



SEQUEL TO SUBURBIA

Glimpses of America's Post-Suburban Future

Nicholas A. Phelps

Sequel to Suburbia

Urban and Industrial Environments

Series editor: Robert Gottlieb, Henry R. Luce Professor of Urban and Environmental Policy, Occidental College

For a complete list of books published in this series, please see the back of the book.

Sequel to Suburbia

Glimpses of America's Post-Suburban Future

Nicholas A. Phelps

**The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England**

© 2015 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

This book was set in Stone Sans and Stone Serif by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited. Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available.

ISBN 978-0-262-02983-4

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For Elizabeth McArthur Phelps

Contents

Preface ix

- 1 Introduction: From the Modern Suburb to the Post-Suburb of a Second Modernity 1**
- 2 Locating Post-Suburbs in a Metropolitan Context 15**
- 3 The Suburbs and Their Contradictions: The Post-Suburban Politics of a Second Modernity 35**
- 4 Politics and the Private and Collective Dynamics of America's Post-Suburban Future 57**
- 5 Kendall Downtown: The Past of New Urbanism? 81**
- 6 Taming Tysons: Post-Suburbia's Present? 109**
- 7 Schaumburg: The Post-Suburban Future Yet to Come? 137**
- 8 Conclusion: After Suburbia 169**

Notes 181

Index 227

Preface

My interest in the politics and planning of suburban transformation took shape in the early 1990s while I was working as a subcontractor consultant to Croydon Council in South London. Croydon had picked up on Joel Garreau's term "edge city" and cleverly sought to use it to market itself not as an edge city but as a city at the edge of London. I began my academic career as an economic geographer, and naturally my initial interests were framed in terms of the economic gravity of suburban economic nodes such as Croydon. However, Croydon's opportunistic and overtly self-promotional use of the term edge city soon redirected my interests toward the politics and planning of the sorts of transformations taking place in, or planned for, suburbs in the United Kingdom and Europe. Some of these initial interests and, in particular, whether Europe had anything to compare to America's edge cities were explored with colleagues in *Post-Suburban Europe: Politics and Planning at the Margins of Europe's Capital Cities*, published in 2006 by Palgrave Macmillan.

This book draws on two related research projects undertaken from 2008 to 2010, which I was able to augment with funding from the Bartlett School of Planning in 2013. I am extremely grateful for this funding, without which the book certainly would not have been possible. The first of these research projects was funded by the United Kingdom Economic and Social Research Council under the grant title "Governing Post-Suburban Growth" during 2008–2010 (RES 062–23–0924). One outcome of this research was the edited collection *International Perspectives on Suburbanization: A Post-Suburban World?* (published in 2011 by Palgrave Macmillan). That research took me to Tysons Corner, one of six rapidly developing nodes at the edges of capital cities that manifested development issues that piqued my research interests. At first glance, Tysons Corner, an unincorporated community in

Fairfax County, Virginia, on the Capital Beltway, did not appear to offer an auspicious vantage point from which to reconsider aspects of existing urban theory. It was new, surely too new to yield any important insights. Or else it was somewhere and something destined to be overtaken by some other urban form as the urban frontier left it behind. However, contrary to what I had expected, my visits to Tysons Corner prompted me to question elements of existing urban theories. In particular, that some sites in Tysons Corner had already been through their third iteration of development surprised me. It got me to thinking about the land development process and whether it was all of one piece. The existence of lively debate and planning activity on how to remake Tysons Corner simply underlined these interests. For me, the Tysons Corner study became a way into what I believed was something of a bigger research agenda concerning what may come after suburbia.

This agenda certainly included questions about the character of settlements that could be considered post-suburban. It also included the question of what post-suburban politics might consist of. Luckily, help was at hand, for the historian Jon Teaford and postmodernist scholars of what might be called the Los Angeles school of urbanism in particular had provided something of an essential starting point in this regard. However, it also prompted grander thoughts on whether it might be possible to better attune the political economy approaches to suburbanization (of David Harvey and Richard Walker) and the city as a growth machine (of Harvey Molotch and John Logan) and the idea of urban political regimes (of Clarence Stein) to different types of settlements across complex metropolitan regions and the evolution of individual settlements over time.

A second research project, funded by the British Academy in 2010 under the title “The Planning and Politics of Edge City Retrofit” (SG100596), therefore sought to take these ideas further, by exploring the retrofitting of edge cities. This seemed like a great idea, in light of what was going on in Tysons Corner at the time and Ellen Dunham-Jones and June Williamson’s 2008 publication, *Retrofitting Suburbia* (Wiley). However, finding examples of suburban retrofit that went beyond the level of individual architectural projects proved difficult. Finding edge city retrofits was also difficult, perhaps reflecting the fact that American suburban development had only briefly assumed this format, as Robert E. Lang has argued in his 2003 publication, *Edgeless Cities* (Brookings Institution Press). Eventually, after some

scouring of the Internet, I alighted on two other sites to examine alongside Tysons Corner. These were the Kendall Downtown area, the development issues of which had already been quite widely reported, and Schaumburg, Illinois, which, although a place that had marketed itself strongly as an edge city, had not yet grappled seriously with ideas of transit-oriented density.

This book attempts to bring these concerns together. It extends and develops ideas first aired in articles written with Dave Valler and Andy Wood and published in the journals *Environment and Planning A* and *Urban Studies*, and by myself in *Urban Affairs Review*. In reflecting on the early days of this book, then, I owe a debt to a number of people whom I persuaded to come part of the way on what may have seemed a none-too-promising journey. Dave Valler and Andy Wood, Andrew Dowling, Nick Parsons and Dimitris Ballas, and Fulong Wu deserve special mention for sticking with it without a hint of doubt or regret. Sonia Roitman, Oleg Golubchikov, and Amparo Tarazona Vento have also been great friends and collaborators on research and publications closely related to the ideas discussed in this book. Doubtless they do not share all my views and should be spared any of the blame this book might incur. I am grateful to Miles Irving of the UCL Geography Department's cartographic laboratory for the graphic illustrations and for remaining patient with my requests. I am also grateful to Jim Morin and Dover, Kohl and Partners for granting permission to reproduce the images in chapter 5.

I have also benefited greatly from being part of an international network of scholars examining the phenomenon of global suburbanisms, work funded as a Major Collaborative Research Initiative of the Social and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This network has proved to be an enormously intellectually stimulating as well as an enjoyable and sociable group to be a part of. In particular I am grateful to Roger Keil, director of the network, for his boundless energy and for steadfastly supporting my research and writing on suburbanization.

Several kind folk took pity on a Brit researching America. Robert Brueggemann's correspondence helped greatly to shape some of the ideas contained in this book and with some of the Chicago metro area specifics. I would also like to thank Peter Muller, Richard Grant, Miguel Kanai, Robin Bachin, and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk at the University of Miami for their hospitality, help, and guidance while I was in the field in Miami-Dade County in 2010, and Tim Chapin for his comments and suggestions on a

draft of chapter 5, covering the Kendall-Dadeland situation. Fairfax County planners Linda Hollis and Sterling Wheeler and Schaumburg mayor Al Larson were extremely generous with their time and patient with my requests for meetings, while librarian Jane Rozek was a great help regarding the history of Schaumburg. During the period of 2008 to 2014, more than seventy other people gave their valuable time to talk to me in connection with my investigations. Though they are too numerous to mention here, the contributions of all are gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, I am grateful to the editorial and production team at the MIT Press for their interest, commitment, and hard work in bringing this book to fruition. In particular I would like to thank the Urban and Industrial Landscapes series editor Robert Gottlieb, acquisitions editor Beth Clevenger, assistant acquisitions editor Miranda Martin, and manuscript editor Deborah Cantor-Adams for their support for the project.

1

Introduction: From the Modern Suburb to the Post-Suburb of a Second Modernity

The framework of growth, however hastily devised, tends to become the permanent structure. For better or for worse, the American suburb is a remarkable and probably lasting achievement.

—Kenneth Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*

In the years after World War II, American people and businesses of all sorts moved out of cities or approached them by way of the housing tracts, malls, and campus industry and office developments that steadily coalesced into a distinct and expansive new ring of outer suburbs around the major cities of the United States. Unlike the muted and scattered urban extensions of European towns and cities, the outer suburbs came to form a nearly contiguous conglomeration or matrix of elements in an outward expansion of America's major cities.¹ However, like the urban extensions of European towns and cities, they were, from the start, more diverse in their origins and complexions than we have come to believe: sometimes home to the sorts of major employers that attracted subsequent residential development, sometimes representing bedroom communities that demanded shopping malls and employment opportunities, sometimes coalescing further around railroad station towns but at other times stuck out instead in vast expanses crisscrossed or bounded by major highways.²

Although there are some reasons to dub the outer suburbs a “geography of nowhere,” to introduce James Howard Kunstler’s term, there is little doubt that they have come to represent a distinct place of residence and way of life, and the site of much new economic opportunity.³ Indeed, as Richard A. Walker contended some time ago, it is hard to conceive of the success of postwar American capitalism without these new suburbs.⁴ They represented a propitious “spatial fix” (or geographical embodiment of) for

the peculiar strengths of American capitalism during this time and helped to generate the profits being produced by American businesses of all sorts during this time.⁵ They were the embodiment of America's "Fordist" mass-production, mass-consumption economy.⁶ As Robert A. Beauregard has written, "Suburbanization provided investment in new construction and the purchase of consumer goods that, along with rising exports to Europe, anchored national prosperity."⁷ During the 1950s and 1960s, "government articulated a national interest in central city revitalization, while at the same time promoting massive redistribution of population and capital investment from central cities to suburbs."⁸ The benefits of employment decentralization to the outer suburbs clearly accrued to the federal government in terms of national economic performance.⁹ It hardly seems credible that the federal government was not aware of the fact, and it clearly was complicit in encouraging a process that brought it such gains.¹⁰ Federal and state investments in major new road infrastructure, incentives in the form of mortgage relief, a "growth machine" politics, and the fledgling, and permissive, planning control of rural counties created something of a tabula rasa for development on unincorporated land. This at times barely limited market for development saw local banks, insurance companies, real estate brokers, and land speculators, developers, and house builders grow into national business entities. The development of outer suburbia became a national business. The business of producing the built environment—what David Harvey terms the "secondary" circuit of capital may yet become America's primary international business.¹¹

This was a business that fashioned a peculiarly American sense of modernity and projected it internationally. "For centuries," Beauregard writes, "US cities had never quite been able to overcome the history, urbanity, and civilizing image of European cities.... What the postwar suburbs gave up in cosmopolitanism and intellectual and cultural depth, they more than made up in prosperity, freedom of choice, and opportunity. Living well was the American revenge on its European origins."¹² Thus, he continues, "although suburbanization was not confined to the United States, the mass suburbanization of single-family detached houses, shopping malls, an automobile-dependent life-style, and low-density sprawl was peculiar to it."¹³ By today, Dolores Hayden suggests, suburbs have "overwhelmed the centers of cities, creating metropolitan regions largely formed of suburban parts."¹⁴ So much were cities overwhelmed that at the end of the twentieth century it

was possible to regard the outer suburbs of America's cities as little short of a new urbanity—the sort of lasting achievement alluded to in this chapter's epigraph.¹⁵

Or are the outer suburbs instead by now the urbanity of an older, first modernity? As with so many models and concepts in circulation in urban studies, one might argue that the American outer suburbs we have in mind represent a certain vintage of urbanization. They were the ultimate logical expression of the sorts of personal mobility and the attendant organization of land use promised by the motor car as early as the first decade of the twentieth century, an expression of bureaucratic, organized capitalism, and the rational spatial configuration best suited to fighting late modernity's cold war.

For while the outer suburbs are associated with the phenomenal economic success of the American economy during the 1940s through the 1970s, they have also come to exemplify the contradictions inherent in the urbanization of capital in general and American capitalism in particular—contradictions that were built into the suburban matrix itself. Once a spatial fix allowing American capitalism to flourish, suburbia has now become a barrier to further accumulation in the United States.¹⁶ These contradictions, it can be suggested, were latent in the format of an outer suburban development and the web of interests that stimulated such development. Some of the barriers that suburbs themselves now represent to future accumulation are registered in present interests such as transit-oriented development (TOD), “smart growth,” the retrofitting or repairing of suburbia, and New Urbanism, each of which has embedded in it an explicit critique of the interests and of a development format that are considered to have produced suburban sprawl.¹⁷

There is certainly enough in present academic and popular debates to realize that much of the shine has come off the outer suburbs of this first modernity, but is there enough to glimpse the makings of a distinctly new post-suburbanity? This is the question addressed in this book. It is an important question, for while in many respects the outer suburban matrix is peculiar to America, it has a continuing legacy. It has a legacy within America itself since it is a development format that continues to be used and is likely to go on being used for some time into the future, owing to the many coincident interests involved. It is easy to overlook the fact that this legacy will be felt unevenly within America itself as a federation of

governmental and regulatory arrangements pertaining to different vintages of urbanization. A one-size-fits-all urban theory and policy, even within the United States, let alone beyond, are unlikely to suffice.¹⁸ Just as important, the American suburban ideal has fostered a legacy that is yet to be born in many other parts of the world. Ominously, it is only since the 1980s and after the end of the “short American century” that the American model of suburban living is being exported in earnest.¹⁹

A Second Modernity: Glimpses of Post-Suburbia?

For Ulrich Beck, a politics of a second modernity has emerged as a result of the unintended consequences of a first modernity.²⁰ Modern capitalism produced a set of significant environmental and social side effects. These have been as much a product of the state as of the private sector—after all, the private and public sectors became barely distinguishable in what John Kenneth Galbraith memorably termed the “technostructure” of society in late modernity.²¹ Though what people have in mind when they refer to suburban sprawl is something natural or spontaneous, it should be remembered that sprawl has been thoroughly planned.²² That is, suburban sprawl is as good an example as any of the technostructure and an associated sense of modernity at work. It has been planned, though doubtless it would also be a good example of the unintended effects of planning interventions. The outer suburbs have made their own significant contribution to the sorts of global environmental risks around which, as Beck observes, the politics of a second modernity revolve, since the resource and energy usage associated with the suburban format of development and living and working is hard to ignore. As George A. Gonzalez has written in *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital*, “While urban sprawl policies of the United States can be credited with fostering global economic growth and stability, urban sprawl also has ... significant liabilities: climate change and oil depletion. Both of these liabilities result directly from the fact that urban sprawl is predicated on the profligate utilization of fossil fuels.”²³ And while renewed population growth in central cities and attempts to promote more compact forms of development in existing or new suburban downtowns give the illusion of reduced energy consumption, it should be remembered that much of the consumption associated with populations in such places remains dependent on production and logistics infrastructures that have long since been suburban.

The contradictions of this first modernity are literally seen in concrete in the outer suburbs themselves, in the vast concrete and tarmac expanses of parking lots and structures and building setbacks from curvilinear road patterns. They are registered in the separation of land uses and all that this entails in terms of the daily commute, not just back and forth from home to work but also between home and any number of amenities and services, such as schools, sports, entertainment, and health facilities. They are registered in the swaths of single-story manufacturing, warehousing, retailing, and office facilities lining major roadways. They are seen in the low-density housing and its occupants, which present a formidable political barrier to infill and a greater density of residential development. Yet it is precisely such a reworking of the suburban development format that can help deliver viable public transit and local services, along with significant reductions in energy consumption. Such a reworking of the development format even has the potential to address the once barely imagined externalities of suburbia, such as traffic congestion.

The contradictions of outer suburbia—the unintended consequences of the sort of modern corporate and state planning that were imbricated in the production of American capitalism's distinctive spatial fix—have become further exposed by generally rising oil prices and the recent subprime mortgage crisis, but also by demographic and housing preference changes. These contradictions have become so evident that they seem certain to drive some measure of response in terms of the urbanization of suburbs over the next decades. Whereas for some time after World War II, the nation as a whole gained from the movement of business out of cities, the outer suburbs themselves barely benefited at all, while the central cities and the inner suburbs bore the costs. The unfolding contradictions of the outer suburban spatial fix now appear to raise the specter of a nation no longer benefiting at all, even as the costs to most communities across the metropolitan regions continue to make themselves known.²⁴

For the historian Jon Teaford, the internal contradictions of the Fordist outer suburbs were apparent as early as the 1950s, prompting a subtle change in both the character of local politics and the sorts of questions raised regarding the appropriate scale of government attending to suburban development.²⁵ It is these contradictions that prompted the gradual, almost imperceptible transformation of residential suburbs into distinctly post-suburban communities displaying distinctly post-suburban politics. Though Beauregard is less convinced, I provide some limited confirmation

of Teaford's dating of the antecedents of post-suburbia later in this book. In any case, a transformation of suburbs and suburban politics was well under way by the 1970s in the guise of an "urbanization of suburbia" and was conspicuous by the 1980s with the rise of the many outer cities and edge cities that had sprung up at the intersections of radial interstate highways and state parkways and the orbital beltways surrounding America's major cities.²⁶

As the various public and private interests invested in suburban development grapple with some of these contradictions, it is apparent that the contradictions also represent enormous opportunities. The estimated 6 million acres of land in suburban corridors, which are developed at around a 0.25 floor-to-area ratio (FAR) as a result of being 75 percent devoted to parking, would supply two-thirds of the projected growth in housing needs and three-quarters of employment growth over the period 2010 to 2030.²⁷ Thus, for Arthur C. Nelson, "America is changing ... it will mature. This is a contrast to the half century after World War II when America became a suburban nation.... As it matures, America will likely become an urban society."²⁸

Yet, if the *Zeitgeist* is of a sequel to suburbia waiting to be written by *some* architects, planners, and civil society organizations under the manifestos for a New Urbanism, TOD, smart growth, and the like, that picture is not one received by all. Indeed—and here's the rub—arguably, the majority of citizens, architects, planners, politicians, land speculators, and construction, banking, and insurance companies are happy for the story of suburbia to carry on. The production of suburbia "adds up to an automated system that is sustained by inertia.... There are few incentives to try anything different," Nelson notes, while the consumers of suburban housing themselves are the key and rather implacable opponents to change and those in need of incentivizing.²⁹

As Judith K. De Jong has recently projected, the future pattern of urbanization in America is likely to be somewhere in between these two perspectives, not least because of what Emily Talen describes as the already "fragmented sense of what urbanism in America is."³⁰ Joel Kotkin has argued that "the basic pattern of the future metropolis will be built upon a predominantly suburban matrix dominated by cars, road connections, and construction as is familiar to the denizens of contemporary Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Houston."³¹ The suburbs of 2050 America that Kotkin envisions might form a new paradigm that embodies neither suburban sprawl

nor the traditional city format but a multipolar process of suburbanization at greater density and evincing a greater degree of self-containment. Heeding Kotkin's call for the need for better suburbs opens up questions surrounding the potential of any urbanization of the suburbs to deliver a new post-suburban urbanity. While the likes of the New Urbanism and interest in TOD and smart growth have begun to gain some purchase in planning and local governmental circles, they coexist with more established thinking regarding the ease, familiarity, utility, profitability, and viability of a suburban density and format of residential and commercial development. That any signs of a distinctive post-suburban future for America can only just be glimpsed through this fog of counterclaims should not be surprising.

The Structure of the Book

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 elaborate a theoretical perspective on post-suburbia and its potential meaning in urban theory and relevance to policy debates. They are followed by three chapters that illustrate these ideas and concerns in three different post-suburban communities. Finally, chapter 8 marks a conclusion.

If America became suburban in the last half of the twentieth century, it may take the twenty-first century for what is now a suburban nation to become more fully urban again. The glimpses of post-suburban America presented here underline the difficulties of effecting the sort of systemic change that would be needed for such a transformation of the suburbs to occur. However, they also provide evidence here and there of something altered in the popular desire for and experience of the suburban way of life, the political will that can exist not just in incorporated communities but also in surrounding major redevelopment opportunities on unincorporated land, and even partial examples of intergovernmental cooperation that hint at the revival of metropolitan regional-scale governance.

To begin, in the next three chapters of this book I set out the significance of the post-suburban question as it emerges in concerns over how to rework suburban space, given the already apparent issues of the long-term economic and environmental sustainability of automobile-oriented suburbs and ongoing expectations among citizens and aspirations among politicians for the rounding out of suburban communities. The vast majority of the population was born in suburbs of different vintages, and much employment exists there, yet the suburbs continue to play a secondary role

to the historical city cores as laboratories for political, policy, and even academic experimentation and discourse.

In and of themselves, suburbs are rarely the focal point of academic theory building.³² Only very recently have the subjects of suburbia and suburbanization submitted to significant revision and the recognition of a greater historical and present variation in suburbs and their complexion than was previously acknowledged.³³ Yet a cohesive field of suburban studies has yet to emerge from the fragmented approaches to understanding the suburbs found in, for example, planning, sociology, architecture and urban design, urban morphology, postmodern urban theory, and urban and historical geography. This book will, I hope, contribute to a better understanding of one distinctive emerging class of settlements and their economic and political dynamics from among the various settlement types—cities, stable affluent residential suburbs, declining industrial suburbs, newly built residential suburbs—found in the largest metro regions.

In chapter 2, I locate post-suburban communities within the broader metropolitan spaces of which they are a part. The metropolitan urban regions of the United States represent increasingly complex settlement patterns that embody specialized local economies or “trading places”—as William Bogart terms them—and a variety of trajectories of growth and decline.³⁴ Indeed, some question whether terms such as city and suburb are not “zombie” categories as a result of the ever-widening scope of the urbanization process.³⁵ Distinguishing a class of post-suburban settlements and considering the potential for evolution of settlements from suburbs to post-suburbs is far from an unproblematic exercise. Yet it can be one ingredient in a theoretical and policy appreciation of the variety apparent within the unity of the urbanization process.

Specifically, commentators have been vague about how to define post-suburban communities in geographic terms, with Robert E. Lang’s “edgeless cities” sprawling from inner suburban to exurban locations, while Robert Fishman’s “technoburbs” and Rob Kling and colleagues’ “post-suburbs” have been defined at an urban regional scale.³⁶ Perhaps as a result, it is at the county and regional scale that commentators see new relations of governance being fashioned to act on and shape this new urbanity.³⁷ I argue that post-suburban communities and their politics can and should be positioned within wider metropolitan urban systems. That is, post-suburbs take their place among a range of different settlement types across metro

regions, and their dynamics are as worthy of study as are, for example, the decline of industrial suburbs or the gentrification of inner cities.

In chapter 3, I suggest that some of the problems of speaking of a post-suburban era are resolved by placing the emergence of post-suburban politics in historical perspective, one that sees fundamental continuities with the previous automobile-oriented suburbanization.³⁸ Specifically, the suburbs formed part of a Fordist spatial fix, in which state intervention was deeply implicated. However, the contradictions of state interventions tend to magnify over time, so that the unanticipated consequences of suburbanization become a barrier to further accumulation. The emergence of a distinctly post-suburban politics might be seen as one manifestation of what Ulrich Beck regards as a politics of a “second modernity.”³⁹ Beck’s analysis emphasizes the politicization of major environmental risks (the side effects) of modernity and the processes of individualization in society associated with the rise of special interest groups and identity politics. Yet the unanticipated effects of state interventions in promoting low-density suburban development can hardly be overstated, especially in light of their significant contribution to environmental risks such as those underlying climate change.

This historical perspective is also, of course, a geographic perspective because of the different *vintages* of urban development that exist in the United States. Just as American urbanization is not reducible to a single Chicago or Los Angeles model, so too no post-suburban sequel to suburbia can be reduced to the California example sketched out in an early use of the term.⁴⁰ The newest automobile-oriented suburbs *may* be more amenable to reworking if they exist in metropolitan regions with an older vintage of urban development by virtue of extant public transit and other infrastructure networks—though, as we will see, this also depends on the other specifics of the particular metropolitan context under consideration. New suburbs in new metro regions, such as Kendall in metro Miami-Dade County, may truly embody a “splintering urbanism” and have limited prospects for redevelopment in the foreseeable future.⁴¹

A string of commentators have spoken of the new urbanity being fashioned in the outer suburbs. However, it is one that is very much in its infancy and has only begun to be depicted and analyzed in academic terms. It is possible to view the retrofitting of suburbia as insubstantial, as a postmodern affectation of developers concerned with creating a sense of

place when marketing newly developed residential communities.⁴² However, post-suburban politics, when viewed as an emerging response to the side effects of modernist suburbanization, appears to coalesce around possibly more substantial concerns to urbanize suburbia and to “retrofit” or rework suburban spaces. In and around local debates over the need for, and the financial and technical challenges to, reworking suburban space, we see a post-suburban politics being played out. It is one in which the traditional popular and political ideals embodied in suburban living have been adulterated somewhat.⁴³ These traditional suburban ideals have met with the emerging contradictions of suburbanization itself in a politics that centers on tensions over the pursuit of private accumulation (growth) and conservation of the environment, the pursuit of growth and provision for collective consumption, and the appropriate scale and vehicles for governing any post-suburban landscape.⁴⁴

In chapter 4, then, some of the important political and governmental challenges to reworking suburban space are elaborated under these three main headings. First, I consider the tension between the pursuit of private accumulation (primarily conducted as a means of underpinning the local fiscal position of suburban communities) and conservation of the built and natural environments. From the outset, environmental amenity has been sought as part of the suburban way of life and jealously protected by suburban communities. However, it has been overlain recently with an additional layer of environmental politics born of the commonly felt side effects of modernity. Second, since almost by definition suburbs of all complexions exist as less than cities—that is, as somehow less than urban in terms of the various amenities and services that are consumed collectively—there has existed a politics of collective consumption alongside the licensing of private accumulation of capital. The question of financing and providing for collective consumption needs necessarily expands the range of local politics into the arena of intergovernmental cooperation. Third, the prospects for the reworking of suburban space are crucially dependent on the extent and manner in which any rescaling of the state can address the increasing latitude of the collective consumption and environmental corollaries to private accumulation. It is little accident that much suburban development has existed, at least initially, on unincorporated county land. By the same token, its successful redevelopment may founder on the lack of a government entity dedicated to financing and enforcing planning and infrastructure investment aspirations.

In chapter 4, I therefore draw a distinction between what I term mark I and mark II post-suburban politics. The former was an early and purely locally oriented response by communities to some of the contradictions of their suburban character—namely, what Teaford has described as the adulteration of suburban ideals with pragmatic political and policy responses to the economic realities of providing for a host of *local* collective consumption needs. What I term mark II post-suburban politics is barely in evidence anywhere across the expanses of American suburban communities, which are desperately in need in a meaningful sequel to suburbia; mark II politics is implied in the view that the environmental side effects of the suburban format of development and many of the collective consumption needs of individual suburban communities can only be addressed at a scale larger than the individual community.

In the next three chapters I present three glimpses of post-suburban America based on research I conducted during the period 2008 to 2012 as part of projects funded by the United Kingdom Economic and Social Research Council and the British Academy. These chapters pull together local planning and economic development documents, relevant newspaper articles, and published and unpublished local histories. Together, the chapters also draw on more than seventy face-to-face and telephone interviews with local and state politicians and planners, private-sector architects and consultant planners, and civic, environmental, and business organizations.

Originally the three glimpses of America's post-suburban future offered by Kendall Downtown (in Miami-Dade County, Florida), Tysons Corner (in Fairfax County, Virginia), and Schaumburg (a suburb of Chicago in Cook County, Illinois) were selected as part of the research in an attempt to tell the story of the reworking of edge cities specifically. However, the comparatively dense edge city format of outer suburban development was only briefly popular with developers and is no longer the norm, especially for new commercial development outside central cities.⁴⁵ Moreover, it proved hard to identify many actual instances of the active reworking of the suburban space of such edge cities.

Nevertheless, the three localities afforded a reasonable coverage of the variety of America's postwar suburbs—a point underlined recently by Jan Nijman and Tom Clery—and the challenges presented in any sequel to suburbia, as seen in the summary facts provided for each site in table 1.1.⁴⁶ They allow reasonable examination of the contrasting geographic scale of the suburban redevelopment challenge, the contrasting administrative

Table 1.1

Summary Characteristics of Kendall Downtown, Tysons Corner, and Schaumburg

	Kendall Downtown	Tysons Corner	Schaumburg
Administrative status	Unincorporated area, Miami-Dade County, Florida	Unincorporated community, Fairfax County, Virginia	Incorporated village (1956), Cook County, Illinois
Land area	1.3 km ²	8.5 km ²	50 km ²
Population	3,800 ^a	19,627 ^b	75,386 ^c
Years of retrofit	1998–2008	2010–present	Future?

Notes: a. This is the 2000 census figure for unincorporated East Kendall. The population is likely to be considerably smaller. b. 2010. c. 2000.

context of initiating and implementing that challenge, and the contrasting vintages of American metropolitan development in which such a challenge will need to be met. As such, discussion of the three sites is arranged to emphasize progressively the scale of the challenge of reshaping suburban America, ending with Schaumburg, which corresponds less to an edge city and more to the expansive edgeless city format that Robert Lang emphasizes as the present of suburban America. The three sites pose rather different sequels to the suburban story. Their stories offer glimpses of past, present, and future post-suburban America.

The first look at America's post-suburban future, in chapter 5, shows an attempt to fashion a new downtown, Kendall Downtown, for the sprawling Kendall suburbs of Miami-Dade County in Florida during the 1990s. If, as Raymond A. Mohl and Gary R. Mormino hold, "Postwar Florida came to embody and in turn radiate the values of American culture: youth, leisure, consumption, mobility, and affluence," then Miami-Dade County's landscape of "sprawl plus" represents something of the physical incarnation of this culture.⁴⁷ Somewhat paradoxically, it is in this newest and most centerless of American urban environments that the New Urbanism movement, with its appeals to the urban morphology and architectural styles of the past, has grown up. Even as the Kendall Downtown continues to evolve, it is already part of the past of New Urbanism. It exists as something of an island of success in a sea of a repetitive low-density, automobile-oriented, suburban sprawl. Though New Urbanism has emerged and grown as something of a new planning orthodoxy, it is also, as chapter 5 stresses,

an orthodoxy that has some very real political, governmental, and private corporate limits as a result of the weight of traditional suburban-oriented residential preferences and architectural, planning, construction, financial, and political interests in America today. Of the three site studies presented, the Kendall Downtown story is one that perhaps best highlights the tensions between growth and conservation of the natural environment.

In chapter 6, I recount the story of the growth and current replanning and redevelopment of Tysons Corner, Virginia. Tysons (its publicists and developers have informally dropped “Corner”) is perhaps the archetypal edge city.⁴⁸ While private-sector land speculators and property developers have been instrumental in its growth, it has also been subject to several plans over the years. The latest of these planning exercises recently won the Daniel Burnham Prize from the American Planning Association. It proposes a significant reworking of Tysons Corner’s suburban space into a proper downtown. It also represents something of a present-day test case for similar attempts to retrofit the many edge cities across America. Tysons illustrates clearly how the pattern of government—or perhaps more precisely a lack of government—can shape prospects for a sequel to suburbia, since it persists as a city in waiting on unincorporated county land. Nevertheless, it is an even better test case of how economic growth and collective consumption are intimately related. The irony is that a settlement unleashed by federal and state expenditure on roads for private automobile use is now set to be saved by more federal, state, and county expenditure, this time on improvements in mass public transit.

The Village of Schaumburg, Illinois, which is the subject of chapter 7, was in some important respects born as a post-suburban development. Incorporated with a tiny population in the 1950s, it was conceived and planned almost from the outset as a new kind of city, a regional capital for the northwestern suburbs of Chicagoland. Yet its conception as a particular, very diffuse, type of new city also means that the sheer scale and separation of land uses shed light on some of the difficulties of building post-suburban communities from the majority of suburban expanses of America, even in the public-transit-rich, older, and increasingly regionally planned metropolitan context of Chicagoland. It is its suburban modernity as a planned community that poses the biggest problem to the reworking of space in Schaumburg. Schaumburg has benefited from remarkable continuity and stability in political leadership since its incorporation, though important

questions remain over how political leaders will be able to engage and take the resident population with them as they continue to shape this expansive and new kind of outer city in function but not in form. Since Schaumburg was conceived as a new kind of city for the outer northwestern suburbs of Chicago, its local political leaders will have to assume a leadership role in the sorts of intergovernmental cooperation needed to deliver the big-ticket items of expenditure for collective consumption, such as improvements in mass public transit, necessary for a transformation of these communities.

Finally, in chapter 8, I draw together some of the key themes and concerns raised in the opening chapters of the book. In particular, I reiterate how the challenge of reworking suburban settlement space is enormously varied because of the different ways that suburban settlements relate geographically and temporally to the metropolitan regions of which they are a part. These challenges will likely necessitate new arrangements among governments at the county but also the regional level. The new post-suburban politics will not be fashioned by a small group of architects, planners, or politicians. Instead, any reworking of suburban space will be a political process in which all will need to be involved. Since suburban living represents a mass preference, the emerging post-suburban politics will have to command the approval of the mass of resident voters.⁴⁹ It will need to be seen by investors and developers to stack up in financial terms. In this respect, a number of policy analysts have begun to provide some of the tools for appraising the costs and benefits of sprawl, though these have yet to gain significant purchase on the thinking of politicians and government planners, transportation and economic development staff, and the preferences of citizens.

Notes

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. M. Clawson and P. Hall, *Planning and Urban Growth: An Anglo-American Comparison* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).
2. See R. Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs," in *Suburbanisation in Global Society*, ed. M. Clapson and R. Hutchison (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2010); R. Harris and P. Larkham, "Suburban Foundation, Form and Function," in *Changing Suburbs: Foundation, Form and Function*, ed. R. Harris and P. Larkham (London: Spon, 1999), 1–31; and G. Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth-Century Metropolis* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
3. J. H. Kunstler, *The Geography of Nowhere: The Rise and Decline of America's Man-made Landscape* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993).
4. R. A. Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization: Capitalism and the Construction of Urban Space in the US," in *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Societies*, ed. M. Dear and A. Scott (New York: Methuen, 1981), 383–429.
5. D. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985).
6. Regulation theory suggests that the capitalist economy has grown in a series of long term periods of economic expansion regulated by an articulation between producers, consumers and state and non-state institutions. The Fordist regime of accumulation (named after Henry Ford's pioneering of mass car production for mass markets), of which the United States was the leading international center, is commonly considered to have lasted from the 1930s until the early 1970s. See M. Aglietta, *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience* (London: Verso, 1979), and subsequent discussion in, for example, A. Amin, *Post-Fordism: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).
7. See R. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 5–6.

8. C. Walker and P. Boxall, "Economic Development," in *Reality and Research*, ed. G. Galster (Washington DC, Urban Institute Press, 1996, 13–27, 19) quoted in Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*, 83.
9. J. Persky and W. Wiewel, *When Corporations Leave Town: The Costs and Benefits of Metropolitan Job Sprawl* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2000).
10. N. A. Phelps, "Suburbs for Nations? Some Interdisciplinary Connections on the Suburban Economy," *Cities* 27 (2008): 68–76.
11. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*.
12. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*, 180.
13. *Ibid.*, 65.
14. D. Hayden, *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820–2000* (New York: Vintage, 2004), 11.
15. M. P. O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).
16. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*.
17. Transit-oriented development refers to a mix and density of development that can be sustained in close proximity (usually within a half-mile radius) to mass transit infrastructure (see, for example, www.reconnectingamerica.org, accessed December 16, 2014). The smart growth movement is concerned essentially with the promotion of compact urban forms (see www.smartgrowth.org, accessed December 16, 2014). The New Urbanism movement was founded in the 1980s; the Congress for the New Urbanism, according to its website, dedicates itself to "the restructuring of public policy and development practices to support the following principles: neighborhoods should be diverse in use and population; communities should be designed for the pedestrian and transit as well as the car; cities and towns should be shaped by physically defined and universally accessible public spaces and community institutions; urban places should be framed by architecture and landscape design that celebrate local history, climate, ecology, and building practice" (www.cnu.org/charter, accessed December 16, 2014).
18. L. S. Bourne, "On Schools of Thought, Comparative Research, and Inclusiveness: A Commentary," *Urban Geography* 29 (2008): 177–186.
19. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*.
20. U. Beck, W. Bonss, and C. Lau, "The Theory of Reflexive Modernization: Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Program," *Theory, Culture & Society* 20 (2003): 1–33.
21. J. K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967).

22. M. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl* (London: Sage, 1977).
23. See G. A. Gonzalez, *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 111; and P. G. Newman and J. R. Kenworthy, "Gasoline Consumption and Cities," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 55 (1989): 24–37.
24. Persky and Wiewel, *When Corporations Leave Town*.
25. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
26. See L. H. Masotti, "Prologue: Suburbia Reconsidered—Myth and Counter-Myth," in *The Urbanization of the Suburbs*, ed. L. H. Masotti and J. K. Hadden (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1973), 15–22; and J. Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Knopf Doubleday/Anchor Books, 1991).
27. A. C. Nelson, "The New Urbanity: The Rise of a New America," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626 (2009): 192–208, 206.
28. *Ibid.*, 207.
29. A. Flint, *This Land: The Battle over Sprawl and the Future of America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 59.
30. See J. K. De Jong, *New SubUrbanisms* (London: Routledge, 2014); and E. Talen, *New Urbanism and American Planning: The Conflict of Cultures* (London: Routledge, 2005), 1–2.
31. J. Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million: America in 2050* (New York: Penguin Press, 2010), x.
32. N. A. Phelps, "The Growth Machine Stops? Urban Politics and the Making and Re-making of an Edge City," *Urban Affairs Review* 84 (2012): 670–700.
33. Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs."
34. See W. T. Bogart, *Don't Call It Sprawl: Metropolitan Structure in the 21st Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and M. Orfield, *American Metropolitcs: The New Suburban Reality* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002).
35. R. Lang and P. Knox, "The New Metropolis: Rethinking Megalopolis," *Regional Studies* 43 (2009): 789–802.
36. R. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003); R. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); R. Kling, S. C. Olin, Jr., and M. Poster, "The Emergence of Postsuburbia: An Introduction," in *Postsuburban California: The*

Transformation of Orange County Since World War II, ed. R. Kling, S. Olin, and M. Poster (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 1–30.

37. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*; Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*.
38. For one of the most precise definitions of post-suburbia in terms of a distinct era, see W. H. Lucy and D. L. Phillips, “The Postsuburban Era Comes to Richmond: City Decline, Suburban Transition and Exurban Growth,” *Landscape and Urban Planning* 36 (1997): 259–275.
39. U. Beck, *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).
40. Kling, Olin, and Poster, “The Emergence of Postsuburbia.”
41. S. Graham and S. Marvin, *Splintering Urbanism* (London: Routledge, 2000).
42. M. Dear, “The Los Angeles School of Urbanism: An Intellectual History,” *Urban Geography* 24 (2003): 493–509.
43. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*.
44. Collective consumption refers to use of a raft of services that, because of their public good properties or the large scale typically required for their production, have generally been provided by the state.
45. Lang, *Edgeless Cities*. Robert Lang’s figures for 1999 suggest that as much as one-third of all office space in thirteen metropolitan areas of the United States was in what he terms edgeless cities—nearly twice that in edge cities. See also B. Scheer and M. Petkov, “Edge City Morphology: A Comparison of Commercial Centers,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64 (1998): 298–310.
46. J. Nijman and T. Clery, “Rethinking Suburbia: A Case Study of Metropolitan Miami,” *Environment and Planning A* 46 (2015): 69–88.
47. R. A. Mohl and G. Mormino, “The Big Change in the Sunshine State: A Social History of Modern Florida,” in *The New History of Florida*, ed. M. Gannon (Miami: University Press of Florida, 1996), 418–447, 436.
48. Garreau, *Edge City*.
49. R. Bruegmann, *Sprawl: A Compact History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

Chapter 2: Locating Post-Suburbs in a Metropolitan Context

1. See W. T. Bogart, *Don’t Call It Sprawl: Metropolitan Structure in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and M. Orfield, *American Metropolitanities: The New Suburban Reality* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002).

2. See R. Lang and P. Knox, "The New Metropolis: Rethinking Megalopolis," *Regional Studies* 43 (2009): 789–802; and J. Nijman and T. Clery, "Rethinking Suburbia: A Case Study of Metropolitan Miami," *Environment and Planning A* 46 (2015): 69–88.
3. B. Hanlon, T. Vicino, and J. R. Short, "The New Metropolitan Reality in the US: Rethinking the Traditional Model," *Urban Studies* 43 (2006): 2129–2143; N. Smith "Gentrification and Uneven Development," *Economic Geography* 58 (1982): 138–155.
4. See M. Castells, *The Urban Question*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977); and P. Saunders, *Social Theory and the Urban Question* (London: Hutchison, 1981).
5. N. Brenner, D. J. Madden, and D. Wachsmuth, "Assemblages, Actor-networks, and the Challenges of Critical Urban Theory," in *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, ed. N. Brenner, P. Marcuse, and M. Mayer (London: Routledge, 2011), 117–137; N. Brenner, "What Is Critical Urban Theory?," in Brenner, Marcuse, and Mayer, *Cities for People, Not for Profit*, 11–23.
6. R. Harris and P. J. Larkham, "Suburban Foundation, Form and Function," in *Changing Suburbs: Foundation, Form and Function*, ed. R. Harris and P. J. Larkham (London: Spon, 1999), 1–31.
7. R. Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs," in *Suburbanization in Global Society*, ed. M. Clapson and R. Hutchinson (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2010), 15–50.
8. N. A. Phelps, A. Tarazona Vento, and S. Roitman, "The Suburban Question: Grass-roots Politics and Place Making in Spanish Suburbs," *Environment and Planning C* 33 (3): 512–532.
9. A. Forsyth, "Defining Suburbs," *Journal of Planning Literature* 27 (2012): 270–281; Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs."
10. Harris and Larkham, "Suburban Foundation, Form and Function," 8.
11. Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs."
12. R. E. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002).
13. G. Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth-Century Metropolis* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 12.
14. R. Bruegmann, *Sprawl: A Compact History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 71.

15. For my purposes I use the terms “reflexive” or “second” modernity, which place greater stress on the continuities apparent between processes and patterns of suburbanization and post-suburbanization. The terminological preference is important as it has implications for incorporating an understanding of the legacies of state interventions and their side effects in the production of suburbs and post-suburbs.

16. D. Hayden, *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820–2000* (New York: Vintage, 2004), 158.

17. J. C. O’Connell, *The Hub’s Metropolis: Greater Boston’s Development from Railroad Suburbs to Smart Growth* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

18. R. Walker and R. D. Lewis, “Beyond the Crabgrass Frontier: Industry and the Spread of North American Cities, 1850–1950,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 27 (2001): 3–19, 8–9.

19. R. A. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 37.

20. R. McManus and P. J. Ethington, “Suburbs in Transition: New Approaches to Suburban History,” *Urban History* 34 (2007): 317–337, 317.

21. *Ibid.*, 325.

22. W. H. Lucy and D. L. Phillips, “The Postsuburban Era comes to Richmond: City Decline, Suburban Transition and Exurban Growth,” *Landscape and Urban Planning* 36 (1997): 259–275, 261.

23. J. Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Knopf Doubleday/Anchor Books, 1991).

24. R. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), 17.

25. Garreau, *Edge City*. An edge city is defined as having at least 2 million square feet of office space, 600,000 square feet of retail space, more jobs than bedrooms, and is identified as a destination but was nothing like this thirty years ago.

26. See, among others, M. Dear, “The Los Angeles School of Urbanism: An Intellectual History,” *Urban Geography* 24 (2003): 493–509; M. Dear and S. Flusty, “Post-modern Urbanism,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (1998): 50–72; M. J. Dear, H. E. Schockman, and G. Hise, eds., *Rethinking Los Angeles* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996); and E. Soja, *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2000).

27. M. J. Dear and N. Dahmann, “Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism,” *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (2008): 266–279, 269.

28. S. J. Essex and G. P. Brown, “The Emergence of Post-Suburban Landscapes on the North Coast of New South Wales: A Case Study of Contested Space,” *Interna-*

tional Journal of Urban and Regional Research 21 (1997): 259–285; Lucy and Phillips, “The Postsuburban Era Comes to Richmond.”

29. Lucy and Phillips, “The Postsuburban Era Comes to Richmond,” 260 and 259, respectively.

30. N. Brenner, “Decoding the Newest ‘Metropolitan Regionalism’ in the USA: A Critical Overview,” *Cities* 19 (2002): 3–21, 11.

31. N. A. Phelps, N. Parsons, D. Ballas, and A. Dowling, *Post-Suburban Europe: Planning and Politics at the Margins of Europe’s Capital Cities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

32. Bogart, *Don’t Call It Sprawl*, 6–7.

33. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*, 65.

34. J. W. R. Whitehand and C. M. H. Carr, *Twentieth-Century Suburbs: A Morphological Approach* (London: Routledge, 2001), 121.

35. P. Larkham, “The Study of Urban Form in Great Britain,” *Urban Morphology* 10 (2006): 117–150, 127. Urban morphological approaches to suburbanization have arrived at conclusions similar to those found in the literature on post-suburbia and postmodern urban theory primarily because the complexity of suburban morphology cannot be captured in terms such as innovation, diffusion, and distance decay, which themselves speak to a predictable linear pattern of evolution centered on the city.

36. H. W. Dick and P. J. Rimmer, “Beyond the Third World City: The New Urban Geography of South-east Asia,” *Urban Studies* 35 (1998): 2303–2321.

37. See H. Nuissl and D. Rink, “The ‘production’ of Urban Sprawl in Eastern Germany as a Phenomenon of Post-Socialist Transition,” *Cities* 22 (2005): 123–134; and M. Bontje and J. Burdack, “Edge Cities European-style: Examples from Paris and the Randstad,” *Cities* 22 (2005): 317–330, 317.

38. K. T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 303.

39. M. Gottdiener and G. Kephart, “The Multinucleated Region: A Comparative Analysis,” in *Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange County since World War II*, ed. R. Kling, S. C. Olin, Jr., and M. Poster (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 31–54, 51.

40. See Dear and Dahmann, “Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism”; R. Keil, “Global Sprawl: Urban Form after Fordism,” *Environment and Planning D* 12 (1994): 31–36; and Soja, *Postmetropolis*. However, discussion of a distinctive geography of post-suburbia is also clouded by some of the successive simplifications made regarding the spatial structure of cities and suburbs associated with the spread

of the Chicago school ideas. See R. Harris and R. Lewis, "Constructing a Fault(y) Zone: Misrepresentations of American Cities and Suburbs, 1900–1950," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (1998): 622–639.

41. Dear and Dahmann, "Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism," 269.

42. K. Brake et al., cited in C. Kraemer, "Commuter Belt Turbulence in a Dynamic Region: The Case of the Munich City-Region," in *The City's Hinterland: Dynamism and Divergence in Europe's Peri-Urban Territories*, ed. K. Hoggart (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 41–68, 44.

43. McManus and Ethington, "Suburbs in Transition," 332.

44. R. Koolhaas, "Atlanta," in *Shaping the City: Studies in History, Theory, and Urban Design*, ed. R. El-Khoury and E. Robbins (London: Routledge, 2003), 5–13 quoted in S. Marshall, "The Emerging 'Silicon Savanna': From Old Urbanism to New Suburbanism," *Built Environment* 32 (2006): 267–280, 268.

45. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias*, 203.

46. R. Fishman, "The Garden City Tradition in the Post-Suburban Age," *Built Environment* 17 (1991): 232–241, 234–235.

47. Lang, *Edgeless Cities*, 1–2.

48. S. Graham and S. Marvin, *Splintering Urbanism* (London: Routledge, 2001).

49. J. Gottmann, *Megalopolis* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1961); T. G. McGee, "The Emergence of Desakota Regions in Asia: Expanding a Hypothesis," in *The Extended Metropolis: Settlement Transition in Asia*, ed. N. S. Ginsburg, B. Koppel, and T. G. McGee (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 3–25.

50. Fishman, "The Garden City Tradition in the Post-Suburban Age," 239.

51. R. Kling, S. C. Olin, Jr., and M. Poster, "The Emergence of Postsuburbia: An Introduction," in *Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange County since World War II*, ed. R. Kling, S. Olin, and M. Poster (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 1–30, 7.; Thomas Sieverts, *Cities without Cities: An Interpretation of the Zwischenstadt* (London: Routledge, 2003).

52. Kraemer, "Commuter Belt Turbulence in a Dynamic Region," 44.

53. Gottdiener and Kephart, "The Multinucleated Region," and Dear and Flusty, "Postmodern Urbanism."

54. Dear and Dahmann, "Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism," 270.

55. Larkham, "The Study of Urban Form in Great Britain," 126–127. The fringe belt he describes as "a zone of largely extensive land uses that is formed at the edges of

an urban area during a pause in outward residential growth. Each fringe belt . . . has several distinctive features in terms of plan, building form, and land and building uses. Typical uses requiring extensive sites, include public utilities, parks, sports facilities, and allotment gardens.”

56. Whitehand and Carr, *Twentieth-Century Suburbs*.

57. S. M. Wheeler, “The Evolution of Built Landscapes in Metropolitan Regions,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 27 (2008): 400–416.

58. F. Wu and N. A. Phelps, “(Post) Suburban Development and State Entrepreneurialism in Beijing’s Outer Suburbs,” *Environment and Planning A* 43 (2011): 410–430. In major city-regions such as Beijing, the gentrification of urban cores occurs alongside the development of new mass residential suburbs and at the same time as extremely low-density ex-urban development.

59. Phelps et al., *Post-Suburban Europe*.

60. E. Mazierska and L. Rascaroli, *From Moscow to Madrid: Postmodern Cities, European Cinema* (London: I. B. Taurus, 2003), 18.

61. Although regulation theory has been developed in ways that speak to the local modes of regulation, it has rarely been used at the urban scale. In theories of the growth machine and urban regimes, regions and cities are treated as undifferentiated wholes.

62. M. Feldman, “Spatial Structures of Regulation and Urban Regimes,” in *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, ed. M. Lauria (London: Sage, 1997), 30–50, 31.

63. H. Molotch and J. Logan, “Tensions in the Growth Machine: Overcoming Resistance to Value-Free Development,” *Social Problems* 31 (1984): 483–499.

64. Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles*.

65. G. Frug, *City Making: Building Communities without Building Walls* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 108.

66. D. Young and R. Keil, “Reconnecting the Disconnected: The Politics of Infrastructure in the In-Between City,” *Cities* 27 (2010): 87–95, 94 and 93, respectively.

67. A. Althubaity and A. E. G. Jonas, “Suburban Entrepreneurialism: Redevelopment Regimes and Co-ordinating Metropolitan Development in Southern California,” in *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*, ed. T. Hall and P. Hubbard (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1998), 149–172.

68. On the economics of the in-between economy, see N. A. Phelps, “Clusters, Dispersion and the Spaces in between: For an Economic Geography of the Banal,” *Urban Studies* 41 (2004): 971–989. On the politics of the in-between city, see Young and Keil, “Reconnecting the Disconnected.”

69. Young and Keil, "Reconnecting the Disconnected," 87.
70. Garreau, *Edge City*.
71. Frug, *City Making*, 106.
72. See also J. Allen and A. Cochrane, "Beyond the Territorial Fix: Regional Assemblages, Politics and Power," *Regional Studies* 41 (2007): 1161–1175, 1172.
73. Feldman, "Spatial Structures of Regulation and Urban Regimes." Other means of orchestrating flows can be distinguished. For a discussion of the role of seduction within the relational properties of power, see J. Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003). For an emphasis on models, reciprocity, and learning, see J. Braithwaite and J. Drahos, *Global Business Regulation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
74. Phelps, "Clusters, Dispersion and the Spaces in between"; N. A. Phelps and T. Ozawa, "Contrasts in Agglomeration: Proto-industrial, Industrial and Postindustrial Forms Compared," *Progress in Human Geography* 27(2003): 583–604.
75. T. Swanstrom, "Beyond Economism: Urban Political Economy and the Post-modern Challenge," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15 (1993): 55–78.
76. As emphasized by, among others, D. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); R. Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization: Capitalism and the Construction of Urban Space in the United States," in *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Societies*, ed. M. Dear and A. Scott (London: Methuen, 1981), 383–429; and Walker and Lewis, "Beyond the Crabgrass Frontier."
77. Lang and Knox, "The New Metropolis," 790.
78. In Europe too these developments find their expression in morphologically and functionally polycentric patterns of urban development. See, for example, P. Hall and K. Pain, *The Polycentric Metropolis: Learning from Mega-City Regions in Europe* (London: Earthscan, 2006); and S. Musterd, M. Bontje, and W. Ostendorf, "The Changing Role of Old and New Urban Centers: The Case of the Amsterdam Region," *Urban Geography* 27 (2006): 360–387. They may appear as muted, distorted, European versions of the likes of edge cities. See M. Bontje and M. Burdack, "Edge Cities European-style: Examples from Paris and the Randstad," *Cities* 22 (2005): 317–330.
79. Bogart, *Don't Call It Sprawl*; Lang and Knox, "The New Metropolis"; R. Shearman, R. Coffee, C. Dube, and R. Barbonne, "Intrametropolitan Employment Structure: Polycentricity, Scatteration, Dispersal and Chaos in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, 1996–2001," *Urban Studies* 44 (2007): 1713–1738.
80. U. Beck, *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992); U. Beck, W. Bonss, and C. Lau, "The Theory of Reflexive Modernization: Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Program," *Theory, Culture & Society* 20 (2003): 1–33.

81. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 4.
82. Harris and Larkham, "Suburban Foundation, Form and Function."
83. Musterd, Bontje, and Ostendorf, "The Changing Role of Old and New Urban Centers." Notions of the homogeneity and stability of residential suburbs continue to have salience in Europe, although there too changes in the distribution of employment and populations have also begun to signal an urbanization of the suburbs, while a single European labor market and former colonial relations continue to fuel migration flows that have selectively altered the complexion of residential suburbs in the larger cities.
84. Hanlon, Vicino, and Short, "The New Metropolitan Reality in the US"; Orfield, *American Metropolitics*.
85. Dear and Dahmann, "Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism"; McManus and Ethington, "Suburbs in Transition."
86. Suburbs have rarely been residentially or industrially monofunctional: Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles*; Walker and Lewis, "Beyond the Crabgrass Frontier."
87. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 44.
88. L. H. Masotti, "Prologue: Suburbia Reconsidered—Myth and Counter-myth," in *The Urbanization of the Suburbs*, ed. L. H. Masotti and J. K. Hadden (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1973) 15–22, 16–17.
89. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias*, 190; O'Connell, *The Hub's Metropolis*, 202.
90. M. P. O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); L. Mazingo, *Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).
91. N. A. Phelps, "Suburbs for Nations? Some Interdisciplinary Connections on the Suburban Economy," *Cities* 27 (2010): 68–76.
92. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009).

Chapter 3: The Suburbs and Their Contradictions

1. A. J. Scott and S. T. Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice: A Reappraisal," *Environment and Planning A* 9 (1977): 1097–1119; D. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985).
2. U. Beck, *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).

3. M. Dear, "The Los Angeles School of Urbanism: An Intellectual History," *Urban Geography* 24 (2004): 493–509.
4. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
5. J. Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988); C. Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation," in *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism: Public Policy and the Theory of the State*, ed. L. N. Lindberg, R. Alford, C. Crouch, and C. Offe (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1975), 125–144; C. Offe, *Disorganized Capitalism: Contemporary Transformations of Work and Politics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985).
6. R. Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization: Capitalism and the Construction of Urban Space in the United States," in *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Societies*, ed. M. Dear and A. Scott (London: Methuen, 1981), 383–429; Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*.
7. E. Talen, *New Urbanism and American Planning: The Conflict of Cultures* (London: Routledge, 2005), 13.
8. A. Wildavsky, "If Planning Is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing," *Policy Sciences* 4 (1973): 127–153.
9. *Ibid.*; E. Reade, "If Planning Is Anything, Maybe It Can Be Identified," *Urban Studies* 20 (1983): 159–171.
10. R. Bruegmann, *Sprawl: A Compact History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 100.
11. Scott and Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice," 1103.
12. Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation," 134.
13. M. H. Rose and R. A. Mohl, *Interstate: Highway Politics and Policy since 1939*, 3rd ed. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2012).
14. C. E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through,'" *Public Administration Review* 19 (1959): 79–88.
15. W. T. Bogart, *Don't Call it Sprawl: Metropolitan Structure in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
16. P. Hall, *Great Planning Disasters* (London: Weidenfeld, 1980).
17. Scott and Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice," 1110.
18. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 60–61.

19. Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation," 135.
20. J. C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).
21. A. Harding, "Urban Regimes and Growth Machines: Toward a Cross-National Research Agenda," *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 29 (1994): 356–382; A. Harding, "Urban Regimes in a Europe of the Cities?," *European Urban and Regional Studies* 4 (1997): 291–314.
22. J. C. O'Connell, *The Hub's Metropolis: Greater Boston's Development from Railroad Suburbs to Smart Growth* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013), 135.
23. Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization," 409.
24. A. Flint, *This Land: The Battle over Sprawl and the Future of America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); R. Hogan, *The Failure of Planning: Permitting Sprawl in San Diego Suburbs, 1970–1999* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2003); A. Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
25. A. Duany, E. Plater-Zyberk, and J. Speck, *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* (New York: North Point Press, 2000), 4.
26. M. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl: Private and Public Interests in Suburbia* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977).
27. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 122.
28. Beck, *Risk Society*, 2.
29. R. Keil, "Global Sprawl: Urban Form after Fordism," *Environment and Planning D*, 12 (1994): 31–36.
30. D. Young and R. Keil, "Reconnecting the Disconnected: The Politics of Infrastructure in the In-Between City," *Cities* 27 (2010): 87–95, 90.
31. Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation."
32. Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, 72.
33. Beck, *Risk Society*, 47.
34. U. Beck, W. Bonss, and C. Lau, "The Theory of Reflexive Modernization: Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Program," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20 (2003): 1–33.
35. Becker and Jahn, quoted in R. Keil, "Sustaining Modernity, Modernizing Nature: The Environmental Crisis and the Survival of Capitalism," in *The Sustainable Development Paradox: Urban Political Economy in the United States*, ed. R. Krueger and D. Gibbs (New York: Guilford Press, 2007), 41–65, 54.

36. On the application of ideas of communicative rationality in collaborative and deliberative planning, see P. Healey, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997); J. Forester, *Planning in the Face of Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). On the overburdening of the state, see Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation," 140, and idem, *Disorganized Capitalism*, 313.
37. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl*, 67.
38. M. Sheller and J. Urry, "The City and the Car," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24 (2000): 737–757.
39. Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck, *Suburban Nation*, 19.
40. Network externalities exist where the utility of consumers and the advantages to producers depend on the number of consumers using a product or service over time. M. L. and C. Shapiro, "Network Externalities, Competition and Compatibility," *American Economic Review* 75 (1985): 424–440; M. L. Katz and C. Shapiro, "Technology Adoption in the Presence of Network Externalities," *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (1986): 822–841.
41. Sheller and Urry, "The City and the Car."
42. L. Lerup, "American Speed, American Distance," in *New Urbanism: Peter Calthorpe vs. Lars Lerup.*, ed. R. Fishman, Michigan Debates on Urbanism (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Taubman College of Architecture, 2005), 40–52, 43.
43. Robert A. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).
44. L. H. Masotti, "Prologue: Suburbia Reconsidered—Myth and Counter-myth," in *The Urbanization of the Suburbs*, ed. L. H. Masotti and J. K. Hadden (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1973), 115–122; E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009). G. Tachieva, *Sprawl Repair Manual* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2010).
45. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*, v.
46. Bruegmann, *Sprawl*, 64.
47. J. Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million: America in 2050* (New York: Penguin, 2010); A. C. Nelson, "The New Urbanity: The Rise of a New America," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626 (2009): 192–208.
48. Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million*, 16.
49. A. Passell, *Building the New Urbanism: Places, Professions, and Profits in the American Metropolitan Landscape* (London: Routledge, 2013), 15.

50. Ibid., 2.
51. Dear, "The Los Angeles School of Urbanism," 503.
52. Passell, *Building the New Urbanism*, 34.
53. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*, 177.
54. T. Swanstrom, "Beyond Economism: Urban Political Economy and the Post-modern Challenge," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15 (1993): 55–78.
55. Harding, "Urban Regimes and Growth Machine," 359.
56. Swanstrom, "Beyond Economism."
57. Harding, "Urban Regimes and Growth Machines."
58. M. Aglietta, *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience* (London: Verso, 1979); J. O'Connor, *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973); J. O'Connor, *Accumulation Crisis* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984).
59. M. Goodwin and J. Painter, "Concrete Research, Urban Regimes and Regulation Theory," in *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, ed. M. Lauria (London: Sage, 1997), 13–29; M. Feldman, "Spatial Structures of Regulation and Urban Regimes, in Lauria, *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory*, 30–50; K. Ward, "Rereading Urban Regime Theory: A Sympathetic Critique," *Geoforum* 27 (1996): 427–438.
60. H. Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1976): 309–32.
61. Ibid., 331.
62. C. Webster, "Property Rights and the Public Realm: Gates, Greenbelts, and Gemeinschaft," *Environment and Planning B* 29 (2002): 397–412, 409.
63. C. Stone, *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946–1988* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989), 8.
64. Ibid., 221.
65. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
66. G. Frug, *City Making: Building Communities without Building Walls* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 83.
67. K. T. Jackson, "Introduction: The Shape of Things to Come: Urban Growth in the South and West," in *Essays on Sunbelt Cities and Recent Urban America*, ed. R. Mohl, R. Fisher, C. Abbott, R. W. Lotchin, R. B. Fairbanks, and Z. L. Miller (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1990), 3–7, 5.

68. N. A. Phelps, N. Parsons, D. Ballas, and A. Dowling, *Post-Suburban Europe: Planning and Politics at the Margins of Europe's Capital Cities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*.
69. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*.
70. J. Logan and H. Molotch, *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), xx.
71. N. Smith, "Gentrification and Uneven Development," *Economic Geography* 58 (1982): 138–155.
72. F. J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962 [1920]).
73. J. Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Knopf Doubleday/Anchor Books, 1991).
74. Compare J. M. Levy, *Contemporary Urban Planning* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1988), ix, and P. McAuslan, *The Ideologies of Planning Law* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1980), on the legal basis of planning in the United States and the United Kingdom.
75. Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine."
76. Jackson, "Introduction: The Shape of Things to Come," 4.
77. A. Sarzynski, G. Galster, and L. Stack, "Evolving United States Metropolitan Land Use Patterns," *Urban Geography* 35 (2014): 25–47, 25 and 26, respectively. Using a range of indicators of metropolitan land use, the authors typify patterns of urban development in the United States in terms of "intensity," "compactness," "mixing," and "core-dominance."
78. Z. L. Miller, (1990) "Pluralizing America: Walter Prescott Webb, Chicago School Sociology and Cultural Regionalism," in Mohl et al., *Essays on Sunbelt Cities and Recent Urban America*, 151–176; Talen, *New Urbanism and American Planning*, 1–2.
79. L. S. Bourne, "On Schools of Thought, Comparative Research, and Inclusiveness: A Commentary," *Urban Geography* 29 (2008): 177–186, 179.
80. J. H. Mollenkopf, "School Is Out: The Case of New York City," in *The City Revisited: Urban Theory from Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York*, ed. D. R. Judd and D. Simpson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 169–185, 175, emphasis added.
81. R. E. Lang and J. B. LeFurgy, *Boomburbs: The Rise of America's Accidental Cities* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007).

82. T. S. Chapin, "From Growth Controls to Comprehensive Planning to Smart Growth: Planning's Emerging Fourth Wave," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 78 (2012): 5–15, 6.

83. C. Abbott, "Southwestern Cityscapes: Approaches to an American Urban Environment," in Mohl et al., *Essays on Sunbelt Cities and Recent Urban America*, 59–86.

84. Chapin, "From Growth Controls to Comprehensive Planning to Smart Growth." Chapin identifies four eras of urban growth management in the United States: the era of growth controls, which did indeed involve a measure of containment through the use of the likes of stop lines and urban growth boundaries; the era of comprehensive planning, which did not seek to limit the spatial extent of urban development but instead tied it to questions of financing and concurrent provision for collective consumption; the era of smart growth management, in which a greater mix and density of development were encouraged selectively in urban and suburban centers; and an era of sustainable growth management, which he sees emerging presently to encompass yet broader and longer-term concerns such as climate change and food security alongside those of the resilience and sustainability of communities in economic development terms.

85. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*.

86. Talen, *New Urbanism and American Planning*, 4.

87. A. Forsyth, "Who Built Irvine? Private Planning and the Federal Government," *Urban Studies* 39 (2002): 2507–2530.

88. R. E. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003).

89. Lang and LeFurgy, *Boomburbs*.

90. C. R. Leinberger, "The Next Slum?," *The Atlantic* (March 2008), 70–75, cited in Young and Keil, "Reconnecting the Disconnected," 92

Chapter 4: Politics and the Private and Collective Dynamics of America's Post-Suburban Future

1. R. Keil, "Sustaining Modernity, Modernizing Nature: The Environmental Crisis and the Survival of Capitalism," in *The Sustainable Development Paradox: Urban Political Economy in the United States*, ed. R. Krueger and D. Gibbs (New York: Guilford Press, 2007), 41–65, 62.

2. R. Gottlieb, *Reinventing Los Angeles: Nature and Community in the Global City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 332.

3. D. Hayden, *Building Suburbia: Greenfields and Urban Growth, 1820–2000* (New York, 2003), 3.
4. R. Bruegmann, *Sprawl: A Compact History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
5. R. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York: Basic Books, 1987).
6. Hayden, *Building Suburbia*, 245.
7. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press 1997), 5.
8. R. Kling, S. C. Olin, Jr., and M. Poster, "The Emergence of Postsuburbia: An Introduction," in *Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange County Since World War II*, ed. R. King, S. Olin, and M. Poster (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 1–30.
9. M. J. Dear and N. Dahmann, "Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism," *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (2008): 266–279.
10. Bruegmann, *Sprawl*, 163.
11. D. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); R. Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization: Capitalism and the Construction of Urban Space in the United States," in *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Societies*, ed. M. Dear and A. Scott (London: Methuen, 1981), 383–429.
12. H. Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1976): 309–322.
13. L. H. Masotti, "Prologue: Suburbia Reconsidered—Myth and Counter-myth," in *The Urbanization of the Suburbs*, ed. L. H. Masotti and J. K. Hadden (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1973), 16–17.
14. L. Mazingo, *Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011), 217.
15. M. P. O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 4.
16. R. Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia*. (New York: Basic Books, 1987), 190; R. Fishman, "The Garden City Tradition in the Postsuburban Age," *Built Environment* 17 (1991): 232–241, 234.
17. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*, 44.
18. P. Saunders, *Social Theory and the Urban Question* (London: Hutchison, 1981); N. A. Phelps, N. Parsons, D. Ballas, and A. Dowling, *Post-Suburban Europe: Planning*

and *Politics at the Margins of Europe's Capital Cities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

19. M. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl: Private and Public Interests in Suburbia* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977).

20. P. O. Muller, "The Suburban Transformation of the Globalizing American City," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 551 (1997): 44–58, cited in J. Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million: America in 2050* (New York: Penguin, 2010), 94.

21. A. Wood, "The Scalar Transformation of the US Commercial Property-Development Industry: A Cautionary Note on the Limits of Globalization," *Economic Geography* 80 (2004): 119–140. On the "transnational capitalist class," see L. Sklair, "The Transnational Capitalist Class and Contemporary Architecture in Global Cities," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29 (2005): 484–500. On the idea of a "global intelligence corps," see K. Olds, *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture and Pacific Rim Mega-projects* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

22. N. A. Phelps "Clusters, Dispersion and the Spaces in between: For an Economic Geography of the Banal," *Urban Studies* 41 (2004): 971–989.

23. T. Sieverts, *Cities without Cities: An Interpretation of the Zwischenstadt* (London: Routledge, 2003), 154.

24. R. A. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006); Walker, "A Theory of Suburbanization"; J. Wolch, M. Pastor, and P. Dreier, "Introduction: Making Southern California: Public Policy, Markets, and the Dynamics of Growth," in *Up Against the Sprawl: Public Policy and the Making of Southern California*, ed. J. Wolch, M. Pastor, and P. Dreier (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 1–23. In the mixed economies of Europe, examples of the state instigating suburbanization and post-suburbanization are equally if not more pronounced, while in East Asia the state is currently perhaps the most important direct and indirect force driving suburban and post-suburban development in many national settings.

25. A. J. Scott and S. T. Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice: A Reappraisal," *Environment and Planning A* 9 (1977): 1097–1119.

26. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl*.

27. U. Beck, W. Bonss, and C. Lau, "The Theory of Reflexive Modernization: Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Program," *Theory, Culture & Society* 20 (2003): 1–33.

28. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009).

29. T. N. Clark, K. Lloyd, K. Wong, and P. Jain, "Amenities Drive Urban Growth," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (2002): 493–515.
30. My reference to global here is not literal but is meant to imply simply a politics that exceeds purely local concerns centered on suburban communities, whether incorporated or not.
31. Scott and Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice"; C. Offe, "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation," in *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism: Public Policy and the Theory of the State*, ed. L. N. Lindberg, R. Alford, C. Crouch, and C. Offe (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1975), 125–144.
32. M. Castells, *The Urban Question*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977); idem, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*, California Series in Urban Development 2 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983).
33. R. Gottlieb, M. Vallianatos, R. M. Freerer, and P. Dreier, *The Next Los Angeles: The Struggle for a Livable City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); R. Gottlieb, *Reinventing Los Angeles: Nature and Community in the Global City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007).
34. R. E. Lang and J. B. LeFurgy, *Boomburbs: The Rise of America's Accidental Cities* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007), 122.
35. *Ibid.*, 121.
36. K. R. Cox and A. E. G. Jonas, "Urban Development, Collective Consumption and the Politics of Metropolitan Fragmentation," *Political Geography* 12 (1993): 8–37, 33.
37. J. Persky and W. Wiewel, *When Corporations Leave Town: The Costs and Benefits of Metropolitan Job Sprawl* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2000), 82–83.
38. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*.
39. A. Passell, *Building the New Urbanism: Places, Professions, and Profits in the American Metropolitan Landscape* (London: Routledge, 2013), 18.
40. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*, 140.
41. A. While, A. E. G. Jonas, and D. C. Gibbs, "Unblocking the City? Growth Pressures, Collective Provision, and the Search for New Spaces of Governance in Greater Cambridge, England," *Environment and Planning A* 36 (2004) 279–304.
42. M. H. Rose and R. A. Mohl, *Interstate: Highway Politics and Policy since 1939*, 3rd ed. (Knoxville: University Press of Tennessee, 2012), 166. This much has become familiar in accounts of the suburban development of America, though it is worth

remembering that the interstate era actually emerged around a consensus regarding the presumed benefits of expressway development for central city regeneration, and not for the suburbs.

43. Ibid. Indeed, the politics surrounding urban expressway development was significantly imbued with a politics in which black and poor neighborhoods were demolished in order to facilitate fresh development opportunities for city business elites.

44. Persky and Wiewel, *When Corporations Leave Town*.

45. Rose and Mohl, *Interstate*, 188.

46. M. Parés and D. Saurí, "Integrating Sustainabilities in a Context of Economic, Social and Urban Change: The Case of Public Spaces in the Metropolitan Region of Barcelona," in Krueger and Gibbs, *The Sustainable Development Paradox*, 160–191, 187.

47. D. B. Massey, "A Global Sense of Place," *Marxism Today* 35 (1991): 24–29.

48. Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million*, 215.

49. Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, 122.

50. A. Duany, E. Plater-Zyberk, and J. Speck, *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* (New York: North Point Press, 2000), 42.

51. A. Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 229.

52. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*, viii.

53. A. C. Nelson, "The New Urbanity: The Rise of a New America," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626 (2009): 192–208, 206.

54. A. Flint, *This Land: The Battle over Sprawl and the Future of America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 103.

55. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*, 177.

56. A. E. G. Jonas and S. Pincetl, "Rescaling Regions in the State: The New Regionalism in California," *Political Geography* 25 (2006): 482–505, 485.

57. R. Hogan, *The Failure of Planning: Permitting Sprawl in San Diego Suburbs, 1970–1999* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2003) 87.

58. A. E. G. Jonas and A. While, "Greening the Entrepreneurial City? Looking for Spaces of Sustainability in the Competitive City," in Krueger and Gibbs, *The Sustainable Development Paradox*, 123–159, 144.

59. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl*, 25 and 111, respectively.

60. C. M. Tiebout, "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures," *Journal of Political Economy* 64 (1956): 416–424.
61. Jonas and While, "Greening the Entrepreneurial City?," 146.
62. G. A. Gonzalez, *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009).
63. R. Cervero and J. Murakami, "Effects of Built Environments on Vehicle Miles Traveled: Evidence from 370 Urbanized Areas," *Environment and Planning A* 42 (2010): 400–418.
64. T. S. Chapin, "From Growth Controls to Comprehensive Planning to Smart Growth: Planning's Emerging Fourth Wave," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 78 (2012): 5–15.
65. Gottlieb, *Reinventing Los Angeles*.
66. *Ibid.*, 54.
67. Underbounding refers to a situation in which the functional economic area of a city or incorporated community (as measured in, for example, the travel to work area) exceeds the administrative boundary of the same community.
68. R. Mohl, "The Transformation of Urban America since the Second World War," in *Essays on Sunbelt Cities and Recent Urban America*, ed. R. Mohl, R. Fisher, C. Abbott, R. W. Lotchin, R. B. Fairbanks, and Z. L. Miller (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1990), 8–32, 24.
69. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia*, ix–x.
70. *Ibid.*, 209–210.
71. *Ibid.*, 84.
72. A. Forsyth, "Defining Suburbs," *Journal of Planning Literature* 27 (2012): 270–281.
73. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*, 191.
74. *Ibid.*, 179–180.
75. K. T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 146.
76. *Ibid.*, 140–141.
77. *Ibid.*, 150.
78. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban*, 189.
79. A. Silverman and L. Schneider, "Suburban Localism and Long Island's Regional Crisis," *Built Environment* 17 (1991): 191–204, 200–201.

80. Persky and Wiewel, *When Corporations Leave Town*, 99.
81. *Ibid.*, 83.
82. M. Orfield, *American Metropolitcs: The New Suburban Reality* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002).
83. A. Althubaity and A. E. G. Jonas, "Suburban Entrepreneurialism: Redevelopment Regimes and Co-ordinating Metropolitan Development in Southern California," in *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*, ed. T. Hall and P. Hubbard (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1998), 149–172, 149.
84. *Ibid.*, 150.
85. J. A. Musso, "Metropolitan Fiscal Structure: Coping with Growth and Fiscal Constraint," in Wolch, Pastor, and Dreier, *Up Against the Sprawl*, 171–194.
86. Gottdiener, *Planned Sprawl*, 26.
87. Althubaity and Jonas, "Suburban Entrepreneurialism."
88. R. Keil, "Governance Restructuring in Los Angeles and Toronto: Amalgamation or Secession," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24 (2000): 758–781, 777.
89. N. Brenner, "Between Fixity and Motion: Accumulation, Territorial Organization, and the Historical Geography of Spatial Scales," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16 (1998): 459–481.
90. Chapin, "From Growth Controls to Comprehensive Planning to Smart Growth"; J. F. Horan and G. T. Taylor, *Experiments in Metropolitan Government* (New York: Praeger, 1977).

Chapter 5: Kendall Downtown

1. R. A. Mohl and G. Mormino, "The Big Change in the Sunshine State: A Social History of Modern Florida," in *The New History of Florida*, ed. R. A. Mohl and G. Mormino (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996), 418–447, 425.
2. R. Gottlieb, M. Vallianatos, R. M. Freer, and P. Dreier, *The Next Los Angeles: The Struggle for a Livable City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
3. See M. Grunwald, *The Swamp: The Everglades, Florida and the Politics of Paradise* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006); and C. Pittman and M. Waite, *Paving Paradise: Florida's Vanishing Wetlands and the Failure of No Net Loss* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009).
4. D. R. Colburn and L. deHaven-Smith, *Florida's Megatrends: Cultural Issues in Florida*, 2nd ed. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010), 135.

5. D. M. Parker, "Is South Florida the New Southern California? Carl Hiaasen's Dystopian Paradise," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 90 (2012): 306–323.
6. R. E. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003), 69.
7. J. Nijman, *Miami: Mistress of the Americas* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 205.
8. G. R. Mormino, "Sunbelt Dreams and Altered States: A Social and Cultural History of Florida, 1950–2000," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 80 (2002): 3–21, 20.
9. L. Sandercock, *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2003).
10. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009); D. S. Goldstein, "New Urbanism: Recreating Florida by Rewriting the Rules," *Florida Bar Journal* 80 (2006): 63–71.
11. Mohl and Mormino, "The Big Change in the Sunshine State," 419.
12. Nijman, *Miami*, 67.
13. T. S. Chapin, "Growth Management or Growth Unabated? Economic Development in Florida since 1990," in *Growth Management in Florida: Planning for Paradise*, ed. T. S. Chapin, C. E. Connerly, and H. T. Higgins (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 119–140, 137 and 139, respectively.
14. H. Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political-Economy of Place," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1976): 309–322.
15. Nijman, *Miami*, 70.
16. *Ibid.*, 126.
17. P. S. George, "Kendall," in *Miami's Historic Neighborhoods: A History of Community*, ed. B. R. Matkov (San Antonio: Historical Publishing Network, 2001), 118–122, 122.
18. *Ibid.*
19. According to Dr. Stokes of Miami Dade Community College, South Campus, "One issue is that the area is not evidently self-contained. Residents must commute out of Kendall to their place of work. We have a multitude of skilled workers living in Kendall, but no industry to support their working here." Quoted in M. E. Pando, "Life in Fast-Growing Kendall," *Kendall Gazette* 18 (1992): 8B–9B.
20. George, "Kendall," 118.

21. C. M. Rogier, *The Comprehensive Development Master Plan: A Study of Environmental Politics* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, 1982), 37.
22. C. R. Leonard, *License to Steal: Secrets of Acquiring Distressed Property in Florida* (Jacksonville, FL: Cliff R. Leonard & Associates, 1982).
23. W. B. Stronge, *The Sunshine Economy: An Economic History of Florida since the Civil War* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), 193.
24. A. Ettorre, *Arvida: A Business Odyssey* (Coral Springs, FL: ECI, 1990), 11–12.
25. Quoted in B. Weiner, “Dadeland Work Starts Tomorrow,” *Miami News*, August 6, 1961, 7c.
26. P. Kaplan, “Kendall,” in *Miami’s Neighborhoods*, ed. P. Morrissey (Miami: Miami News, 1982), 64–66, 66.
27. Some measure of Arvida’s interest in rapid infrastructure improvements in the Kendall area, represented by the likes of the North Kendall Drive extensions, is indicated by the fact that in 1958, at the announcement of the issue of its flotation on the U.S. stock exchange, only 1 percent of its land holdings had been improved. By as late as 1971 as little as 17 percent of Arvida’s land holdings had been improved, but by the end of 1976, 68 percent of its land holdings had zoning, water and sewer service, and access roads, and were at elevations required for construction. Arvida Corporation, *Prospectus Class A Common Stock* (1956), and Arvida Corporation, *Annual Report* (1976), 2–3.
28. J. Taylor, *A History of South Dade County, Florida* (Miami, 1983), 5. One interviewee who arrived in the area in the late 1960s recalled how the road remained surrounded on either side by farmland west of the turnpike and was a prime spot for drag car racing at the time (Interview, planner, Metropolitan Division, Miami-Dade County Planning Department, June 26, 2013).
29. Interview, principal, Henry Wolffe Jr. and Associates, Miami Beach, June 26, 2013.
30. P. S. George, *A Journey through Time: A Pictorial History of South Dade* (Virginia Beach, VA: Walsworth, 1995), 165.
31. Dunham-Jones and Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia*.
32. Goldstein, “New Urbanism,” 63 and 69, respectively.
33. See <http://www.chambersouth.com/community/downtown-kendall> (accessed May 31, 2014).
34. P. Whoriskey, “Vision of a Downtown Intrigues Kendall,” *Miami Herald*, July 19, 1998, 1A.
35. *Ibid.*

36. Interview, membership development manager, Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce (South), April 21, 2011.
37. See <http://www.miami21.org> (accessed December 14, 2014). A form-based zoning code is less concerned less with specifying set densities of development (floor-to-area ratios, or FARs) than with architectural form.
38. Interview, planner, Community Planning, Miami Dade County Planning Department, April 15, 2011.
39. Interview, partner, Dover, Kohl and Partners, Coral Gables, June 28, 2013.
40. Interview, former mayor, Cutler Bay, April 28, 2011.
41. Interview, executive vice president, The Green Companies, Dadeland Center, June 27, 2013.
42. Interview, membership development manager, Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce (South), April 21, 2011.
43. Interview, president and CEO, Good Governance Initiative, Miami, April 22, 2011.
44. Interview, executive vice president, The Green Companies, Dadeland Center, June 27, 2013.
45. Interview, former mayor, Cutler Bay, April 28, 2011.
46. Interview, executive vice president, The Green Companies, Dadeland Center, June 27, 2013.
47. Chapin, "Growth Management or Growth Unabated?," 1.
48. T. S. Chapin, C. E. Connerly and H. T. Higgins, "Introduction," in Chapin, Connerly, and Higgins, *Growth Management in Florida*, 1–4, 2.
49. Chapin, "Growth Management or Growth Unabated?," 9.
50. T. G. Pelham, "A Historical Perspective for Evaluating Florida's Evolving Growth Management Process," in Chapin, Connerly, and Higgins, *Growth Management in Florida*, 7–19, 15.
51. Colburn and deHaven-Smith, *Florida's Megatrends*, 127.
52. M. E. Klass, "Florida Lawmakers Wipe out 30 Years of Growth Management-Law," *Tampa Bay Times*, May 7, 2011.
53. M. S. Douglas, *The Everglades: River of Grass* (Sarasota: Pineapple Press Inc., 1988 [1947]).

54. Quoted in R. S. Turner and M. S. Murray, "Managing Growth in a Climate of Urban Diversity: South Florida's Eastward Ho! Initiative," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20 (2001): 308–328, 316.
55. Turner and Murray, "Managing Growth in a Climate of Urban Diversity," 324.
56. R. A. Mohl, "Interstating Miami: Urban Expressways and the Changing American City," *Tequesta* 68 (2008): 5–40.
57. Turner and Murray, "Managing Growth in a Climate of Urban Diversity," 326.
58. Interview, president and CEO, Good Governance Initiative, Miami, April 22, 2011.
59. K. Ross, "Downtown for Kendall Delayed a Year," *Miami Herald*, April 13, 2001, 3B.
60. Interview, executive vice president, The Green Companies, Dadeland Center, June 27, 2013.
61. Interview, vice president of property management, Lennar Corporation, April 21, 2011.
62. Interview, architect, Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company, April 26, 2011.
63. Interview, professor of architecture, University of Miami, April 22, 2011.
64. Interview, architect, Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company, April 26, 2011.
65. Interview, architect, Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company, April 26, 2011.
66. A. C. Nelson, "The New Urbanity: The Rise of a New America," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626 (2009): 192–208.
67. Interview, president, Continental Park Residents Board, and member, East Kendall Homeowners Association, April 18, 2011.
68. Colburn and deHaven-Smith, *Florida's Megatrends*, 57.
69. *Ibid.*, 122.
70. L. J. Carter, *The Florida Experience: Land and Water Policy in a Growth State* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 138, 139.
71. *Ibid.*, 155, 156.
72. Rogier, *The Comprehensive Development Master Plan*, 46.
73. *Ibid.*, 48.
74. Miami-Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan for Metropolitan Dade County, Florida* (Miami, 1975), 136.

75. Ibid., 101.
76. P. Kaplan, "West Kendall Growth Not As Easy As ABC," *Miami News*, December 7, 1978, 1A and 6A.
77. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), *Growing for a Sustainable Future: Miami-Dade County Urban Development Boundary Assessment* (Washington, DC: EPA, 2012), 1 and 7, respectively.
78. F. W. Boal, "Urban Growth and Land Value Patterns: Government Influences," *Professional Geographer* 22 (1970): 79–82.
79. EPA, *Growing for a Sustainable Future*, 7. Nevertheless, Miami Dade Commissioners recently agreed to expand the area within the UDB by 521 acres while also rejecting recommendations by planners to provide greater protection for 3,600 acres of environmentally sensitive land. This was the first such enlargement since 2011, when 120 acres were included. P. Mazzei, "Miami Dade Commissioners Expand Urban Development Boundary," *Miami Herald*, October 3, 2013.
80. EPA, *Growing for a Sustainable Future*, 4 and 10, respectively.
81. Ibid., 23.
82. Miami-Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan* (Miami, 1988), 1–15.
83. Interview, planning manager, Miami Dade Expressway Authority, April 25, 2011.
84. Miami-Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan for Metropolitan Dade County Florida*, 118.
85. Miami-Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan (revision) for Miami Dade County* (Miami, 1979), 163.
86. Miami-Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan for Metropolitan Dade County Florida* (Miami, 1975), 3.
87. M. Lucoff, "Metro, Cities Outline Transit Zoning Rules," *Miami News*, September 29, 1978, 4A.
88. EPA, *Growing for a Sustainable Future*, 22.
89. Interview, regional planner, South Florida Regional Planning Commission, April 27, 2011.
90. Interview, executive vice president, The Green Companies, Dadeland Center, June 27, 2013.
91. Interview, president and CEO, Good Governance Initiative, Miami, April 22, 2011.

92. Interview, director of engineering, Miami Dade Expressway Authority, April 25, 2011.
93. Ibid.
94. Interview, resident and local historian, East Kendall, April 26, 2011.
95. R. P. Wolff, *Miami Metro: The Road to Urban Unity* (Coral Gables, FL, 1960), 82.
96. Ibid., 58–59.
97. E. Sofen, *The Miami Metropolitan Experiment* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), 13.
98. Wolff, *Miami Metro*, 82.
99. Sofen, *The Miami Metropolitan Experiment*.
100. Colburn and deHaven-Smith, *Florida's Megatrends*, 69.
101. Sofen, *The Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 11.
102. J. F. Horan and G. T. Taylor, *Experiments in Metropolitan Government* (New York, 1977), 99.
103. Miami Dade County, *Comprehensive Development Master Plan (revision) Miami Dade County*, 165.
104. R. K. Vogel and G. N. L. Stowers, "Miami: Minority Empowerment and Regime Change," in *Big City Politics in Transition*, ed. H. V. Savitch and J. C. Thomas (London: Sage, 1991), 115–131, 121.
105. Lucoff, "Metro, Cities Outline Transit Zoning Rules," 16A.
106. Interview, professor of architecture, University of Miami, April 22, 2011.
107. Interview, president, Continental Park Residents Board, and member, East Kendall Homeowners Association, April 18, 2011.
108. Interview, resident and local historian, East Kendall, April 26, 2011.
109. Interview, planner, Community Planning, Miami Dade County Planning Department, April 15, 2011.
110. Colburn and deHaven-Smith, *Florida's Megatrends*, 138–139.
111. Nijman, *Miami*, 74.
112. Ibid., 136.
113. Ibid., 211.
114. Interview, member, Pinecrest Village Council, April 27, 2011.

Chapter 6: Taming Tysons

1. Interview, partner, KGP Design Studio, Washington, D.C., May 21, 2008.
2. J. Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Knopf Doubleday/Anchor Books, 1991).
3. Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, *On Wedges and Corridors: A General Plan for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties* (Washington, DC: Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 1962).
4. J. Peck, "Neoliberal Suburbanism: Frontier Space," *Urban Geography* 32 (2011): 884–919, 908, argues that the centrifugal momentum of suburban development continues to drive a metropolitan transformation in the United States involving "the evasion and subversion of post-urban regulatory coordination, and its secessionist eclipse through the prosaic medium of suburbanized 'subgovernance,'" where subgovernance entails not only a "a locally scaled modality of suburban (self) rule" but also "a purposive bundle of secessionist, exclusionary and marketizing interventions."
5. J. Logan and H. Molotch, *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).
6. R. E. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003).
7. C. P. Stuntz and M. Stuntz, *This Was Tysons Corner, Virginia: Facts and Photos* (Fairfax, VA: Stuntz and Stuntz, 1982).
8. P. L. Knox, "The Restless Urban Landscape: Economic and Sociocultural Change and the Transformation of Metropolitan Washington, DC," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81 (1991): 181–209.
9. P. E. Ceruzzi, *Internet Alley: High Technology in Tysons Corner, 1945–2005* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).
10. Til Hazel was a lawyer acting on behalf of the state and federal governments identifying land and buildings to make way for the Beltway. He went on to become a tenacious land speculator and developer himself as well as acting as legal adviser in planning applications for some of the earliest developers at Tysons Corner.
11. Interview, former county executive, Fairfax County, April 9, 2008.
12. S. Mastran, "The Evolution of Suburban Nucleations: Land Investment Activity in Fairfax County, Virginia," PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1988; S. Mastran, "Tysons Corner, Virginia: Planning for the Urban Retrofitting of a Suburban Edge City," *Real Estate Review* 39 (2010): 63–81, 72.

13. Ceruzzi, *Internet Alley*, and Garreau, *Edge City*, document Til Hazel's and Gerry Halpin's roles in the physical development of and wider promotion of economic development in northern Virginia.

14. A. J. Scott and S. T. Roweis, "Urban Planning in Theory and Practice: A Reappraisal," *Environment and Planning A* 9 (1977): 1097–1119.

15. K. T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 267.

16. Interview, president, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, May 29, 2008.

17. H. Molotch, "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1976): 309–332.

18. Ceruzzi, *Internet Alley*, 55.

19. B. Katz, "Welcome to the 'Exit Ramp' Economy," May 13, 2001, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2001/05/13metropolitanpolicy-katz> (accessed May 25, 2014).

20. J. Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

21. R. Banham, *The Fight for Fairfax: A Struggle for a Great American County* (Fairfax, VA: George Mason University Press, 2009).

22. T. S. Peters, *The Politics and Administration of Land Use Control: The Case of Fairfax County, Virginia* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1974).

23. Interview, former Fairfax County supervisor, May 27, 2008.

24. Mastran, "Tysons Corner, Virginia," 67.

25. *Ibid.*, 67.

26. Banham, *The Fight for Fairfax*; N. Netherton, D. Sweig, J. Artemel, P. Hickin, and P. Reed. *Fairfax County, Virginia: A History* (Fairfax, VA: Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, 1978).

27. By this time, the rapid growth of the county's population, from approximately 96,000 in 1950 to 455,000 in 1970, had produced a measure of popular support for and the election of a "growth control" board of supervisors (Peters, *The Politics and Administration of Land Use Control*, 5). Popular support for this agenda was short-lived as a result of continuing failures of the board to deal adequately with these concerns at the same time as restraints on development increased the share of the tax take coming from residents. See County of Fairfax, *Committee to Study the Means of Encouraging Industrial Development in Fairfax County* (Fairfax, VA, 1976).

28. *Ibid.*

29. Interview, vice chair, Fairfax County Planning Commission, April 23, 2010.
30. Ceruzzi, *Internet Alley*.
31. Interview, former Fairfax County executive, April 9, 2008.
32. Interviews, former Fairfax County supervisor, May 28, 2008, and former Fairfax County supervisor, May 27, 2008. A planning aspiration to create a more pedestrian-friendly, urban center with a greater mix of uses has been apparent since 1971. See County of Fairfax, *Tysons Corner Regional Center Study* (Fairfax, VA, 1971). This was reiterated in County of Fairfax, *Tysons Corner Area Study* (Fairfax, VA, 1977). There was also an independent visioning exercise in the 1990s by the Tysons Transportation Association, *The Future of Tysons Corner: A Vision* (Tysons Corner, VA, 1992). The most recent comprehensive plan was County of Fairfax, *Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan* (Fairfax, VA, 1994). It is this plan that has been revised as a result of the recommendations of the Tysons Corner Land Use Task Force.
33. Banham, *The Fight for Fairfax*, 179; Netherton et al., *Fairfax County, Virginia*.
34. Interview, vice president, EDAW Inc., Alexandria, April 3, 2008.
35. Interview, president, Vienna-Tysons Regional Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008.
36. Interview, president and CEO, Fairfax County Economic Development Authority, April 4, 2008.
37. Interview, lawyer, Holland & Knight LLP, April 22, 2010.
38. "Tysons Corner, 2.0: Retrofitting a Giant, 50 Years Later," *Washington Post*, April 23, 2010, A20.
39. Knox, "The Restless Urban Landscape," 191.
40. Interview, senior vice president, Development Services, West Group, May 28, 2008.
41. Interview, vice president, EDAW Inc., Alexandria, April 3, 2008.
42. The task force was charged with promoting more mixed uses, better facilitating transit-oriented development, enhancing pedestrian connections across the Tysons area, increasing the residential component of the land-use mix, improving the functionality of Tysons, and providing for amenities and aesthetics in Tysons. County of Fairfax, *The Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County* (Amendment No. 2007-23) (Fairfax, VA, 2010), 4.
43. Interviews, president and CEO, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008, and mayor, Town of Vienna, May 23, 2008, respectively.
44. Interview, former Fairfax County supervisor, May 28, 2008.

45. George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis, *Forecasts for Tysons Corner to 2050* (Arlington, VA, 2008). The highest of a series of forecasts of future growth at Tysons Corner anticipates the population growing to 85,900 and employment growing to 209,900 by 2050, representing more or less a doubling of employment and a fivefold increase in population from that in 2008.
46. A. Gardner, "U.S. Transportation Chief Backs Dulles Rail Project," *Washington Post*, January 8, 2009, B1.
47. See the web page <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/news/2013/board-approves-largest-residential-project-tysons.htm> (accessed May 15, 2014).
48. County of Fairfax, *The Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County* (Amendment No. 2007–23), 6.
49. Interview, partner, Davis Carter Scott, May 20, 2008.
50. Interview, president and CEO, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008.
51. Interview, committee chairman, McLean Citizens Association, May 29, 2008.
52. County of Fairfax, *Tyson's Corner Urban Design Charrette* (Fairfax, VA, 1976), 13.
53. Mastran, "Tysons Corner, Virginia," 72.
54. The Los Angeles River, once natural, is now almost entirely artificial. For much of its length it passes through an elaborate set of concrete channels engineered for flood control purposes. Los Angeles effectively turned its back on the river, but civic and environmental groups have campaigned successfully to restore some of the amenity and ecological value of the river. See B. Gumprecht, *The Los Angeles River: Its Life, Death and Possible Rebirth* (new edition) (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).
55. Interviews, former Fairfax County supervisor, May 28, 2008; president, The Regency Residents Association, June 13, 2008.
56. J. O'Connell, "Fairfax County Plans 154 Acres of Urban Parks for Tysons," *Washington Post*, April 25, 2014; Fairfax County Parks Authority, *Tysons Park System Concept Plan (Draft)* (Fairfax VA, 2014), vii.
57. T. Jackman, "Fairfax Agrees Third New Large Development for Tysons 'Other' Green Space," *Washington Post*, April 22, 2013. A coalition of fifteen neighborhood groups led the Save Tysons' Last Forest campaign to successfully help protect proposed exit ramp and road developments from the Dulles Toll Road into Tysons Corner from destroying an area of forest. See the website <http://www.savetysonslast-forest.org> (accessed May 31, 2014).

58. This is a certification program developed by the U.S. Green Building Council. Silver is the second of four categories of certification for buildings. See the website <http://www.usgbc.org/leed#overview> (accessed May 25, 2014).

59. G. A. Gonzalez, *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009).

60. Interview, research officer, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, June 19, 2008.

61. A. Olivo, "He Helps Others See His Vision of Redeveloped Tysons Corner," *Washington Post*, January 1, 2014.

62. Interview, committee chairman, McLean Citizens Association, May 29, 2008.

63. A. Gardner, "Plan to Remake Tysons Corner Envisions Dense Urban Center," *Washington Post*, May 29, 2008, A1.

64. Interview, president, Tysons Tunnel Campaign, May 22, 2008.

65. J. O'Connell, "Fairfax County Plans 154 Acres of Urban Parks for Tysons," *Washington Post*, April 25, 2014.

66. Personal communication, principal, Synergy/Planning Inc., Warrenton, VA, January 24, 2009. Among the reservations here are the manner in which the superimposition of a grid of streets remains oriented toward the automobile rather than the pedestrian, the extent to which planned building densities around the metro line will deliver the anticipated outcomes, and the more general notion that property development continues to be oriented to short-term exchange rather than longer-term use values.

67. Interview, president and CEO, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008.

68. Mastran, "Tysons Corner, Virginia," 76.

69. Interviews, president and CEO, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008; president, Tysons Tunnel Campaign, May 22, 2008; and executive director, Coalition for Smarter Growth, May 21, 2008.

70. J. M. Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty-Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park*, with a foreword by E. C. Bearss (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press 1998).

71. J. Garreau, "The Last Thing He Expected Was a Fight," *Washington Post*, July 28, 1991, W14.

72. Quoted in C. Reilly and V. Zapan, "Tysons Corner Is Unofficially Dropping the 'Corner' from Its Name," *Washington Post*, October 5, 2012.

73. Interview, executive director, Coalition for Smarter Growth, May 21, 2008.

74. Ceruzzi, *Internet Alley*.
75. Interview, vice president, EDAW Inc., Alexandria, April 3, 2008.
76. Interviews, president, Tysons Tunnel Campaign, May 22, 2008, and former Fairfax County supervisor, May 28, 2008, respectively.
77. Interview, chair, Tysons Corner Land Use Task Force, April 4, 2008.
78. Interviews, Judy Meany, professor, Dominion University, June 19, 2008, and planner, Planning Department, Fairfax County, April 4, 2008.
79. Interview, senior manager, Development, Tysons Corner Center, May 29, 2008.
80. Interview, senior vice president, Development Services, West Group, May 28, 2008.
81. Interview, senior manager, Development, Tysons Corner Center, May 29, 2008.
82. Interview, partner, Davis Carter Scott, May 20, 2008.
83. Interview, senior vice president, Development Services, West Group, May 28, 2008.
84. Interview, partner, The Georgelas Group of Companies, April 22, 2010.
85. Tysons Corner Collaborative, *Taming Tysons: Transforming the Quintessential Edge City*, n.d., <http://www.tamingtysons.com/tysons/tth2.pdf> (accessed May 26, 2014).
86. Interview, lawyer, Holland & Knight LLP, April 22, 2010.
87. Greater Washington 2050 Coalition, *Region Forward* (Washington, DC, 2010).
88. Interview, chief of housing and planning, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC, May 21 2008.
89. Interview, president, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, May 29, 2008.
90. Interview, committee chairman, McLean Citizens Association, May 29, 2008.
91. This is the marketing statement accompanying the Tysons Partnership logo.
92. Interview, vice president, EDAW Inc., Alexandria, April 3, 2008.
93. J. Garreau, "The Shadow Governments: More Than 2000 Unelected Units Rule in New Communities," *Washington Post*, June 14, 1987, A1.
94. Interview, former Fairfax County supervisor, May 28, 2008.
95. Interview, president and CEO, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, April 8, 2008. Also see Gardner, "Plan to Remake Tysons Corner."

96. Interviews, lawyer, Holland & Knight LLP, April 22, 2010, and member, Tysons Corner Land Use Task Force and Dranesville resident, April 20, 2010.

97. See the web page <http://tysonspartnership.org/the-partnership/partnership-councils> (accessed May 15, 2014). The Tysons Partnership has a thirty-five-member board of directors sitting for renewable three-year terms. "The Board provides fiduciary oversight to assure legal, ethical and prudent operation. The Board also defines Partnership policy, direction, goals and budgets." See the web page <http://tysonspartnership.org/the-partnership/board-of-directors> (accessed May 15, 2014). "Members of the Tysons Partnership are dues paying employers, landlords, land owners and developers, retailers, hoteliers and hospitality service providers, civic groups, and professional consultants that are physically located or own property within Tysons. Fairfax County government is also in the Partnership." See the web page <http://tysonspartnership.org/the-partnership/members> (accessed May 15, 2014).

98. Interview, supervisor, Fairfax County, May 29, 2008. In 1964, as a self-contained newly master-planned city on the edge of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, Reston's vision was as "a creative solution to the twin danger [of] unsightly suburban sprawl and haphazard urban sprawl" (Robert Simon, quoted in K. MacDonald, "Reston Revisited," *Landscape* 32 [1994]: 28–33, 28.) A planned downtown did not take shape until the 1990s.

99. L. Mazingo, *Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011), 220.

100. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 191.

101. See the web page <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/tysons> (accessed May 15, 2014).

102. Indeed, despite its youth as a developed location some sites have already been developed and redeveloped at least three times. Interview, Chief, Policy and Plan Development Branch, Planning Division, Fairfax County Planning Department, April 19, 2010.

103. J. O'Connell, "Tysons: The Building of an American City," *Washington Post*, September 24, 2011.

104. Lang, *Edgeless Cities*.

Chapter 7: Schaumburg

1. Schaumburg Outer Planets Corporation, *The Outer Planets: A Regional Master Concept Planned Unit Development* (Arlington Heights, IL, 1973).

2. R. E. Lang, *Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003).
3. W. J. Holderfield, *Schaumburg's Woodfield Mall* (Chicago: Arcadia, 2007), 73.
4. C. Lemus, *The Village of Hoffman Estates: An Atypical Suburb* (Charleston, NC: History Press, 2009), 70–71.
5. Jack Hoffman was Jewish, and sadly, this as much as anything else was indicated to have figured prominently in the reaction of Schaumburg farmers. Interview, former mayor, Hoffman Estates, 11 August 2011.
6. C. O. Shepherd, "Hoffman Estates: A Village Battles over Growth Problems," *Chicago's American*, May 18, 1965, 28.
7. C. Spirou, "Both Center and Periphery: Chicago's Metropolitan Expansion and the New Downtowns," in *The City Revisited: Urban Theory from Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York*, ed. D. R. Judd and D. Simpson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 273–301, 297.
8. Interview, Mayor of Schaumburg, 7 April 2011.
9. Village of Schaumburg, *Community Profile* (Schaumburg, IL, 1980), 1.
10. See J. F. MacDonald and P. J. Prather, "Suburban Employment Centers: The Case of Chicago," *Urban Studies* 31 (1994): 201–217.
11. Village of Schaumburg, *Schaumburg Comprehensive Plan* (Schaumburg, IL, 1996), 117. Schaumburg has been aggressive in marketing itself as an edge city and a prominent and repeat host of annual meetings of edge cities in the United States.
12. Interviews, economic development coordinator, Village of Schaumburg, July 18, 2011 and principal, Medusa Consulting, April 8, 2011.
13. Interview, senior vice president, Office Brokerage, CBRE, April 26, 2011.
14. Interview, economic development coordinator, Village of Schaumburg, July 18, 2011.
15. It would be another ten years or so before some of the first interest was shown in developing land in the regional commercial center, during which time legend has it that Atcher personally persuaded the remaining farmers to wait and sell their land at the right time in order to receive the best value from developers, often arranging a partial exchange for land elsewhere for those who wished to continue farming. Interviews, mayor, Village of Schaumburg, July 13, 2011, and attorney, Holland and Knight LLP, July 15, 2011.
16. A copy of this version can be consulted in the mayor's office in the Village of Schaumburg.

17. Quoted in M. Reifschneider, "Planet Project Is Approved," *Daily Herald*, September 15, 1968.

18. One could be forgiven for mistaking this plan for a major parcel of land in Schaumburg as a copy of that for downtown Seattle as it contained a monorail and a sky needle, along with a sixty-five-story motor lodge, what would at the time have been the world's tallest office building, and a series of residential blocks. Then again, Romano had recruited the architects responsible for those same developments in Seattle.

19. Quoted in M. Reifschneider, "Tall Talk in Schaumburg," *Daily Herald*, July 12, 1968.

20. Interview, attorney, Holland and Knight LLP, July 15, 2011.

21. See N. A. Phelps, A. M. Wood, and D. C. Valler, "A Postsuburban World? An Outline of a Research Agenda," *Environment and Planning A* 42 (2010): 366–383; N. A. Phelps and A. M. Wood, "The New Post-suburban Politics?," *Urban Studies* 48 (2011): 2591–2610; N. A. Phelps, "The Growth Machine Stops? Urban Politics and the Making and Re-making of an Edge City," *Urban Affairs Review* 84 (2012): 670–700.

22. David K. Hamilton, *Governing Metropolitan Areas: Growth and Change in a Networked Age*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014). The fragmented character of the Chicago metropolitan area is also partly a result of a state constitution that saw special-purpose governments proliferate, until the government's reform in 1970. L. Bennett, "Regionalism in a Historically Divided Metropolis," in Koval et al., *The New Chicago*, 277–285, 278.

23. *Ibid.*, 277.

24. B. Lindstrom, "The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus: Institution Building in a Politically Fragmented Metropolitan Region," *Urban Affairs Review* 46 (2010): 37–67, 50. Indeed, as Lindstrom goes on to document, these same areas of initial collaboration have also proved to be significant fissures along which fragile consensus has broken down.

25. Bennett, "Regionalism in a Historically Divided Metropolis," 278.

26. D. Judd, "Theorizing the City," in *The City Revisited: Urban Theory from Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York*, ed. D. R. Judd and D. Simpson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 3–20, 13. See also Bennett, "Regionalism in a Historically Divided Metropolis," 278.

27. R. Bruegmann, "Schaumburg, Oak Brook, Rosemont, and the Recentering of the Chicago Metropolitan Area," in *Chicago Architecture and Design, 1923–1993: Reconfiguration of an American Metropolis*, ed. J. Zukowsky (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago; Munich: Prestel, 1993), 177.

28. K. Fidel, "The Emergent Suburban Landscape," in Koval et al., *The New Chicago*, 77–81, 77.
29. Interview, former Parks Board and Zoning Board chair, Hoffman Estates, July 18, 2011.
30. Interview, president, Village of Barrington, Illinois, July 19, 2011.
31. B. Lindstrom, "Regional Cooperation and Sustainable Growth: No One Councils of Government in Northeast Illinois," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 20 (1998): 327–342. Though these COGs have not been linked institutionally to a multipurpose regional body Lindstrom (p. 328) speculated that "these subregional councils represent the revitalization of councils of government as viable institutional arrangements facilitating intergovernmental cooperation for systemwide problems (transportation infrastructure and solid waste management, for example), membership services (e.g., joint purchasing agreements), and legislative lobbying. . . . Their emergence as agents articulating subregional development strategies in the past decade offers one example of a new institutional arrangement that has the possibility to bypass partisan gridlock and find regional solutions in the Chicago metropolitan region."
32. Bennett, "Regionalism in a Historically Divided Metropolis," 284.
33. *Ibid.*, 279.
34. Interview, mayor of Hoffman Estates, July 19, 2011.
35. Interview, executive director, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, Chicago, July 12, 2011.
36. Lindstrom, "The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus," 40.
37. Judd, "Theorizing the City," 14; Lindstrom, "The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus"; interviews, executive director, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, July 12, 2011, and economic development coordinator, Village of Schaumburg, April 7, 2011.
38. L. Bennett, "Chicago's New Politics of Growth," in Koval et al., *The New Chicago*, 44–55, 53.
39. Hoffman Herald, "Hoffman Board Votes to Merge," *Hoffman Herald*, September 1, 1960, 1.
40. Quoted in Hernandez, "Atcher Wouldn't 'Admit' Hoffman Estates," *Schaumburg Pioneer*, November 4, 1993, 7–8. Robert Atcher's animosity in this case was doubtless partly fueled by his own pride in the building of the complete community of Schaumburg, but also by concerns over Hoffman Estates' reputation. Former mayor Virginia Hayter later admitted that "Hoffman Estates' reputation at the time was "everything is for sale." Lemus, *The Village of Hoffman Estates*, 100.
41. Lemus, *The Village of Hoffman Estates*, 117.

42. Interview, government relations officer, Metropolitan Planning Council, Chicago, July 20, 2011.
43. Metropolitan Planning Council, *Regional Tax Policy Task Force: Report to the CMAP Board* (Chicago, 2012), 10.
44. *Ibid.*, 9.
45. Interview, mayor, Hoffman Estates, July 19, 2011.
46. Interview, government relations officer, Metropolitan Planning Council, Chicago, July 20, 2011.
47. Interview, program director, Transportation and Community Development, Community Neighborhood Trust, Chicago, July 20, 2011.
48. Lindstrom, "Regional Cooperation and Sustainable Growth," 336.
49. Interview, secretary, Northwest Council of Governments, July 20, 2011.
50. D. K. Hamilton, "Regimes and Regional Governance: The Case of Chicago," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (2002): 203–223; J. Schwieterman, "Coalition Politics and America's Premier Transportation Hub," in Koval et al., *The New Chicago*, 288–294.
51. Interview, government relations officer, Metropolitan Planning Council, Chicago, July 20, 2011.
52. Interview, former Parks Board and Zoning Board chair, Hoffman Estates, July 18, 2011.
53. Interview, vice president, Chicago Metropolis 2020, April 11, 2011.
54. Interview, executive officer, Northwest Council of Governments, July 20, 2011.
55. Interview, mayor, Hoffman Estates, July 19, 2011.
56. J. Cidell, "Fear of a Foreign Railroad: Transnationalism, Trainspace, and (Im) mobility in the Chicago Suburbs," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (2012): 593–608.
57. Metropolitan Planning Council, *Rolling Meadows: Preserving Local Housing Options in the Path of Redevelopment* (Chicago, n.d.), <http://www.metroplanning.org> (accessed April 23, 2014).
58. *Ibid.*, 8.
59. See the web page <http://vhiis2.ci.schaumburg.il.us/publicdocs/Cracker%20Barrel%20Archive/Winter%202012%20Cracker%20Barrel%20Flip/index.html#/0> (accessed April 14, 2015). The same report mentions a new plan for a tax increment financing (TIF) district being drawn up. See also <http://www.ci.schaumburg.il>

.us/Permit/PLicense/Documents/TIF%20Eligibility%20Study.pdf (accessed May 25, 2014).

60. Interviews, government relations officer, Metropolitan Planning Council, Chicago, July 20, 2011 and director, Community Development, Village of Schaumburg, July 18, 2011.

61. Teska Associates, *North Schaumburg Concept Plan: Village of Schaumburg, Illinois* (Draft of October 30) (Schaumburg: Village of Schaumburg, 2013), 1.

62. Ibid.

63. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009). The authors describe how “isolated, privately owned shopping malls and aging office parks surrounded by asphalt are being torn down and replaced with multiblock, mixed-use town centers, many with public squares and greens” (vi) and note that “the most dramatic and prevalent retrofits tend to be on dead mall sites” (4).

64. Interview, former mayor, Hoffman Estates, August 11, 2011.

65. Holderfield, *Schaumburg's Woodfield Mall*, 81.

66. Interview, manager, Woodfield Mall, July 15, 2011.

67. Interview, senior manager, Long Range Planning, Pace Bus, Arlington Heights, July 13, 2011.

68. L. Mazingo, *Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).

69. See the web page <http://www.ci.schaumburg.il.us/Permit/PLicense/Documents/TIF%20Eligibility%20Study.pdf> (accessed May 25, 2014).

70. Chicago Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, *GOTO 2040: Comprehensive Regional Plan* (Chicago: CMAP, 2010), 66.

71. Interview, executive director, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, Chicago, July 12, 2011.

72. Interview, program director Transportation and Community Development, Center for Neighborhood Technology, Chicago, July 20, 2011.

73. Interview, mayor, Arlington Heights, April 11, 2011.

74. Holderfield, *Schaumburg's Woodfield Mall*, 86.

75. Ibid.

76. Interview, mayor, Hoffman Estates, July 19, 2011.

77. Interview, attorney, Holland and Knight LLP, July 15, 2011.

78. Interview, manager, Woodfield Mall, July 15, 2011.
79. Lindstrom, "Regional Cooperation and Sustainable Growth," 331.
80. Interview, president, Village of Barrington, July 19, 2011.
81. See the website <http://www.nwpa.us> (accessed May 31, 2014).
82. Interview, program director, Transportation and Community Development, Center for Neighborhood Technology, July 20, 2011.
83. Interview, senior manager, Long Range Planning, Pace Bus, Arlington Heights, July 13, 2011.
84. Interview, senior manager, Long Range Planning, Pace Bus, Arlington Heights, July 13, 2011.
85. B. Scheer and M. Petkov, "Edge City Morphology: A Comparison of Commercial Centers," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64 (1998): 298–310.
86. K. Manson, "Airport Expansion Foes Refocus Efforts," *Chicago Tribune*, April 7, 2010.
87. Interview, executive officer, Northwest Municipal Conference, July 20, 2011.
88. Lang, *Edgeless Cities*.
89. Scheer and Petkov, "Edge City Morphology," 308.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

1. A. Forsyth, "Defining Suburbs," *Journal of Planning Literature* 27 (2012): 270–281, 270.
2. A. Althubaity and A. E. G. Jonas, "Suburban Entrepreneurialism: Redevelopment Regimes and Co-ordinating Metropolitan Development in Southern California," in *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime, and Representation*, ed. T. Hall and P. Hubbard (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1998), 149–172, 150.
3. R. Harris, "Meaningful Types in a World of Suburbs," in *Suburbanization in Global Society*, ed. M. Clapson and R. Hutchinson (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2010), 15–50.
4. E. Dunham-Jones and J. Williamson, *Retrofitting Suburbia: Urban Design Solutions for Redesigning Suburbs* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 18.
5. U. Beck, *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992); K. Dennis and J. Urry, *After the Car* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009).

6. E. Soja, *Postmetropolis* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2000); M. Dear and N. Dahmann, "Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism," *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (2008): 266–279.
7. See, for example, A. Amin, ed., *Post-Fordism: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).
8. F. J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962 [1920]), 2.
9. D. Hayden, *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820–2000* (New York: Vintage, 2004).
10. See N. A. Phelps, A. M. Wood, and D. C. Valler, "A Postsuburban World? An Outline of a Research Agenda," *Environment and Planning A* 42 (2010): 366–383.
11. T. S. Chapin, "From Growth Controls to Comprehensive Planning to Smart Growth: Planning's Emerging Fourth Wave," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 78 (2012): 5–15.
12. Beck, *Risk Society*.
13. Mark Clapson, *Suburban Century: Social Change and Urban Growth in England and the USA* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), 2.
14. Compare, for example, J. K. De Jong, *New SubUrbanisms* (London: Routledge, 2014), and E. Eidlin, "The Worst of All Worlds: Los Angeles, California, and the Emerging Reality of Dense Sprawl," *Transportation Research Record* 1092 (2005): 1–9.
15. N. Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979).
16. Not the least because, for example, any post-automobile era would be constituted from the likes not only of policy elements such as deprivatization and post-car transport policies but also of wider developments such as the emergence of new fuel systems, new materials, smart cars, digitization, new work/living patterns and disruptive innovation. Dennis and Urry, *After the Car*.
17. J. M. Sellers, "Re-Placing the Nation: An Agenda for Comparative Urban Politics," *Urban Affairs Review* 40 (2005): 419–445, 441.
18. R. Bruegmann, *Sprawl: A Brief History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
19. A. Duany, E. Plater-Zyberk, and J. Speck, *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* (New York: North Point Press, 2000), 13.
20. P. Filion, "Optimistic and Pessimistic Perspectives on the Evolution of the North American Suburbs," *Planning Theory and Practice* 14 (2013): 411–413.

21. H. B. Franklin, *The Future Perfect: American Science Fiction of the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), quoted in J. Gold, *The Experience of Modernism: Modern Architects and Urban Transformation, 1954–72* (London: Spon, 1997), 210.
22. P. L. Knox, *Metroburbia USA* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2009).
23. R. E. Lang, and J. B. LeFurgy, *Boomburbs: The Rise of America's Accidental Cities* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007).
24. N. A. Phelps, N. Parsons, D. Ballas, and A. Dowling, *Post-Suburban Europe: Planning and Politics at the Margins of Europe's Capital Cities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); N. A. Phelps, A. Tarazona Vento, and S. Roitman, "The Suburban Question: Grassroots Politics and Place Making in Spanish Suburbs," *Environment and Planning C* (2015).
25. S. P. Erie and S. A. MacKenzie, "From the Chicago School to the L.A. School: Whither the Local State?," in *The City Revisited: Urban Theory from Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York*, ed. D. R. Judd and D. Simpson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 104–134.
26. On grassroots politics in the potential remaking of Los Angeles as a livable and just city, see R. Gottlieb, M. Vallianatos, R. M. Freerer, and P. Dreier, *The Next Los Angeles: The Struggle for a Livable City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
27. See S. Hirt, "Home, Sweet Home: American Residential Zoning in Comparative Perspective," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 33 (2013): 292–309; and R. A. Beauregard, *When America Became Suburban* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).
28. G. A. Gonzalez, *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2009), 112.
29. See P. G. Newman and J. R. Kenworthy, "'Peak Car Use': Understanding the Demise of Automobile Dependence," *World Transport Policy and Practice* 17 (2011): 31–42; and P. G. Newman and J. R. Kenworthy, "Gasoline Consumption and Cities," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 55 (1989): 24–37.
30. J. L. Grant, "Suburbs in Transition," *Planning Theory and Practice* 14 (2013): 391–392, 391.
31. A. Forsyth, "Suburbs in Global Context: The Challenges of Continued Growth and Retrofitting," *Planning Theory and Practice* 14 (2013): 403–406, 405.
32. F. Wu and N. A. Phelps, "(Post) Suburban Development and State Entrepreneurialism in Beijing's Outer Suburbs," *Environment and Planning A* 43 (2011): 410–430.

33. A. Roy, "The 21st-Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory," *Regional Studies* 43 (2009): 819–830, 826.
34. J. Glassman, "Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession, Accumulation by 'Extra-economic' Means," *Progress in Human Geography* 30 (2006): 608–625.
35. D. T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).
36. J. Robinson, *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development* (London: Routledge, 2006). See also N. A. Phelps, T. Bunnell, M. Miller, and J. Taylor, "Urban Inter-referencing within and beyond a Decentralised Indonesia," *Cities* 39 (2014): 37–49.

