationale that small venues have such a vital role in terms of talent development that they deserve additional support.

Finally, live music could be supported through various dedicated cultural policy interventions that aim to enhance the cultural vibrancy

in a particular city. Many Dutch cities have 'night mayors' (also known as night czars in some countries) who ensure that the interests of nightlife business are recognised adequately in town halls (Music Venue Trust, 2015; Terrill et al., 2015; Webster et al., 2018). Furthermore, a single point of contact at the city council or a music office is recommended in various reports (Government of South Australia, 2016; Live Music Taskforce, 2017; Rowling, 2015). This makes it easier for music organisations to discuss licenses, regulations and other issues that affect their business.

6. Conclusions

In both academia and policy circles the attention paid to the connections between live music and urban planning has grown in the last decade or so. This is evidenced in the burgeoning number of music reports and strategies that were analysed in this study. Among local governments and policy makers, economic impact assessments of live music seem to have contributed to a wider recognition of the merits of this cultural form. Such impact studies are considered vital to legitimise the investments made in the live music sector (Baker, 2017; Brown et al., 2015). We have thus observed policy objectives emerging at different levels, whereby live music infrastructure policies are usually combined with objectives of economic return. This confirms that policy interventions in the field over live music are often rooted in economic considerations (Behr, Brennan, and Cloonan, 2016; Brown et al., 2015; Martin, 2017). Notwithstanding the relevance of such cost-benefit analyses, a too strong emphasis on the economic value of live music diverges the attention from the social and cultural benefits. While possible effects on city branding and the creative city are common themes, issues of cultural participation, education, diversity and citizenship are less prevalent.

We contributed to the emerging scholarly literature on urban live music ecologies by drawing upon a cultural economics perspective on the value of culture (Klamer, 2004; Throsby, 2001). This perspective allowed us to make a theoretical distinction between social, cultural and economic value. Through our content analysis of music reports and strategies from seven different countries, we have conceptualised the social values (i.e. social capital, public engagement and identity) and cultural values (i.e. musical creativity, cultural vibrancy and talent development) attributed to live music. Furthermore, we have discussed the spaces, activities and characteristics associated with those values (see Table 1). These indicators of the values range from quantitative aspects (e.g. the number of spaces for music-making and the number of female performers) to qualitative ones (e.g. a local live music heritage and identification with live music ecologies). By comparing the approaches to urban live music ecologies in different geographical settings, we identified various interventions that could support these values such as the agent of change principle, financial tools (e.g. micro-loans) and cultural policies (e.g. night mayors and music offices).

We conclude with two final reflections and suggestions for future research. In the analysis of the music reports it struck us that generally little attention is paid to live music taking place outside venues (e.g. festivals, pop-up concerts, street performances and live music in pubs). The reports rather take the perspective of venues, which might reflect their stronger institutionalisation in associations and lobbying organisations. Since the number of festivals is growing in many cities (Jakob, 2013), future research could explicitly explore their role in urban live music ecologies. As temporary events in public space, festivals provide many opportunities to, for example, enhance cultural vibrancy and support the talent development of local musicians. However, performances outside venues also pose new challenges for cities in terms of noise and safety. Finally, more research is required on the ways in which the impact of social and cultural values can be assessed. These values are more difficult to measure than economic impact because they are largely qualitative in nature. However, they are essential to live music's contribution to the urban environment.

---

[7] http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2017. TE23.18 (Accessed 22 November 2018).

[8] https://www.austintexas.gov/department/sound-permits (Accessed 21 November 2018).

Table 1
The dimensions and indicators of social and cultural value.

Value	Dimension	Indicators
Social	Social capital: bonding and bridging	Spaces to develop social networks; supporting live music participation for all ages and communities; policies against sexual harassment; musical activities for minority communities; access for disabled people; number of female performers.
	Public engagement	Activities beyond live music; activities for the neighbourhood; charity and fundraising activities; policies for sustainability; providing opportunities for citizen participation (e.g. volunteering).
	Identity	Identification with local music ecologies; iconic venues with a long history; national and international recognition (e.g. media attention); local music heroes representing the city; a local live music heritage; local musical styles.
Cultural	Musical creativity	A diversity of genres and styles; spaces for musical experimentation; booking upcoming artists; booking original music (instead of cover bands); spaces for audiences to discover new music.
	Cultural vibrancy	The number of performances; the number of venues, festivals and spaces for music-making (a diversity of cultural offerings); cultural clusters; a street performance and busking programme; collaboration with other cultural organisations.
	Talent development	Rehearsal spaces; spaces for emerging talent; booking amateur musicians; performance opportunities for less established performers (small size venues); providing opportunities for networking between musicians; fair remuneration for musicians; involving local talent in city activities; career development scholarships and grants; training and coaching of musicians; collaborations with local educational institutions.

Acknowledgements

Appendix A. Sample of documents

#	Title	Year of publication	Geographical scope	Published/commissioned by	Pages
1	The economic, social and cultural contribution of venue-based live music in Victoria.	2011	Victoria, Australia	Deloitte Access Economics (commissioned by Arts Victory)	81
2	Waarde van pop 2.0: De maatschappelijke betekenis van popmuziek	2018	The Netherlands	POPnl and the Dutch Association of Music Venues and Festivals (VNPF)	42
3	Report for City of Edinburgh Council: The Challenges for Live Music in the City	2015	Edinburgh, Scotland	Music Venue Trust	18
4	London Music Strategy	2014	London, Canada	London's Music Industry Development Task Force	41
5	The mastering of a music city: key elements, effective strategies and why it's worth pursuing	2015	Global	IFPI & Music Canada	104
6	Streamlining Live Music Regulation	2016	South Australia, Australia	Government of South Australia	19
7	understanding small music venues: A report by the music venue trust	2015	United Kingdom	The Institute of Contemporary Music Performance (commissioned by the Music Venue Trust)	67
8	The economic & cultural value of live music in Australia 2014	2015	Australia	University of Tasmania, Australian Live Music Office, South Australian government, City of Sydney, City of Melbourne	81
9	Hamilton Music Strategy	2013	Hamilton, Canada	The City of Hamilton	49 (two documents)
10	The Economic and Cultural Contributions of Live Music Venues in the City of Sydney	2016	Sydney, Australia	Paul Muller and Dr. Dave Carter (University of Tasmania)	20
11	Valuing live music: The UK Live Music Census 2017 report	2018	United Kingdom	Emma Webster, Matt Brennan, Adam Behr and Martin Cloonan with Jake Ansell	276 (large print version)
12	City of Melbourne Music Strategy: Supporting and growing the city's music industry 2014–17	2014	Melbourne, Australia	City of Melbourne	19
13	From Glyndebourne to Glastonbury: the impact of British music festivals	2016	United Kingdom	Emma Webster and George McKay	33 (large print version)
14	Practise what you Preach! Popmuziek in Rotterdam - Een survey naar oefenruimtes en presentatieplekken	2010	Rotterdam, the Netherlands	jongRRKC (the youth delegation of The Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture)	10
15	Het Grote Poppodium Onderzoek 2008: Analyse van de ontwikkelingen in de bedrijfsvoering van de Nederlandse poppodia	2009	The Netherlands	Dutch Association of Music Venues and Festivals (VNPF)	92
16	London's Grassroots Music Venues Rescue Plan	2015	London, United Kingdom	The Mayor of London's Music Venues Taskforce	48
17	The Austin music census: a data-driven assessment of Austin's commercial music economy	2015	Austin, United States	Titan Music Group, LLC (commissioned by the city of Austin economic development department's music & entertainment division)	233
18	Music Strategy Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area	2015	Downtown Yonge, Toronto, Canada	Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area	8
19	Song Lines: Mapping the South African Live Performance Landscape.	2013	South Africa	Concerts South Africa	42
20	Report and recommendations to help drive the Gold Coast's reputation as a live music-friendly city	2017	Gold Coast, Australia	Live Music Taskforce	39

References

Angelini, F., & Castellani, M. (2017). Cultural and economic value: A (p)review. *RCEA working paper n. 17-10*. Retrieved from https://ideas.repec.org/p/rim/rimwps/17-10.html.

Ansell, G., & Barnard, H. (2013). *Song lines: Mapping the South African live performance landscape*. Johannesburg: Concerts SA.

Australasian Performing Right Association (2011). *Economic contribution of the venue-based live music industry in Australia*. Sydney: APRA.

Baird, P., & Scott, M. (2018). Towards an ideal typical live music city. *City, Culture and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2018.03.003.

Baker, A. J. (2017). Algorithms to assess music cities: Case study—Melbourne as a music capital. *SAGE Open, 7*(1), 1–12.

Ballico, C., & Carter, D. (2018). A state of constant prodding: Live music, precarity and regulation. *Cultural Trends, 27*(3), 203–217.

Behr, A., Brennan, M., & Cloonan, M. (2016). Cultural value and cultural policy: Some evidence from the world of live music. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 22*(3), 403–418.

Behr, A., Brennan, M., Cloonan, M., Frith, S., & Webster, E. (2016). Live concert performance: An ecological approach. *Rock Music Studies, 3*(1), 5–23.

Bianchini, F., & Parkinson, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: The West European experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Blomkamp, E. (2014). Uses of evidence in local cultural policy: Performance, legitimation, problem representation, and learning in two Australian municipalities. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice, 10*(2), 223–241.

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Brown, S., Getz, D., Pettersson, R., & Wallstam, M. (2015). Event evaluation: Definitions, concepts and a state of the art review. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management, 6*(2), 135–157.

Carter, D., & Muller, P. (2015). *The economic and cultural value of live music in Australia 2014*. University of Tasmania, Australian Live Music Office, South Australian government City of Sydney: City of Melbourne and Live Music Office (Australia). Retrieved from http://livemusicoffice.com.au/research/.

Cloonan, M. (2011). Researching live music: Some thoughts on policy implications. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 17*(4), 405–420.

Cohen, S. (2012). Live music and urban landscape: Mapping the beat in Liverpool. *Social Semiotics, 22*(5), 587–603.

Cohen, S. (2013). "From the big dig to the big gig": Live music, urban regeneration and social change in the European Capital of Culture 2008. In C. Wergin, & F. Holt (Eds.). *Musical performance and the changing city: Post-industrial contexts in Europe and the United States* (pp. 27–51). New York: Routledge.

Davyd, M., Russell, A., Foxcroft, A., Webster, D., Horton, J., Broadhurst, P., & Kiehl, T. (2015). *London's grassroots music venues - Rescue plan*. London: Greater London Authority.

Deloitte Access Economics (2011). *The economic, social and cultural contribution of venue-based live music in Victoria*. Melbourne, Australia: Arts Victoria.

Evans, G. (2009). Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy. *Urban Studies, 46*(5–6), 1003–1040.

Frith, S. (2007). Live music matters. *Scottish Music Review, 1*(1), 1–17.

Gallan, B. (2012). Gatekeeping night spaces: The role of booking agents in creating 'local' live music venues and scenes. *Australian Geographer, 43*(1), 35–50.

Gallan, B., & Gibson, C. (2013). Mild-mannered bistro by day, eclectic freak-land at night: Memories of an Australian music venue. *Journal of Australian Studies, 37*(2), 174–193.

Gibson, C., & Homan, S. (2004). Urban redevelopment, live and public space. Cultural performance and the re-making of Marrickville. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10*(1), 67–84.

Government of South Australia (2016). Streamlining live music regulation. Retrieved from https://publicsector.sa.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/Streamlining-Live-Music-Regulation-Report.pdf.

Grazian, D. (2009). Urban nightlife, social capital, and the public life of cities. *Sociological Forum, 24*(4), 908–917.

Grazian, D. (2013). Digital underground: Musical spaces and microscenes in the post-industrial city. In F. Holt, & C. Wergin (Eds.). *Musical performance and the changing City: Post-industrial contexts in Europe and the United States* (pp. 127–151). New York and London: Routledge.

Grodach, C. (2017). Urban cultural policy and creative city making. *Cities, 68*, 82–91.

Gross, S., & Musgrave, G. (2017). *Can music make you sick (part 2)? Qualitative study and recommendations*. London: MusicTank.

Herzog, C., Handke, C., & Hitters, E. (2019). Thematic analysis of policy data. In H. Van den Bulck, M. Puppis, K. Donders, & L. Van Audenhove (Eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of methods for media policy research*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hijmans, E. (1996). Logic for qualitative media content analysis: A typology. *Communications, 21*(1), 93–108.

Hitters, E. (2007). Porto and Rotterdam as European Capitals of Culture: Towards the festivalization of urban cultural policy. In G. Richards (Ed.). *Cultural Tourism: Global and local perspectives* (pp. 281–301). New York: Haworth Hospitality Press.

Holt, F. (2013). Rock clubs and gentrification in New York City: The case of the bowery presents. *IASPM@Journal, 4*(1), 21–41.

Holt, F., & Wergin, C. (2013). Introduction: Musical performance and the changing city. In F. Holt, & C. Wergin (Eds.). *Musical performance and the changing city: Post-industrial contexts in Europe and the United States* (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Routledge.

Homan, S. (2010). Governmental as anything: Live music and law and order in Melbourne. *Perfect Beat, 11*(2), 103–118.

Homan, S. (2017). 'Lockout' laws or 'rock out' laws? Governing Sydney's night-time economy and implications for the 'music city. *International Journal of Cultural Policy.*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1317760.

Hudson, R. (2006). Regions and place: Music, identity and place. *Progress in Human Geography, 30*(5), 626–634.

Hutter, M., & Throsby, C. D. (2008). *Beyond price: Value in culture, economics, and the arts*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jakob, D. (2013). The eventification of place: Urban development and experience consumption in Berlin and New York City. *European Urban and Regional Studies, 20*(4), 447–459.

Klamer, A. (2004). Cultural goods are good for more than their economic value. In V. Rao, & M. Walton (Eds.). *Culture and public action* (pp. 138–162). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Lee, G. (2016). Agents of change in Melbourne's live music scene: A practical review. *INTER-NOISE and NOISE-CON congress and conference proceedings* (pp. 7209–7218). .

Leppert, R., & Doyle, R. (2014). City of Melbourne music strategy: Supporting and growing the city's music industry, 2014–17. Retrieved from https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/music-strategy-final.pdf.

Live Music Taskforce (2017). Report and recommendations to help drive the Gold Coast's reputation as a live music-friendly city. Retrieved from http://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/documents/bf/live-music-taskforce-report.pdf.

Lobato, R. (2006). Gentrification, cultural policy and live music in Melbourne. *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy, 120*, 63–75.

Martin, D. (2017). Cultural value and urban governance: A place for Melbourne's music community at the policymaking table. *Perfect Beat, 18*(2), 110–130.

McCarthy, F., Ondaatje, E. H., Zakaras, L., & Brooks, A. (2004). *Gifts of the muse: Reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Music Venue Trust (2015). Report for city of Edinburgh council: The challenges for live music in the city. Retrieved from http://musicvenuetrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Music-Venue-Trust-Edinburgh-Report.pdf.

Oakes, S., & Warnaby, G. (2011). Conceptualizing the management and consumption of live music in urban space. *Marketing Theory, 11*(4), 405–418.

Parkinson, T., Hunter, M., Campanello, K., Dines, M., & Smith, G. D. (2015). *Understanding small music venues: A report by the music venues trust*. London: Music Venues Trust.

Pratt, A., & Hesmondhalgh, D. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 11*(1), 1–14.

Priel, J. (2014). *Hamilton music strategy report*. Hamilton: Tourism and Culture Division of the City of Hamilton. Retrieved from https://www.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/strategies-actions/hamilton-music-strategy.

Ross, S. (2017). Protecting urban spaces of intangible cultural heritage and nightlife community subcultural wealth: International and national strategies, the agent of change, principle, and creative placekeeping. *Western Journal of Legal Studies, 7*(1), 1–20.

Rowling, N. (2015). *The Austin music census, a data driven assessment of Austin's commercial music economy*. Austin: Titan Music Group, the City of Austin's Economic Development Departments' Music and Entertainment Division. Retrieved from https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Austin_Music_Census_Interactive_PDF_53115.pdf.

Shaw, K. (2013). Independent creative subcultures and why they matter. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 19*(3), 333–352.

Terrill, A., Hogarth, D., Clement, A., & Francis, R. (2015). Mastering of a music city. Retrieved from http://www.ifpi.org/downloads/The-Mastering-of-a-Music-City.pdf.

Throsby, C. D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dalen, T., Van der Hoek, H., & Vreeke, F. (2009). *Het Grote Poppodium Onderzoek 2008. Analyse van de ontwikkelingen in de bedrijfsvoering van de Nederlandse poppodia*. Bussum/Amsterdam: Vreeke & Van Dalen.

Van der Hoeven, A., & Brandellero, A. (2015). Places of popular music heritage: The local framing of a global cultural form in Dutch museums and archives. *Poetics, 51*, 37–53.

Van Vugt, J. (2018). *De waarde van pop 2.0. De maatschappelijke betekenis van popmuziek*. Amsterdam: POPnl en Vereniging Nederlandse Poppodia en -Festivals (VNPF).

Webster, E., Brennan, M., Behr, A., Cloonan, M., & Ansel, J. (2018). *Valuing live music: The UK live music census 2017 report*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh/Live Music Exchange.

Webster, E., & McKay, G. (2016). *From Glyndebourne to Glastonbury: The impact of British music festivals*. Norwich: University of East Anglia.

Whiting, S., & Carter, D. (2016). Access, place and Australian live music. *M/C Journal, 19*(3).

Wilks, L. (2011). Bridging and bonding: Social capital at music festivals. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 3*(3), 281–297.

Wynn, J. R. (2015). *Music/city: American festivals and placemaking in Austin, Nashville, and Newport*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The cultures of cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.