IMAGINING URBAN FUTURES

WORKING PAPER 6

Relationality / territoriality: Toward a conceptualization of cities in the world

Eugene McCann

Department of Geography, Simon Fraser University emccann@sfu.ca

Kevin Ward

Geography, School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester

Kevin.ward@manchester.ac.uk

November 2008

Abstract

The paper will contribute to the conceptualization of cities in the world by first outlining the conceptual and empirical challenges of theorizing the urban/global nexus in both relational and territorial terms. It argues that the most useful and appropriate approach to understanding contemporary urban governance in global context is to develop a conceptualization that is equally sensitive to the role of relational and territorial geographies, of flow and fixity, of global contexts and place specificities, of structural imperatives and embodied practices, in the production of cities. In order to illustrate the benefits of this conceptualization, the paper will apply it to the case of how downtown development is governed in contemporary Western world cities. The role of the Business Improvement District (BID) program and New Urbanist planning models in shaping downtowns will be examined in terms of: (1) how and by whom these models are developed in a global-relational context and are set 'in motion' through scaled circuits of policy knowledge and (2) how the mobilization of these models are conditioned by their territorialization in specific spatial and political economic contexts. The paper emphasizes that the 'local globalness' of policy models like BIDs and New Urbanism and their consequences for cities can best be understood through a combined focus on relationality and territoriality.

Key words: Business Improvement Districts, New Urbanism, mobile policies, downtown revitalization; urban politics

Of course, networks, flows, and mobilities matter, and they may also have become more

important during the last three decades of restructuring (Jessop et al., 2008: 391-392)

The cumulative effect of a range of developments – the internationalization of consultancy

firms; the broadening policy remits of transnational institutions; the formation of new policy

networks around think tanks, governmental agencies and professional associations; and the

growth of international conferencing and policy tourism – has been to proliferate, widen and

lubricate channels of cross-border policy transfer (Peck, 2003: 228-229)

1. Introduction

The policy world seems to be one in constant motion. In a figurative sense, policy-makers seem to

be under increasing pressure to 'get a move on' – to keep up with the latest trends and 'hot' ideas

that sweep into their offices, to convert those ideas into locally-appropriate 'solutions,' and 'roll

them out', thus making the most of them before the next trend emerges. As waves of innovation

arrive more frequently, a concordant 'churning' has been identified in urban policy, with new ideas

and initiatives replacing old with increased regularity (Jessop and Peck, 1998; Peck and Theodore,

2001; Theodore and Peck, 2001). Contemporary policy-making, at all scales, therefore involves the

constant 'scanning' (Gilbert, 1999) of the policy landscape, via professional publications and reports,

the media, websites, blogs, professional contacts and word of mouth, etc. for ready-made, off the

shelf policies and best practices that can be quickly applied locally.

It is in this context of 'fast policy transfer' (Peck and Theodore 2001, 429) that figurative

motion in the policy world becomes literal motion. Policy actors (a broadly defined category

including politicians, policy professionals, practitioners, activists, and consultants) act as 'transfer

agents' (Stone, 2004), shuttling policies and knowledge about policies around the world through attendance at conferences, fact-finding study trips, consultancy work, and so on. These travels involve the transfer of policies from place to place (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996, 2000; Stone, 1999, 2004; Evans, 2004), which, in some cases, seem to diffuse with lightening speed, e.g., welfare policies (Peck and Theodore, 2001; Theodore and Peck, 2001) and creative city policies (Florida, 2002; Peck, 2005). These travels and transfers involve local and national policy-makers in networks that extend globally, bringing certain cities into conversation with each other (while pushing others further apart). They create mental maps of 'best cities' for policy that inform future strategies (Austin for quality of life and creativity (Florida 2002; McCann 2004b), Barcelona and Manchester for urban planning and regeneration (Gdaniec 2000; Bell and Binnie 2003; Monclús, 2003; Peck and Ward 2002), Curitiba for environmental planning (Moore 2007), Portland for growth management (Calthorpe and Fulton 2001; Knaap and Nelson 1992); Porto Alegre for participatory budgeting and direct democracy (Baiocchi 2003), Mexico City for poverty alleviation strategies (Peck and Theodore, 2008). Thus, in a policy sense as in other ways, cities are constituted through their relations with other places and scales: cities in the world (Massey, 1991, 1993a, 1999, 2005, 2007).

Yet, while motion and relationality define contemporary policy-making, this is, of course, only half the picture. Policies and policy-making are also intensely and fundamentally local, grounded, and territorial. Even a cursory familiarity with the examples above confirms this point, since our ability to refer to complex approaches to vexing problems of urban governance through the use of a shorthand of city names indicates how tied certain policies are to specific places. There is a 'Barcelona model' of urban regeneration, for example, which is contingent on the historical-geographical circumstances of that city and its relationship with other regional and national forms of decision-making. While other cities might be encouraged to learn or adopt the model, it is generally understood that, in doing so, adjustments will need to be made in order for it to work in those other

4

locales, just as it is understood that the success of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre will not necessarily guarantee its successful adoption in Vancouver, for example. Furthermore, policy is fundamentally territorial in that it is tied up with a whole set of locally dependent interests, with those involved in growth coalitions being the most obvious example (Logan and Molotch, 1987; Cox and Mair, 1988). As such, policy-making must be understood as both relational and territorial; as both in motion and simultaneously fixed, or embedded in place. The contradictory nature of policy should not, however, be seen as detrimental to its operation. Rather, the tension between policy as relational and dynamic, on the one hand, and fixed and territorial, on the other, is a productive one. It is a necessary tension that produces policy and places.[1]

Our purpose in this paper is to explore the implications of this tension for our understanding of urban policy and to use the study of the 'local globalness' of urban policy to inform the study of urban-global relations more generally. We discuss how contemporary scholarship across the social sciences is exhibiting a remarkable convergence around questions of inter-scalar relations and around a conviction that specific cases of regulation, design, or policy-making, for example, must be understood in terms of processes stretching over wider geographical fields and in terms of imperatives that may not be immediately evident at the scale of, or on the face of the cases themselves. It is our contention that this is an important moment in which to consider global-urban relations since ongoing discussions about the relationships between cities and global processes (McCann, 2002, 2004a; Robinson 2002, 2006; Taylor 2004; Ward 2006) and about networked, relational, and territorial conceptualizations of social space (Allen et al 1998; Allen and Cochrane 2007; Amin, 2002; Cox 1995, 2002; Massey 2005; Murdoch and Marsden 1995) indicate that cities are important nodes in a 'globalizing' world. Yet, scholars still do not understand in a deep and detailed way how those involved in urban politics and policy-making act beyond their own cities in order to practice or perform urban globalness and to articulate their cities in the world. So,

5

while we will outline a convergence of thought around the need for empirical detail on global political-economic relations, we will also suggest that the literature needs more empirical accounts of the struggles, practices and representations that underpin urban-global relations and that territorialize global flows.

In the following section, we outline the convergence of work on scalar relations and through a critical discussion of the 'traditional' political science literature on policy transfer we connect a relational/territorial approach to our specific empirical concerns. Subsequently, we detail two related examples of urban policy – Business Improvement Districts and New Urbanist approaches to urban planning and design. As Olds (2001: 9, citing Murdoch 1997: 334-335) puts it, "the 'role of the analyst,'" is . . . 'to follow networks as they stretch through space and time, localizing and globalizing along the way.'" This is what we attempt to do. Our two examples are drawn from long-term research projects that seek to understand the politics of urban policy-making in scalar terms through largely qualitative research methods. Specifically, the examples draw upon content and discourse analyses of consultancy, government, media, practitioner and think tank publications, on semi-structured interviews with key transfer agents in a number of cities, and on participation in and observation of relevant meetings and conferences where ideas about good urban policy are transferred and negotiated. We contend that qualitative empirical investigations of case studies are a necessary element in any conceptualization of mobile policy. In doing so, we pay close attention to: (1) how urban policies are set 'in motion' globally and how global circuits of policy knowledge and the transfer of policy models influence the governance of specific cities; (2) how the 'making up' of policy (Ward, 2006) is a fundamentally territorialized and political process, contingent on specific historical-geographical circumstances. In the final section, we draw out four implications of our analysis for the wider concerns that are motivating this journal special edition.

2. Conceptualizing global-urban connections: relationalities, territorialities, policies

Territories do not come at the expense of extensive networks and flows but, rather, they are constituted by and contribute to these social networks (Beaumont and Nicholls, 2007: 2559)

[W]hat is commonly referred to as 'urban politics' is typically quite heterogeneous and by no means referable to struggles within, or among, the agents structured by some set of social relations corresponding unambiguously to the urban (Cox, 2001: 756)

2.1 The relational and territorial geographies of urban policies

A great deal of critical geographical scholarship on cities examines the connections between urbanization and capitalism, the changing territorial forms of the state, and the production of new institutional arrangements for urban and regional governance, focusing on economic development and the 'new urban politics' (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Cox, 1995; Cox and Mair 1988; Harvey, 1989a, 1989b; Jessop, 1998; Jonas and Wilson, 1999; Lauria, 1997; Logan and Molotch 1987; Peck, 1995; Stone 1989; Ward 2000). Yet, very little literature exists on *how* – through what practices, where, when, and by whom – urban policies are produced in global relational context, are transferred and reproduced from place to place, and are negotiated politically in various locations. That said, a number of influential, although varied, and not always entirely compatible, theorizations have sought to understand the tensions and power relations central to these global-urban connections: Harvey's (1973, 1982) conceptualization of the dialectic of fixity and mobility in capitalism and the implications of investment and disinvestment for urban built environments;

7

Massey's (1993a; 2005) notion of a global sense of place in which specific places are understood to be open to and defined by situated combinations of flows of people, communications, responsibilities, etc. that extend far beyond specific locales; the literature on spatial scale, much of which focuses on conceptualizations of territorialization and deterritorialization (Brenner 2001, 2004; Jonas 1994; Smith 1993); the world/global cities literature with its focus on certain cities as powerful nodes in the networked geographies of finance capital (Taylor 2004); and the burgeoning 'mobilities' approach which seeks to conceptualize the social content of movements of people and objects from place to place at various scales and the immobilities and 'moorings' that underpin and challenge these dynamics (Cresswell 2001, 2006; Hannam et al 2006; Sheller and Urry 2006a, 2006b).

Each of these literatures seeks to conceptualize how cities are produced in relation to processes operating across wider geographical fields, while recognizing that urban localities simultaneously provide necessary basing-points for those wider processes. Each literature argues that there can be no easy separation between processes of territorialization and deterritorialization; between place-based and global-relational conceptualizations of contemporary political economies. As Hannam et al (2006, 5) put it: "[m]obilities cannot be described without attention to the necessary spatial, infrastructural and institutional moorings that configure and enable mobilities." Rather, "the image of political-economic space as a complex, tangled mosaic of superimposed and interpenetrating nodes, levels, scales, and morphologies has become more [analytically] appropriate than the traditional Cartesian model of homogeneous, self-enclosed and contiguous blocks of territory" (Brenner, 2004, 66). The tensions and crises implied by this 'multiplex' (Amin and Graham, 1997) and multi-scale urban experience are objects of policy-making and politics. Harvey's (1989b) account of urban politics is particularly clear on this issue: While it is important to understand cities as always in a process of becoming (see also Berman 1982), social relations, state policy, and politics shape and are shaped by 'structurally coherent' urban regions, or territories,

which exist "in the midst of a maelstrom of forces that tend to undermine and disrupt" that very coherence (Harvey 1989b: 143).

Allen and Cochrane's (2007: 1171) discussion of (urban) regions resonates strongly with this viewpoint. As they put it: "[T]here is little to be gained by talking about regional (and by inference, urban) governance as a territorial arrangement when a number of the political elements assembled are not particularly regional in any traditional sense, even if they draw on what might called the 'spatial grammar' of regionalism". They proceed to argue:

> Many are 'parts' of elsewhere, representatives of political authority, expertise, skills, and interests drawn together to move forward varied agendas and programmes. The sense in which these are 'regional' (and by inference 'urban') assemblages, rather than geographically tiered hierarchies of decision-making, lies with the tangle of interactions and capabilities within which power is negotiated and played out.

The (urban) region is, thus a social and political product that cannot be understood without reference to its relations with various other scales (Massey 1993a, 2005). Yet, to study how this social production *gets done* involves the study of a whole series of very specific and situated interactions, practices, performances, and negotiations. Allen and Cochrane continue:

> There is … an interplay of forces where a range of actors mobilize, enrol, translate, channel, broker, and bridge in ways that make different kinds of government possible. Some of this interplay takes place at arms length, mediated indirectly, some through relations of co-presence in a more distanciated fashion, and other forms of interaction are more direct in

9

style, but together they amount to a more or less ordered assembly of institutional actors performing the 'region' (and again, by inference, the 'city').

Conceptualizing urban policy-making and politics through the productive tension between relationality and territoriality entails, as Allen and Cochrane indicate, both the study of how urban actors manage and struggle over the 'local' impacts of 'global' flows and also the analysis of how they engage in global circuits of policy knowledge that are produced in and through a "relational geography focused on networks and flows" (Olds, 2001, 6). These transfer agents seek, through this engagement, to take policy models from their own cities and promote them as 'best practices' elsewhere, or to tap into a global field of expertise to identify and 'download' models of good policy. This process of territorializing and deterritorializing policy knowledge is a highly political process (McCann, 2004b, 2008a, 2008b; Peck and Theodore, 2001; Peck, 2006; Ward, 2006). "[Zones] of connectivity, centrality, and empowerment in some cases, and of disconnection, social exclusion and inaudibility" (Sheller and Urry 2006a: 210) are brought into being as struggles ensue over how policies get discursively framed as successes, while the insertion of new 'best practices' from elsewhere into specific cities can empower some interests at the expense of others, putting alternative visions of the future outside the bounds of policy discussion (Robinson 2006). The construction of 'models' of redevelopment, such as that derived from the experience of Barcelona in the 1990s, and their circulation and re-embedding in cities around the world can have profoundly disempowering consequences. On the other hand, this process of policy transfer can also spur contest within cities where activists question the 'pre-approved' credentials of newly imported policy models or where activists are motivated to 'scan globally' (Gilbert, 1999) for alternative policies as part of what Purcell (2008: 153) calls "fast resistance transfer."

2.2 From policy transfer … to mobile policies

How might we think specifically about the movement of policies from a relational/territorial perspective? An appropriate point of departure might be to consider the already existing political science literature on policy transfer which studies how policies are learned from one context and moved to another with the hope of similar results. In one sense, this is a literature that is all about global relations and territories. It developed in the 1990s as "the scope and intensity of policy transfer activity . . . increased significantly" (Evans 2004: 1). This voluminous literature, while internally differentiated and heterogeneous in some respects, also shares some common features. It focuses on modeling how transfer works, creating typologies of 'transfer agents' (Stone, 2004), and identifying conditions under which transfer leads to successful or unsuccessful policy outcomes in the new location (Dolowitz 1997; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000; Evans, 2004; Hulme 2005; Jones and Newburn, 2006; Stone, 1996, 1999; Walker 1999). So, it is not without its insights.

Yet, while this literature is certainly about global relations and territories, it has not involved a social or spatial approach – it is about relations, but is not relational; it is about territories, but is not about the full range of social territoriality. It is limited in its definition of the agents involved in transfer, focusing largely on national and international elites largely working in formal institutions. It focuses solely on national territories – transfer among nations or among localities with single nations – without considering the possibility, or actuality, of transfer among cities that transcend national boundaries, connecting cities globally (an exception is Hoyt, 2004). Furthermore, it tends not to consider transfer as a socio-spatial process in which policies are changed as they travel (Peck and Theodore, 2001; McCann, 2008b).

These limits to the 'traditional' policy transfer literature offer a series of opportunities for further theorization from a number of perspectives that understand, often in different ways, transfer

11

as a global-relational, social and spatial process which interconnects and constitutes cities (Cook, 2008; McCann, 2004, 2008a, 2008b; Peck and Theodore, 2001; Peck, 2003; Wacquant 1999; Ward, 2006, 2007). For Wacquant (1999: 321), the aim should be "to constitute, link by link, the long chain of institutions, agents and discursive supports" that constitute the current historical period while Peck's (2003: 229) approach to policy transfer suggests the challenge is:

> to develop adequate conceptualizations and robust empirical assessments of policies 'in motion', including descriptions of the circulatory systems that connect and interpenetrate 'local' policy regimes. This calls for an analytical shift of sorts, away from the traditional method of focusing on the internal characteristics of different regimes – qua taxonomically defined 'systems' – and towards the transnational and translocal constitution of institutional relations, governmental hierarchies and policy networks

Larner (2003: 510) also advocates a move in the same intellectual direction, towards a "more careful tracing of the intellectual, policy, and practitioner networks that underpin the global expansion of neoliberal ideas, and their subsequent manifestation in government policies and programmes". Explicitly interested in understanding both how and why governing practices and expertise are moved from one place to another, she advocates the 'detailed tracings' of social practices, relations, and embeddings. For example, her study of the global call center and banking industries and the place of New Zealand in the globalization of these economic activities shows the value of the detailed rendering of what might be seen as the banal or mundane practices of various actors who, individually and collectively, play an important role in constituting globalization (Larner 2001).

Much of the mobilities work attempts to understand the details of a particular form of mobility, or a specific infrastructure that facilitates or channels mobilities, in reference to wider processes and contexts:

> [It] problematizes both 'sedentarist' approaches in the social sciences that treat place, stability, and dwelling as a natural steady-state, and 'deterritorialized' approaches that posit a new 'grand narrative' of mobility, fluidity or liquidity as a pervasive condition of postmodernity or globalization … It is a part of a broader theoretical project aimed at going beyond the imagery of 'terrains' as spatially fixed geographical containers for social processes, and calling into question scalar logics such as local/global as descriptors of regional extent … (Hannam et al 2006: 5; see also Sheller and Urry 2006a, 2006b).

For us, the language of the mobilities approach is a useful frame for our discussion of mobile policies because it emphasizes the social and the scalar, the fixed and mobile character of policies. We utilize 'mobilities' in the sense that people, frequently working in institutions, mobilize objects and ideas to serve particular interests and with particular material consequences.

We can, then, see convergences among scholars about the need to be alive to both the *why* and the *how* of policy transfer. This demands that we pay attention to how – through 'ordinary' and 'extra-ordinary' activities – policies are made mobile (and immobile), to why this occurs, and to relationship between these mobilities and the socio-spatial (re)structuring of cities. The question remains how might we best frame these sorts of empirical discussions? Should we understand contemporary policy-making as primarily about territory, as primarily about relationality, or in terms of a both/and logic which recognizes that contemporary "global restructuring has entailed neither the absolute territorialization of societies, economies, or cultures onto a global scale, nor their

complete deterritorialization into a supraterritorial, distanceless, placeless, or borderless space of flows' (Brenner, 2004, 64)? We take the latter position and now use this analytical approach to consider two examples of urban governance and planning.

3. Circulating knowledge, embedded policies: evidence from downtowns

3.1 Business Improvement Districts

Context

A first example of an urban policy 'in motion' is the Business Improvement District (BID) program. Rising to prominence in the early 1990s, the program is about both a way of governing space and an approach to its planning and regulation. A BID is a public-private partnership in which property and business owners in a defined geographical area vote to make a collective contribution to the maintenance, development and marketing/promotion of their commercial district. So a Business Improvement District delivers advertising, cleaning, marketing, and security services across its geographical jurisdiction. The vote to tax themselves by businesses is taken in order to allow them to take management control over 'their' area. Business Improvement Districts reflect how 'property owners …, developers and builders, the local state, and those who hold the mortgage and public debt have much to gain from forging a local alliance to protect their interests and to ward off the threat of localized devaluation' (Harvey, 1989b, 149). BID proponents critique the past role of government in the business of governing the downtown. Instead, Business Improvement Districts are portrayed as "a more focused and flexible form of governance than large municipal bureaucracies" (Levy, 2001, 129). Channeling "private sector agency towards the solution of public

problems" (MacDonald, 1996, 42), they are represented as "an alternative to traditional municipal planning and development" (Mitchell, 2001, 116). Mallett (1994, 284) goes as far as to claim that Business Improvement Districts are "a response to the failure of local government to adequately maintain and manage spaces of the post-industrial city." The BID philosophy is that "the supervision of public space deters criminal activity and the physical design of public space affects criminal activity" (Hoyt, 2004, 369). It draws on the work of Jacobs (1961), Newman (1972) and Wilson and Kelling (1982), which argued that the design of urban space could change the way people behave. As Business Improvement Districts establish the physical layout of benches, street lighting and shop facades, so they shape the ways in which an area is experienced. As such, the BID program draws on, and reinforces, contemporary neo-liberal thinking on both the need to attend to and emphasize the 'business climate' and the 'quality of life'.

The global diffusion of the Business Improvement District program since the mid 1990s has involved a number of 'transfer agents'. Variously situated policy actors have been party to the international diffusion of this program. As it has been moved around the globe from one place to another so it has been subject to a number of changes in its institutional DNA. As it has been territorialized – embedded in particular socio-spatial relations – so certain elements of the program have been emphasized, while others have been downplayed.

Mobilizing Business Improvement Districts

The first BID was established in Toronto in 1970 and the program spread rapidly, encouraged by Canadian state funding incentives. After moving across Canada it entered the US, where the initial BID was set up in New Orleans in 1975. During the 1980s and 1990s the number of US Business Improvement Districts grew slowly but surely. Latest data suggest there are over five hundred

across the country, with the majority in just three of the fifty states: California, New York and Wisconsin (Mitchell, 2001). During the last decade the program has emerged in a number of cities outside of the US. In Australia, Japan, Serbia, South Africa and the United Kingdom Business Improvement Districts (in design if not always in name) have been established (Ward 2006, 2007). According to Hoyt (2006) there are now many thousand around the world. In spite of the program's geographical reach, it is most closely associated, at least in the geographical imagination of many involved in its internationalization, with a small number of cities on the US east coast: New York, Philadelphia and Washington. And senior executives at these Business Improvements have become BID 'gurus', the two most well-known of whom are Daniel Biederman and Paul Levy.

The diffusion of the Business Improvement District program has taken place through a number of channels, some relatively formal, others less so. The International Downtown Association – physically located in Washington but the centre of a network of national downtown trade associations and convener of an annual conference – has been at the centre of the BID program's internationalization.   As it puts:

> Founded in 1954, the International Downtown Association has more than 650 member organizations worldwide including: North America, Europe, Asia and Africa. Through our network of committed individuals, rich body of knowledge and unique capacity to nurture community-building partnerships, IDA is a guiding force in creating healthy and dynamic centers that anchor the well being of towns, cities and regions of the world (http://www.ida-downtown.org)

In its view the BID program is one of the most successful ways of improving the conditions of downtowns the world over. According to the current IDA President, David Feehan, "the IDA is

proud of the role it has played in the resurgence of downtowns in the US and Canada. Now, through partnerships in Europe, the Caribbean, Australia and Africa, IDA is expanding its resources and knowledge base even more" (http://www.ida-downtown.org). Its partners include the Association of Town Centre Management (ATCM) in the UK, Business Improvement Areas of British Columbia (BIABC) in Canada, Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) in the West Indies, and Central Johannesburg Partnership (CJP) in South Africa. Neil Fraser, the Executive Director of the CJP describes the role of the IDA as "a true leader in bringing together city practitioners and specialists from North America and around the world. They provide essential support and assistance in all aspects of private urban management." (http://www.ida-downtown.org). The CJP became a member of the IDA in 1995, and its Executive Director was subsequently appointed to the board of the IDA (Peyroux, 2008). Through regular conferences, institutes, seminars and workshops organised by the IDA, downtown practitioners feed into and reinforce the general emphasis on creative and liveable cities (Florida, 2002). Together with national partners and others with a stake in the expansion of the BID program, such as private consultancies, think tanks and government departments, the activities of the IDA serve to convince urban authorities of the virtues of the BID program. In 1995 the CJP and IDA organised a 'study tour' to the UK and the US for Johannesburg's public and private sector officials. The purpose was 'to visit … sites and learn from international experiences in order to set up practices and legislation for a CID [City Improvement District] in Johannesburg' (Peyroux 2008: 4).

Less formally, but no less importantly in the program's internationalization, have been figures involved in the BID program in some of the largest east coast US cities (Ward, 2006, Cook, 2008). Daniel Biederman, co-founder of Bryant Park Corporation, Grand Central Partnership, and 34th Street Partnership, and the President of the latter two and Paul Levy, CEO and President of Philadelphia's City Centre BID, in particular, have worked hard to promote the BID program

around the world. According to Peyroux (2008: 4), 'the North American BIDS were a strong reference for the Johannesburg CIDs.' They have presented in many countries, extolling its virtues, drawing on their own highly situated and quite specific experiences to 'market' the program and its benefits. Various exchange-making and information-sharing events have been organised in cities including Canberra, Dublin, Johannesburg, London, and Newcastle [Australia]). At these, an ever-wider audience of different types of practitioners and policy-makers are educated in the way of Business Improvement Districts. Not only development officers and planning officials, as might be expected, attend and participate at these events. Due to the financial and legal consequences of BID formation, accountants and lawyers are also selected into the web of mobilization.

When organising 'local' events, 'transfer agents' have tailored 'general' lessons to the specific concerns of host countries or cities. The trick to the on-going global diffusion of this model of downtown governance has been of course to ensure that assembled audiences are convinced both of the virtues of the BID program in general and also of its capacity to attend to whatever issues a particular local representative may be facing. In the UK, the particular case to which this paper now turns, this has meant marketing the BID program in the context of an already extant town management system.

Territorializing Business Improvement Districts

Through our relationship with ATCM (Association of Town Centre Management), and the unique reciprocal membership scheme with the International Downtown Association (IDA) based in Washington DC, our BID network is the largest BIDs network in the world and our Knowledge Bank an unrivalled resource for information on both BIDs and partnership development. Building on our own experience from the National BIDs Pilot, the Knowledge

Bank is growing all the time, as members exchange expertise in the BID Network Exchange and other partnership events across the country (www.ukbids.org)

In addition to the supply side, there needs to be a demand side for policy transfer to occur, although these need to be understood as mutually constituted and reinforcing. Locally dependent or embedded 'transfer agents' of one sort or another play an important in the translating of a general program into something that makes sense to those with particular territorial remits. In the case of the UK, the introduction of the BID program was first mooted in the early 1990s. As the latest in a long line of post-Second World War exchange of urban policies between the two countries (Peck and Theodore 2001; Wacquant 2001; Lupton and Tunstall 2002; Jonas and Ward 2002; Webber and Berube 2008), a report commissioned by the Corporation of London considered the lessons the city might learn from the BID program in New York City (Travers and Weimar, 1996). Although this report argued for the program's introduction into London, it was not until after the election of the national Labour government in 1997 that a series of 'urban' policy documents of different sorts were issued, most noticeably Lord Rogers's *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (Urban Task Force, 1997), which will reappear in our second example, below, and the Government's White Paper *Our Towns and Cities: the Future* (Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, 2000). These all focused political and practitioner attention on the role cities should be encouraged to play in driving national economic growth. All were informed by examples of policy tourism. Government ministers, such as John Prescott, and senior officials were regular visitors to New York and Philadelphia. They were keen to see the BID program in action. A series of other green and white papers were issue at the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s, creating the financial and legal conditions in English cities for the creation of Business Improvement Districts. During this period there was a sustained creation of favorable 'importing' conditions. Various 'transfer agents' operating at and

19

across a range of 'spaces of engagement' (Cox, 2001), such as national think tanks, regional development agencies and local authorities visited examples of existing Business Improvement Districts. A series of documents were produced and circulated. Reports appeared in trade magazines such as *Regeneration and Renewal* and *Town and Country Planning* and on trade websites such as www.publicfinance.co.uk. A made to order website – www.ukbids.org – was established to oversee the introduction of Business Improvement Districts into England.[2] Jacquie Reilly was appointed as the Project Director of the National Business Improvement Pilot Project (and subsequently to run its successor, the UKBIDs Advisory Service). She championed the BID program in England. The creation of English Business Improvement Districts was finally announced in 2001, and the final piece of the legal framework was agreed in 2004. And despite its Canadian origins, central government was clear on the geographical reference points of the variety of the BID program it was introducing into the country:

> I can tell you today that we have decided to introduce legislation to create Business Improvement Districts. These will be similar to the successful US examples (DLTR, 2001: 1)

> This approach [to the BID program] building on the very successful business model in the USA, will allow business to see precisely what they are getting for their money and will help to harness local business leadership (DLTR, 2001: 2)

> Business Improvement Districts are 'New York-style schemes' (ODPM, 2003: 1)

Of course the BID program was not introduced into an institutional vacuum in England. Around the country many cities and towns had already in place some sort of governing partnership.

Many hundreds had town centre management partnerships recognized by the Association of Town Centre Management. Indeed the International Downtown Association's first annual conference took place in Coventry in England in 1997. So the experiences of some of England's cities were already present in the geographical imagination of international practitioners. In addition, the public finance system in England remains highly centralized. There are few examples of city government raising revenue through taxes. And, as Peck and Theodore (2001: 430) remind us, "inherited institutional structures, established political traditions, and extant policy conventions and discourses all operate to ensure a degree of continuity in the policy development process." In the case of the BID program this matters nationally and locally. The centralized system of central-local government relations affects the way something like the BID program would be introduced. And in different localities it is important that those involved in mediating and translating the BID program are aware of its particular issues. Put simply, while there is much that unites Bolton, Brighton and Coventry there is much that distinguishes them.

Unsurprisingly, then, the English BID Program is quite unique. In particular it differs in three quite fundamental ways in design from the US-derived model that has circulated internationally.   First, this was a state-sponsored introduction of the BID program through a National Business Improvement District Pilot Project. English cities and towns competed for a place in this project. More than one hundred applied and twenty three were successful. These were pilot Business Improvement Districts that ran for a couple of years, preparing themselves for a vote. Since the ending of the pilot scheme, any city or town in England has been able to go to a vote. This takes us to the second peculiarly of the English BID program. In the US it is property owners that vote. In the UK it all non-domestic rate payers, i.e. those who rent properties, who vote in the BID referendum. This was the outcome of a long debate amongst vested interests – local and national government, retail trade associations, property owners and so on. Despite evidence of

involvement by property owners in the activities of Business Improvement Districts (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006), this does not stretch to getting a vote in their establishment. Third, a successful vote must past two tests. Firstly, more than 50% of the vote cast must be in favour of the BID and secondly, the positive vote must represent more than 50% of the rateable value of the votes cast.[3] So there is particular politics around the local dependency of businesses (Cox and Mair, 1988). In some instances the first criteria has been met but the second one has not, as typically smaller, local independent businesses have voted 'yes', while multi-site chains, which are typically larger and hence have a higher rateable value have voted 'no'. Moreover, of the 89 BID votes, 16 have been unsuccessful. There have also been issues around turnout. In all but 18 of the votes the % turnout was less at or less than 50%. So, there have been a variety of issues around the introduction of the BID program into English localities.

What all of this reveals is the complicated ways in which the BID program has both been moved around the world and embedded in existing territorially constituted social relations. It has been moved from one city to another through a myriad of formal and informal networks, via the procedural and technocratic transfer of policy on the one hand, and the presentational performances of high-profile individuals on the other. Simultaneously and necessarily, the BID model has been embedded or 'fixed' temporarily in national and local contexts through the activities of a set of territorially entangled 'transfer agents'. It is a policy model with necessary relational and territorial elements.

3.2 New Urbanism

Context

A second example of an urban policy 'in motion' is the New Urbanism. As with BIDS, proponents of the New Urbanism are concerned with the relationship between the urban built environment and the experience of living in cities. It is a highly influential planning and design movement that emerged in the 1980s largely in the United States and is associated most closely with architects such as Andres Duany, Peter Calthorpe, and Leon Krier (Calthorpe, 1993; Calthorpe and Fulton 2001; Duany, Krieger, Lennertz, and Plater-Zyberk, 1991; Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck, 2001; Falconer Al-Hindi and Till 2001; McCann 1995; 2009; Talen 2005). It critiques car-oriented urban forms as detrimental both to the environment, because of the waste involved in sprawl, and also to community, due to the social atomization New Urbanists associate with the use of private automobiles. Their ideal alternative is characterized by compactness or 'human scale' streets designed to increase the comfort of walkers and cyclists more than drivers, public spaces and institutions as well as retailing mixed into residential developments, and a variety of residential and tenure types. This urban form is believed to encourage social ties by drawing people into the public realm and offering numerous chances to interact. New Urban design tends toward the eclectic but the movement is perhaps most strongly associated with a neotraditional aesthetic of idealized porches and picket fences that has been particularly associated with the work of the movement's leading light, Andres Duany and his company, DPZ.

As we will discuss below, however, the diffusion of New Urbanist 'town-making principles' (Duany, Krieger, Lennertz, and Plater-Zyberk, 1991) and their increased centrality to planning practice in many cities in North America and beyond has involved a decrease in the dominance of

the neotraditional aesthetic – one heavily influenced by idealized landscapes and architectural styles of the US South where the movement had one of its early bases – as the key ideas of compactness and walkable, mixed use neighborhoods have been territorialized in a variety of different urban contexts through their incorporation into local planning policies. As such, New Urbanism, exhibits many of the characteristics of relationality and territoriality with which we are concerned in this paper.

Mobilizing New Urbanism: persuasive gurus and traveling designs

In its early years, New Urbanism was a fringe movement. It was unattractive to planners in the US who were suspicious of the new mixed-use zoning categories needed to implement it and it met with the skepticism of developers and financiers who questioned the market attractiveness of compact housing. Today numerous companies design and build in a New Urbanist style. Falconer Al-Hindi (2001) has identified over 400 New Urbanist developments in the US, including the iconic Seaside, Florida (Mohney 1991) and Kentlands, Maryland (McCann, 1995). Grant (2005) outlines the global spread of the movement, while DPZ lists developments, ordinances and plans, urban redevelopment projects, and other projects in North America, South America, Europe, Asia, and Oceania (www.dpz.com), and Calthorpe Associates notes its engagement in projects across four continents (www.calthorpe.com).[4]

The diffusion of New Urbanism has been facilitated by the practices and strategies of a number of related 'transfer agents' and organizations who act in a way that makes New Urbanism as a much a social movement as a set of design ideas (Falconer Al-Hindi and Till, 2001). Duany, Calthorpe and others advocate for and travel with their ideas tirelessly, acting as consultants to cities governments and private developers and speaking to students, professional organizations, chambers

of commerce, the media, and the general public in order to persuade them as many people as possible of the merits of their urban vision (as McNeill [2009] describes, these activities epitomize how 'global architects' of all kinds operate). In the US, the movement's persuasive abilities have led to its ideas not only being adopted by local governments and developers but also by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development's 'HOPE VI' public housing programs. They have also received a corporate imprimatur by being used to design Disney's Celebration housing development in Orlando, Florida. The movement's persuasive advocates work elsewhere too: Leon Krier and Richard Rogers have influenced urbanist discourse in the UK, for example, with the latter chairing a government task force that produced two influential reports that advocated for sustainable, mixed-use, walkable, cyclable, transit-oriented development (DETR Urban Task Force, 1999, 2005). The advocacy of these individuals has been supported the Congress for a New Urbanism (CNU), a professional organization that has its own written charter, officers, conferences, and, of course, web site (www.cnu.org) which define New Urbanism as a serious, broad-based force, rather than just the preoccupation of a few 'starchitects.'

As New Urbanists, like any other group of transfer agents, seek to market their ideas to ever wider audiences of policy-makers, their enthusiasm and professional credentials must be matched by an attention to the specific political, social, institutional, and local contexts that they are addressing and by a related nimbleness in their discourse. Duany's response to an interview question in the early years of this decade, when the notion of 'Smart Growth' was gaining popularity in the US, is telling in this regard. Are "Smart growth and new urbanism . . . synonymous?" he was asked.

> I think the term "smart growth" is going to win [over New Urbanism]. It's got tremendous polemical power. We have actually repositioned our work as smart growth. For example, our old TND [traditional neighborhood design] codes are now called smart codes. I don't

know if new urbanism and smart growth are synonymous, but they are certainly convergent (Duany, quoted in Zimmerman, 2001, p.10).

This pragmatic approach has allowed New Urbanist ideas to be presented as appropriate in a wide range of contexts, allowing their advocates to rapidly transfer ordinances and 'smart codes' from city to city.

Territorializing New Urbanism: powerful ideas and local politics

You've got to be clever, you got to know who you are talking to (Duany, quoted in Zimmerman, 2001, 13)

Transfer has two sides, however, and the category of 'transfer agents,' is not limited to the charismatic consultants who trek from place to place with their policy solutions in their laptop hard drives. Local politicians and planning professionals also play a crucial role in transfer, which is why Duany and others are willing both to speak in the most evocative terms to planners in order to connect with them at an intuitive level and also to adjust their discourse depending on the locality with which they are engaging (again, see McNeill [2009] for a detailed discussion of 'global architects' strategies in this regard). As Duany notes, it is important for incoming consultants to be sensitive about where and to whom they are talking if they are to influence policy change. In other words, the flow of New Urbanist ideas around North America, Europe, and beyond can only be operationalized or valorized when they are territorialized, whether at the national scale, as in the case of Rogers' influence on UK urban policy, or at the local.

Planning in Austin, Texas, for example, became heavily influenced by New Urbanist and Smart Growth, or what would now be called 'sustainable city,' principles in the 1990s (McCann 2003). The city is now seen as an exemplar of this model of planning and thus offers a useful insight into a locality's engagement with wider flows of policy. In Autumn, 2000, **xx[name removed for review]xx** interviewed the director of the department, the planner who wrote the city's Smart Growth code, and a planner leading the redevelopment of an area of the city along broadly New Urbanist lines and asked them about their engagement with New Urbanist ideas. The interviews suggested that there was a relatively welcoming, but not entirely uncritical, reception for the movement in the city. Planners were primed to agree with many of New Urbanist arguments because of their views on what is wrong with US cities in general and what problems were facing Austin in particular, views that must be seen as conditioned by their class, gender, race, etc., and by their training in land use planning. Secondly, the wider political economic context of Austin in the 1990s had a great deal to do with the way that the planning department was staffed, what priorities it set itself in relation to the mandates of the city council, and what options it could reasonably pursue as it attempted to manage the city's built environment. These conditions also influenced New Urbanists' ability to embed their ideas in the city's planning policies.

When asked why New Urbanism was attractive to him, a senior planner said,

It really just *struck a cord with me*. Something that I felt like I'd been looking for my entire career. These guys [New Urbanists] were able to organize it and put some sense to the things that had bothered me for my entire career about cities and suburbs – how they developed and what's wrong with them. They made sense of the problems and how to go about them and resolve them. So, for me, personally, it just hit home. It made a whole lot

of sense, professionally, and it offered, you know, a way of beginning to think of how to deal with growth in a sensible way for an entire region (Planner No.1, 2000, our emphasis).

The ability of New Urbanism to resonate with planners at an intuitive level is reflected in another planners comments: "Back in the late '80s or early '90s, I started, like a lot of other people, you know, reading about Seaside and . . . neotraditional neighborhoods . . . It really *caught my imagination* (Planner No.2, 2000, our emphasis). Some of New Urbanism's design prescriptions were also attractive. For instance, a planner with a training in landscape architecture noted that New Urbanism, "*really made sense to me*, that you could control the [land] uses by size, which I think is what Seaside does" (Planner No.3, 2000, our emphasis). As we will show below, this planner in particular maintains a critique of New Urbanism even as she and her colleagues adopted and utilized 'Smart Codes' and 'Traditional Neighborhood Deign Ordinances' which are based on models provided by the leading New Urbanist design consultancies.

New Urbanist policy transfer – studying places like Seaside and Kentlands and then adopting their underlying design codes and planning ordinances for use in other locations – cannot be understood only in terms of the convictions of individual architects, advocates, or planners, however. The political economic context for the adoption of New Urbanism and Smart Growth in Austin was also crucial. The reorganization of planning procedures in the city and the acceptance of the language of New Urbanism in day-to-day policy discussions went hand-in-hand.

New Urbanism's rise to prominence in the US coincided with a recession in the early 1990s. In Austin, one consequence of the recession was a reduction in staffing in city agencies, including the planning department. When the economy began to expand by the middle of the decade, new hiring resumed. This coincided with the election of a mayor who was influenced by critiques of urban sprawl and by the Smart Growth approach developed in Maryland. As a result of this set of

28

circumstances, a new director of planning was hired in 1998, with the mandate to expand the planning department. When asked if he was looking to hire a new type of planner when he took the position, given that the mayor was advocating relatively new planning principles associated with Smart Growth, the director was clear:

> I was looking for people who were interested in New Urbanism and I wanted, for the first time, an urban design function in the planning staff. We had never had anybody really with an urban design background. And so, those were the two areas that I focused on. Build urban design and build sort of a New Urbanism approach. . . . No matter what their primary background was, transportation or anything else, . . . they had [to have] some sense of how the transportation / land use interface might work (Planner No.1, 2000).

Yet, as we have suggested, the acceptance of New Urbanist design prescriptions has never been total in the Austin planning department, particularly when those prescriptions appear to be externally generated and imposed templates with little sensitivity to local context. "There's kind of a group of New Urbanist people [in Austin] who think that there's a strict formula, that you must never vary from," Planner No.3 observed. "I personally believe," she continued, "that . . . all design must be sight specific. . . . [What I am interested in is] a much more studied outlook than just taking a New Urbanist template and slapping it down . . .." The politics of policy transfer thus emerges in and through the negotiations among planners and between planners, politicians, other bureaucrats, and the public about how the urban built environment might be designed and managed. This negotiation entails 'local' interactions intertwined with mobilizations, enrolments, translations, channeling, brokerings, and bridgings that draw wider circuits of policy knowledge into the city (cf. Allen and Cochrane, 2007).

Milton Freidman once argued that when a crisis occurs, such as the early 1990s US recession, "the actions that are taken depend on the ideas that are lying around." He saw intellectuals functioning "[t]o develop alternatives to existing policies, to keep them alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable" (Friedman quoted in Klein, 2007: 140). While space does not allow a comparison New Urbanism and neoliberalism,[5] we will suggest that certain resonant ideas seemed to be circulating in and around Austin at the right time for politicians and planners. The confluence of the end of the recession, restaffing in the city's planning department, and New Urbanist discourse produced a new 'Smart Growth' Austin, a city produced through relationality and territoriality.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

With a strong emphasis on civility and livability, there are strong resonances between the BID program and New Urbanism. This paper has detailed how each has been moved around the world. It has outlined each program's geographical and ideological origins. Even the most trans-national of policies has to have started somewhere, of course. The paper then turned to documenting those actors and institutions involved in the trans-nationalization of the two policy models and in constructing the cities involved as cities in the world as much as cities embedded in regional or national hierarchies. Both examples reveal the range of 'transfer agents' involved in this process. Some with little reach, overseeing its introduction in a specific city. Others with a far longer reach, able to influence policy reform at a distance. The paper then progressed to examine the ways in which each program was embedded in particular territorial contexts. For the BID program this was England. In the example of New Urbanism the empirical case was Austin, Texas. Both reveal the ways in which a process of translation is performed, both by those coming in from outside and by

30

actors resident in each of the contexts. In these moments – whether they are literally 'performed' at conferences or workshops, or occur through circulated written publications – supply and demand come so close as to be almost indistinguishable.

While these empirical details are important, we want to conclude this paper by noting a number of broader conceptual issues that speak to the wider concerns at play in this journal special edition. First, this paper has argued for a conceptualization of the making of urban policy through both its territorial and relational geographies. It has argued for an appreciation of how cities are assembled by the situated practices and imaginations of actors who are continually attracting, managing, promoting, and resisting global flows of policies and programs. Following Olds (2001: 8), we advocate "a relational geography that recognizes the contingent, historically specific, uneven, and dispersed nature of material and non-material flows." Second, it has sought to question critically the existing literature on policy transfer. It has acknowledged its contributions while also highlighting its weaknesses. In sketching out a new way of thinking about the mobility of policies and programs (McCann 2008b), this paper has drawn on a number of different literatures in which there appears to have been some convergence around documenting in detail the means through which policies are made mobile. Our way forward is to argue for a framework that includes a broad understanding of 'transfer agents', takes seriously the transfer of inter-urban, trans-national policy transfer, and understands 'transfer' as a socio-spatial process in which policies are subject to change as they are moved. Third, the paper has offered some thoughts on what the current concern for thinking relationally might mean for *doing* of research. It means paying attention to the various spaces that are brought into being during the journey of a policy or program: a mixture of following the policy together with sensitivity to the particular territorial contexts at every step in the process of movement. Fourth, the approach we advocate has, at its core, sensitivity to both structure and agency. In the case of the BID and New Urbanism programs key individuals did make a difference.

31

This was not done under terms of their making, however. Rather there is a set of macro supply and demand contexts in which some 'idea brokers' (Smith, 1991), are structurally advantaged. Some, more than others, are likely to have their ideas and policies made mobile. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that both examples are constitutive elements in the current urban neo-liberal policy orthodoxy. And, of course, there is an interaction of a range of differently scaled forces in and through which these agents mobilize, broker, translate and introduce ideas in such a way as to make the territorially embedding of policies and programs not just possible but probable.

References

Allen J, Massey D and Cochrane A 1998 *Re-thinking the Region* London: Routledge

Allen J 2003 *Lost Geographies of Power* Oxford: Blackwell.

Allen J and Cochrane A 2007 Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power, *Regional Studies* 41 1161-1175

Amin A 2002 Spatialities of globalization *Environment and Planning A* 34 385-399

Amin A and Graham S 1997 The ordinary city *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22 411-429

Baiocchi G 2003 Participation, Activism, and Politics: The Porto Alegre Experiment. In A Fung, EO Wright, RN Abers, and R Abers eds. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance.* London: Verso, 45-76.

Bell J and Binnie J 2005 What's eating Manchester? Gastro-culture and urban regeneration *Architectural Design* 75 78-85

Berman M 1982 *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* New York: Penguin Books

Beaumont J and Nicholls W 2007 Between relationality and territoriality: investigating the geographies of justice movements in The Netherlands and the United States *Environment and Planning A* 39 2554 – 2574

Brenner N 1998 Between fixity and motion: accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16 459-481

Brenner N 2001 The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration *Progress in Human Geography* 15 525-548

Brenner N 2004 *New state spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of statehood,* Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York

Brenner N and Theodore N eds 2002 *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe.* London: Blackwell

Calthorpe P 1993 *The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community, and the American Dream.* Princeton Architectural Press.

Calthorpe P and Fulton WB 2001 *The Regional City: Planning for the End of Sprawl.* Island Press.

Cook IR 2008 Mobilising urban policies: the policy transfer of US Business Improvement Districts to England and Wales *Urban Studies* 444 773-795

Cox KR 1995 Globalisation, competition and the politics of local economic development *Urban Studies* 32 213-224

Cox K R 2001 Territoriality, politics and the 'urban' *Political Geography* 20 745-762

Cox KR 2002 *Political geography: Territory, state and society* Blackwell: Oxford

Cox KR and Mair A 1988 Locality and community in the politics of local economic development *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 78 307-325

Cresswell T ed. 2001 Mobilities. Special issue of *New Formations*, 43.

Cresswell T 2006 *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world.* New York: Routledge.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) Urban Task Force. 1999.

Towards an urban renaissance: Final report of the urban task force. London: Department of

Transport, Environment, and the Regions.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) Urban Task Force. 2005.

Towards a stronger urban renaissance. http://www.urbantaskforce.org/UTF_final_report.pdf. Last

accessed: October 30 2008.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) 2000 *Our towns and cities – the*

future: delivering an urban renaissance, London: The Stationary Office.

Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DETR) 2001a *Blair unveils BIDs – a*

scheme to improve local quality of life, News Release 2001/0234

Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions 2001b *Regulatory impact assessment:*

Local government bill: Business Improvement Districts, London: DTLR

Dolowitz D and Marsh D 1996 Who learns from whom: a review of the policy transfer literature

Political Studies 44 342-357

Dolowitz D and Marsh D 2000 Learning from abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary

policy making *Governance* 13 5-24

Duany A, Krieger A, Lennertz WR, and Plater-Zyberk, E. 1991. *Towns and Town-Making Principles.* New York: Rizzoli.

Duany A, Plater-Zyberk E, and Speck J 2000 *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream.* New York: North Point Press.

Evans M (ed) 2004 *Policy transfer in global perspective* Ashgate: Aldershot

Falconer Al-Hindi K 2001 The New Urbanism: Where and for whom? An Investigation of an emergent paradigm. *Urban Geography* 22 (3):202-219.

Falconer Al-Hindi K and Till K eds. 2001 Special Issue: The New Urbanism and Neotraditional Town Planning. *Urban Geography,* 22 (3): 189-286.

Florida R 2002 *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life.* New York: Basic Books.

Gdaniec C 2000 Cultural industries, information technology and the regeneration of post-industrial urban landscapes. Poblenou in Barcelona - a virtual city? *Geojournal* 50 379-387

Gilbert A 1999 'Scan globally: reinvent locally': reflecting on the origins of South Africa's capital housing subsidy policy *Urban Studies* 39 1911-1933

Grant, J. 2005. *Planning the good community: New urbanisms in theory and practice.* New York: Routledge.

Hall T and Hubbard P 1996 The entrepreneurial city: new urban politics, new urban geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 20 153-174

Hall T and Hubbard P (eds) 1998 *The entrepreneurial city: geographies of politics, regime, and representation.* New York: Wiley.

Hannam K, Sheller M and Urry J 2006 Editorial: mobilities, immobilities and moorings *Mobilities* 1-22

Harvey D 1973 *Social Justice and the City* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press

Harvey D 1982 *The Limits to Capital* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Harvey D 1989a From managerialism to entrepreneurialism – the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism *Geografiska Annaler Series B* 71 3-17

Harvey, D. 1989b *The Urban Experience.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harvey, D. 1993 From space to place and back again: reflections on the condition of postmodernity, in: J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putman, G. Robertson, and L. Tickner (Eds.) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change.* New York: Routledge, pp. 3-29.

Hoyt L 2004 Collecting private funds for safer public spaces: an empirical examination of the Business Improvement Districts concept *Environment and Planning B* 31 367-380

Hoyt L 2006 Importing ideas: the transnational transfer of urban revitalization policy *International Journal of Public Administration* 29 221-243

Hume R 2005 Policy transfer and the internationalization of social policy *Social Policy and Society* 4 417-425

Jacobs J 1961 *The death and life of great American cities* Vintage Books, New York

Jessop B 1998 The narrative of enterprise and the enterprise of narrative: Place marketing and the entrepreneurial city in T Hall and P Hubbard (eds) *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regimes and Representation* John Wiley and Sons: Chichester 77-99

Jessop B and Peck J 1998 Fast policy/local discipline: the politics of time and scale in the neoliberal workfare offensive, mimeograph, Department of Sociology, Lancaster University

Jessop B, Brenner N and Jones MR 2008 Theorizing sociospatial relations *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26 389-401

Jonas AEG 1994 The scale politics of spatiality *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12 257-264

Jonas AEG and Wilson D (eds) 1999 *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives, Two Decades Later* State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.

Jonas AEG and Ward K 2002 A world of regionalisms? Towards a US-UK urban and regional policy framework comparison *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 377-401

Jones T and Newburn T 2006 *Policy Transfer and Criminal Justice* Open University Press: Milton Keynes

Klein N 2007 *The shock doctrine: the rise of disaster capitalism* *

Knaap G and Nelson A 1992 *The Regulated Landscape: Lessons on State Land Use Planning from Oregon.* Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Larner W 2001 Governing globalisation: the New Zealand call centre attraction initiative *Environment and Planning A* 33 297–312

Larner W 2003 Guest editorial: Neoliberalism? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21 508-512

Levy P R 2001 Paying for public life *Economic Development Quarterly* 15 124-131

Lauria M (ed) (1997) *Reconstructing urban regime theory* Sage Thousand Oaks

Logan J and Molotch H 1987 *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place* University of California Press: Berkeley

MacDonald H 1996 Why Business Improvements Districts work. *Civic Bulletin* 4 [available at: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cb_4.htm

Mallett W J 1994 Managing the post-industrial city: business improvement districts in the United States *Area* 26 276-287

Massey, D 1991 A global sense of place, *Marxism Today,* June*,* 24–29.

Massey D 1993a Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place in Bird J, Curtis B, Putman T, Robertson G, and Tickner L (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change* Routledge: New York 59-69

Massey D 1993b Questions of locality *Geography* 78 142-149

Massey D 1999 Imagining globalisation: power-geometries of space-time In Brah A., Hickman M, and MacanGhaill M (eds) *Global Futures: Migration, Environment, and Globalisation* St. Martin's Press, Basingstoke 27-44

Massey D 2005 *For Space* Sage: London

Massey D 2007 *World City* Polity Press: Cambridge

McCann EJ 1995 Neotraditional developments: the anatomy of a new urban form *Urban Geography* 16 210-233

McCann EJ 2002 The urban as an object of study in global cities literatures: representational practices and conceptions of place and scale in Herod A and Wright M W (eds) *Geographies of Power: Placing Scale* Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell 61-84

McCann, E.J. 2003 Framing Space and Time in the City: Urban Policy and the Politics of Spatial and Temporal Scale. ***Journal of Urban Affairs*** 25 (2) 159-178.

McCann EJ 2004a Urban political economy beyond the 'global' city *Urban Studies* 41 2315-2333

McCann EJ 2004b 'Best places': Interurban competition, quality of life and popular media discourse *Urban Studies* 41 1909-1929

McCann EJ 2008a Expertise, Truth, and Urban Policy Mobilities: Global Circuits of Knowledge in the Development of Vancouver, Canada's 'Four Pillar' Drug Strategy. *Environment and Planning A*, 40(4) 885-904.

McCann EJ 2008b Urban policy mobilities and global relational geographies: Toward a research agenda. Working Paper, Simon Fraser University Department of Geography.

McCann EJ 2009 (In Press). The New Urbanism. In R Kitchin and N Thrift eds. ***International Encyclopedia of Human Geography***. Elsevier.

McNeill D 2009 *The Global Architect: Firms, Fame, and Urban Form.* New York: Routledge.

Mitchell J 2001 Business Improvement Districts and the management of innovation *American Review of Public Administration* 31 201-217

Mohney D 1991 *Seaside: Making a Town in America.* Princeton Architectural Press.

Moore SA 2007 *Alternative Routes to the Sustainable City: Austin, Curitiba, and Frankfurt.*

Murdoch J and Marsden T 1995 The spatialization of politics: local and national actor spaces in environmental conflict *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 20 368–380

Monclús F-J 2003 The Barcelona model: and an original formula? From 'reconstruction' to strategic urban projects (1979-2004) *Planning Perspectives* 18 399-421

Newburn T 2002 Atlantic crossings: 'policy transfer' and crime control in the US and Britain *Punishment and Society* 4 165-194

Newman O 1972 *Defensible space: crime prevention through urban design* Macmillan, New York

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) 2003 *Businesses 'BID' to help communities thrive*, News Release 2003/0005

Olds K 2001 *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture, and Pacific Rim Mega-Projects.* Oxford University Press: Oxford

Peck J 1995 Moving and shaking: business elites, state localism and urban privatism *Progress in Human Geography* 19 16-46

Peck J 2001 *Workfare states* Guildford Press, New York

Peck J 2003 Geography and public policy: mapping the penal state *Progress in Human Geography* 27 222-232

Peck J 2005 Struggling with the creative class *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24 740-770

Peck J 2006 Liberating the city: between New York and New Orleans *Urban Geography* 27 681-723

Peck J and Theodore N 2001 Exporting workfare/importing welfare-to-work: Exploring the politics of Third Way policy transfer *Political Geography* 20 427–460

Peck J and Theodore N 2008 Recombinant workfare, across the Americas. Paper presented at the Association of American Geographers conference.

Peck J and Ward K (eds) 2002 *City of revolution: restructuring Manchester* Manchester University Press: Manchester

Peyroux E 2008 City Improvement Districts in Johannesburg: an examination of the local variations of the BID model in Pütz, R., (ed.), *Business Improvement Districts, Passau: Geographische Handelsforschung* 14 (forthcoming)

Purcell M 2008 *Recapturing Democracy*. New York: Routledge.

Robinson J 2002 Global and world cities: a view from off the map *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26 531-554

Robinson J 2006 *Ordinary cities: Between modernity and development* Routledge: London

Sheller M and Urry J 2006a The new mobilities paradigm, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 38 207-226

Sheller M and Urry J (eds) 2006b *Mobile technologies of the city* Ashgate: Aldershot

Smith J 1991 *The idea brokers: the rise of think tanks and the rise of the policy elite* New York: Free Press

Smith N 1993 Homeless/global: scaling places In J Bird, B Curtis, T Putman, G Robertson, L Tickner (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change* Routledge: New York 87-119

Stone C 1989 *Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988* University of Kansas Press, Lawrence

Stone D 1996 *Capturing the political imagination: think tanks and the policy process* Frank Cass: London

Stone D 1999 Learning lessons and transferring policy across time, space and disciplines *Politics* 19 51-59

Stone D 2004 Transfer agents and global networks in the 'transnationalisation' of policy', *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 545-66

Talen E 2005 *New Urbanism and the American Dream.* New York: Routledge.

Taylor P 2004 *World City Network: A Global Urban Analysis* Routledge: London

Theodore N and Peck J 2001 Searching for 'best practice' in welfare-to-work: the means, the method and the message *Policy and Politics* 29 85-98

Travers T and Weimar J 1996 *Business improvement districts: New York and London.* The Greater London Group, London School of Economics and Political Science: London.

Wacquant L 1999 How penal common sense comes to Europeans: notes on the transatlantic diffusion of the neoliberal doxa *European Societies* 1 319-352

Wacquant L 2001 The penalisation of poverty and the rise of neo-liberalism *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 9 401-412

Walker R (1999) The Americanization of British welfare: a case study of policy transfer *International Journal of Health Services* 29 679-697

Ward K 2000 Critique in search of a corpus: re-visiting governance and re-interpreting urban politics *Transactions of the Institute of the British Geographers* 25 169 - 185

Ward K 2006 'Policies in motion', urban management and state restructuring: the trans-local expansion of Business Improvement Districts *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 54-75

Ward K 2007 Business Improvement Districts: policy origins: mobile policies and urban liveability *Geography Compass* 2 657-672

Ward K and Jonas AEG 2004 Competitive city-regionalism as a politics of space: a critical reinterpretation of the new regionalism *Environment and Planning A* 36 2119-2139

Wilson J and Kelling G 1982 "Broken windows": the police and neighborhood safety *Atlantic Monthly* March 29-38

Zimmerman, M. 2001. Is New urbanism Growing Old? An Interview with Andres Duany. *Planning*, June, 10-13.

Table 1: England's Business Improvement Districts, 2008

	BID	TYPE	BALLOT DATE	POS by NUM	POS by RATES	TURNOUT
1	Edinburgh BID	Town Centre	27/05/08	58%	63%	44%
2	Falkirk BID	Town Centre	09/05/08	70%	61%	39%
3	Lancing BID	Ind Estate	08/04/08	65%	83%	50%
4	Clackmannanshire BID	Ind Estate	01/04/08	85%	79%	48%
5	BID Leamington	Town Centre	31/03/08	61%	63%	41%
6	Inverness BID	Town Centre	18/03/08	73%	84%	34%
7	Bathgate BID	Town Centre	14/03/08	93%	82%	45%
8	Daventry First	Town Centre	13/03/08	74%	80%	27%
9	Coventry City Centre BID (2nd Term Ballot)	Town Centre	29/02/08	83%	85%	36%
10	Dorchester BID Company	Town Centre	29/02/08	81%	84%	56%
11	New West End Company (2nd Term Ballot)	Town Centre	21/12/07	63%	73%	43%
12	Astmoor Industrial Estate	Ind Estate	06/12/07	72%	77%	65%
13	Halebank Industrial Estate	Ind Estate	06/12/07	72%	70%	50%
14	Derby Cathedral Quarter BID	Town Centre	28/11/07	85%	74%	43%
15	Longhill and Sandgate BID (Hartlepool)	Ind Estate	12/11/07	80%	94%	29%
16	Dublin City Centre BID	Town Centre	30/10/07	77%	TBC	TBC
17	Nottingham Leisure BID	Town Centre	26/10/07	75%	75%	33%
18	Kings Heath BID	Town Centre	28/08/07	74%	53%	27%
19	Blackburn EDZ Industrial Estate BID	Ind Estate	02/08/07	89%	89%	40%
20	BID Taunton	Town Centre	31/07/07	72%	67%	42%
21	Winchester BID	Town Centre	26/07/07	54%	62%	45%
22	Worthing Town Centre BID	Town Centre	05/07/07	57%	53%	31%
23	Truro	Town Centre	05/07/07	71%	63%	51%
24	Sleaford BID	District Wide	05/07/07	69%	75%	40%
25	E11 BID	Town Centre	22/06/07	95%	91%	42%
26	Argall BID	Ind Estate	23/05/07	86%	93%	TBC
27	Segensworth Estates BID - Fareham	Ind Estate	15/05/07	73%	TBC	30%
28	Segensworth Estates BID - Winchester	Ind Estate	10/05/07	100%	TBC	76%
29	Cannock Chase BID	Ind Estate	30/03/07	62%	68%	44%
30	Erdington	Town Centre	29/03/07	74%	55%	31%
31	Croydon BID	Town Centre	28/02/07	63%	70%	44%
32	London Riverside BID	Ind Estate	26/02/07	82%	68%	30%
33	Heart of London Business Alliance (2nd Term Ballot)	Town Centre	26/02/07	86%	89%	62%
34	Angel Town Centre BID	Town Centre	23/02/07	77%	83%	51%
35	Coventry City Wide BID	District Wide	22/02/07	54%	59%	33%
36	Cater Business Park	Ind Estate	05/02/07	90%	80%	56%
37	InSwindon	Town Centre	01/02/07	69%	54%	41%
38	Oldham BID	Town Centre	06/12/06	76%	56%	45%
39	Southern Cross BID	Ind Estate	04/12/06	94%	99%	72%
40	Retail Birmingham BID	Town Centre	09/11/06	69%	62%	49%
41	Altham BID (2nd Ballot)	Ind Estate	08/11/06	61%	70%	70%
42	Hull BID	Town Centre	18/10/06	81%	76%	45%
43	Cowpen Industrial Association BID	Ind Estate	05/10/06	88%	87%	32%
44	Ipswich	Town Centre	24/07/06	66%	70%	49%

45	Brighton	Town Centre	26/05/06	64%	70%	46%
46	Swansea	Town Centre	04/05/06	74%	65%	45%
47	West Bromwich Albion BID	Ind Estate	07/04/06	79%	85%	48%
48	Hammersmith	Town Centre	29/03/06	57%	70%	48%
49	Great Yarmouth BID	Town Centre	28/03/06	82%	88%	44%
50	Ealing	Town Centre	28/03/06	65%	64%	51%
51	Hainault Business Park Business Improvement District	Ind Estate	20/03/06	85%	93%	52%
52	Camden Town Unlimited	Town Centre	01/03/06	83%	84%	50%
53	Waterloo Quarter Business Alliance	Town Centre	01/03/06	74%	92%	50%
54	Bolton Industrial Estates BID	Ind Estate	01/12/05	72%	84%	46%
55	Winsford Industrial Estate	Ind Estate	19/11/05	89%	71%	50%
56	Reading BID	Town Centre	19/11/05	68%	60%	38%
57	London Bridge	Town Centre	17/11/05	71%	78%	50%
58	Liverpool City Central BID (2nd Ballot)	Town Centre	20/10/05	62%	51%	56%
59	Rugby	Town Centre	30/09/05	66%	74%	50%
60	Keswick	Town Centre	22/09/05	55%	74%	50%
61	Blackpool Town Centre	Town Centre	23/08/05	89%	74%	40%
62	Bristol Broadmead	Town Centre	30/06/05	60%	56%	59%
63	Birmingham Broad Street	Town Centre	26/05/05	92%	97%	65%
64	Lincoln	Town Centre	18/04/05	79%	83%	44%
65	Bedford	Town Centre	30/03/05	77%	81%	40%
66	New West End Company	Town Centre	16/03/05	61%	69%	53%
67	Plymouth BID	Town Centre	01/03/05	77%	66%	58%
68	Paddington BID	Town Centre	01/03/05	87%	88%	51%
69	Coventry City Centre BID	Town Centre	24/02/05	78%	75%	38%
70	Holborn Partnership	Commercial	11/02/05	82%	77%	50%
71	Better Bankside (London)	District Wide	24/01/05	75%	67%	48%
72	Heart of London Business Alliance	Town Centre	31/12/04	71%	73%	62%
73	Kingston First (Kingston Upon Thames)	Town Centre	16/11/04	66%	66%	37%

* Represents a single BID across a Borough Boundary

Table 2, **England's unsuccessful Business Improvement District votes, 2008**

BID	TYPE	DATE	POS by NUM	POS by RATES	TURNOUT
Hams Hall	Ind Estate	17/09/08	75%	42%	80%
Oxford BID	Town Centre	07/07/08	44%	48%	41%
Shrewsbury BID for the Town	Town Centre	25/04/08	52%	48%	TBC
Colchester BID	Town Centre	28/11/07	30%	TBC	TBC
Bayton Industrial Estate BID	Ind Estate	16/03/07	39%	37%	65%
Southport BID (2nd Ballot)	Town Centre	16/03/07	64%	42%	56%
Chester	Town Centre	03/01/07	46%	24%	34%
Leicester	Town Centre	03/10/06	52%	36%	37%
Malton	Commercial	11/04/06	42%	59%	50%
Maidstone BID (2nd Ballot)	Town Centre	01/02/06	49%	59%	33%
Runnymead BID (2nd Ballot)	District Wide	08/12/05	46%	TBC	60%
Southport BID (1st Ballot)	Town Centre	19/11/05	52%	48%	59%
Liverpool City Central BID (1st Ballot)	Town Centre	14/03/05	51%	47%	36%
Runnymede BID (1st Ballot)	District Wide	01/03/05	39%	47%	58%
Altham BID	Ind Estate	25/02/05	49%	52%	79%
Maidstone BID (1st Ballot)	Town Centre	23/02/05	49%	60%	33%

Endnotes

[1] It should be obvious here that our perspective is strongly influenced by Harvey's (1982, 1993) discussion of the fixity and mobility of capital.

[2] According to its website "UKBIDs is committed to supporting robust and successful Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) in the United Kingdom. UKBID incorporates the National BIDs Advisory Service and is delivered by the Association of Town Centre Management, who led the government-supported National BIDs Pilot that introduced BIDs to England and Wales. Today we work actively with new and established BIDs across the country, and with strategic organisations such as the Regional Development Agencies. We lead the national BID Network Exchange and are delivering the country's first BIDs Academy, as well as undertaking research, training events and seminars" (www.ukbids.org)

[3] In the US there is no federal or state wide voting system for the creation of a BID. It differs within states, and even within cities (Ward 2007).

[4] While present in a number of continents, it is important to emphasize that New Urbanist developments are still largely concentrated in North America and Europe.

[5] New Urbanism is undoubtedly a pragmatic, free-marketist ideology. For instance, Duany (quoted in Zimmerman, 2001: 11) is at pains to distance New Urbanism from the 1960s environmental movement that might be seen as an ancestor to a great deal of contemporary anti-sprawl and sustainability activism in the US. This movement, he argues, "became associated with anti-market forces." He goes on to claim that "[w]e have to realize that this is an economy that provides choice, and smart growth has to be presented as a choice." When pushed on this issue and on the political position of smart growth and New Urbanism advocates in the US, he makes the following statement:

> Smart growth, thanks to Al Gore's backing, has been positioned as a movement of the left, and so the right is reflexively attacking it. . . . Let's suggest instead that every jurisdiction should have a smart growth code so that the market can decide – because right now the market has only sprawl as a choice. The idea can be presented to the Republicans as a choice (Duany, quoted in Zimmerman, 2001: 13, our emphasis).