

Inside mobile urbanism: cities and policy mobilities

Cristina Temenos

University of Manchester

Tom Baker

University of Auckland

Ian R. Cook

Northumbria University

To be published in 2019 in Schwanen, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Urban Geography*. Cheltenham:

Edward Elgar.

INTRODUCTION

In the southern suburbs of Marseille, by the Boulevard Michelet, is a 17 storey concrete housing block. Opening in 1952, the block – like its architect, Charles-Edouard Jeanneret – has had a significant influence on the form of post-war planning and architecture.

Jeanneret, better known as Le Corbusier, produced many spectacular plans throughout his lifetime, and visited many cities in the process, but it was not until he was sixty years old that he won his first major commission – to build the Unité d’Habitation in Marseille (Hall, 2014). Here he was able to showcase part of his utopian vision of the city.

Le Corbusier regularly framed the city as “a body in the last stages of a fatal disease – its circulation clogged, its tissues dying of their own noxious wastes” (Fishman, 1977: 12). Simultaneously inspired and disgusted by his adopted city of Paris – as well as being inspired by numerous other architects and political ideologies – Le Corbusier argued that the only way to save the city was to destroy it and start again. The rebuilt city would be centrally planned, heavily centralised and densely populated. The apartment would be the mass-produced standard unit of accommodation, with the city hosting much green space and wide-open roads. The city would be modern, geometric, functional and efficient. In his 1933 plans for la Ville Radieuse (the Radiant City) – on which the Marseille development was based – Le Corbusier’s city would be built around neighbourhoods known as unités for 2,700 residents, hosting a number of collective services such as cooking, cleaning and child care. There would be little social segregation, with the size of accommodation meeting the needs and size of the family rather than their ability to pay (Fishman, 1977).

With much of the radical politics stripped away, and far from being a fully formed neighbourhood, the freestanding Unité d'Habitation embodied a number of design features of the Radiant City model. When opened, it included 337 maisonnettes, space for a shopping centre on the eighth floor, and a rooftop featuring a paddling pool, playground and a restaurant. Images of the development proliferated across the professional and popular media, and it attracted intrigued visitors from France and beyond (Cook *et al.*, 2015). Le Corbusier also designed similar unités in France (Nantes, Briey and Firminy), in Berlin, and was commissioned to design the Indian city of Chandigarh. Although he had few commissions before he died in 1965, his model underpinned many of the high-rise social housing developments in post-war Western Europe and beyond (Hall, 2014). Over the decades, Le Corbusier's ideas have been derided by many, and countless Corbusier-like buildings have been demolished. Yet the imprint of his (dis)utopian vision of the city can still be seen in many cities across the globe.

Le Corbusier's Unité d'Habitation symbolises a number of dualisms that define contemporary cities and, more particularly, the policy ideas that work to govern and seek to shape them. The first is that cities and urban policies are both local and global (the Unité d'Habitation being both a local building as well as being a 'demonstration project' for a global audience). Second, cities and urban policies are at the same time territorial and relational (the Unité d'Habitation being a physical space or territory but also one that has social relations with people and places in different parts of the world). Third, both cities and urban policies embody fixity and mobility (with Le Corbusier fixing his 'mobile' ideas in Marseille and other European cities). Le Corbusier's Unité d'Habitation is a concrete model that has gained traction in cities throughout the world. It is the mobility of such a concept

and the ways in which it contributes to contemporary urbanism with which this chapter is concerned.

In recent years, scholars have been particularly interested in capturing the heterogeneous and qualitative experiences and effects of being 'on the move' (Cresswell, 2006; Urry, 2007; Adey *et al.*, 2014). The 'mobility turn' as it has been dubbed, is concerned with the physical movements, socio-cultural meanings, and political practices of mobilization. For urban scholars more specifically, mobility has been a longstanding interest – think, for instance, of the early work by the Chicago School which explored relationships between immigration and the spatial forms of the city (e.g. Park and Burgess, 1967). In recent years urban mobilities have captured the interest of a wide range of researchers; geographers in particular have focused their attention on urban *policy* mobilities. This emerging sub-field of urban scholarship examines the processes, practices and resources brought together to construct, mobilize and territorialize policy knowledge (McCann, 2011; Baker and Temenos, 2015). A central empirical concern for the policy mobilities literature has been to understand the ways in which policy models (such as the Radiant City) and policy actors (such as Le Corbusier) move between places, simultaneously shaping and being shaped by the contexts through which they travel, aiming to understand the ways in which urban policies—as a constellation of ideas, people, resources, techniques and technologies—and their mobilities actively produce 'the urban'.

This chapter explores 'mobile urbanism' through the lens of urban policy mobilities. We discuss how geographers and other social scientists have sought to understand the movement of policies between cities. In doing so, it returns to the dualisms outlined earlier to highlight key aspects of urban policy mobility. The chapter then examines how mobile

policies are dependent on a range of related mobilities involving knowledge, people, materials and politics. It concludes with a visit to Park Hill in Sheffield, England, a large Le Corbusian-inspired post-war social housing development, recently redeveloped and gentrified, in order to reaffirm the core ideas running through the urban policy mobilities literature.

MOBILE URBAN POLICY

Geographers are not alone in studying the movement of policies between places (Cook, 2015). Indeed, they were somewhat late to the party, entering these debates in the early 2000s (e.g. Peck and Theodore, 2001; Ward, 2006; McCann, 2008). There is, however, a long tradition in political science of exploring the diffusion of public policies (Walker, 1969), lesson-drawing (Rose, 1991) and policy transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000). Galvanised by the new mobilities turn and frustrated with the political science work's often positivist underpinnings and their restricted engagement with questions of politics and spatiality, a broad range of social scientists, including geographers, planners, anthropologists and others, have sought to rethink the movement and mutation of policies, ideas and expertise (McCann and Ward, 2013; Peck and Theodore, 2015).

Policy mobilities scholars have approached the movement of policies between places through the lens of social constructivism, mainly focusing on three inter-related issues. This

first is the social processes of constructing policy ideas, and the work that goes into their creation, promotion, circulation, and re-embedding. Policy ideas ‘that work’ do not naturally appear, nor are they automatically worthy of emulation by other policymakers and practitioners; they must be conscientiously made and sold. Therefore, analytical attention needs to be paid to the embodied social labour and the material and discursive practices that shape and facilitate the circulation of policy (McCann, 2011; Peck and Theodore, 2015). The second issue is that of movement and mutation. McCann (2011: 115) reasons that “[p]olicies, models, and ideas are not moved around like gifts at a birthday party or like jars on shelves, where the mobilization does not change the character and content of the mobilized objects”. Policies do not move intact from “sites of invention to sites of emulation” (Peck and Theodore, 2015: xxiv). Instead, policies mutate as they move.

The third issue is the co-construction of policy ideas and the landscapes through which they travel. Geographers maintain that it is not simply policy ideas that mutate but also the spatial contexts through which they move: “[p]olicies are not, after all, merely *transferred* over space; their form and their effects are *transformed* by these journeys, which also serve continuously to remake relational connections across an intensely variegated and dynamic socioinstitutional landscape” (Peck and Theodore, 2015: 29, emphasis in original). This contention—that policy and space are mutually constituted—has particular relevance for urban geographers, who see urban policies as both *arising* from particular spatial contexts and *remaking* those contexts.

Now that we have established the three central issues that underpin the social constructivist approach to policy mobilities, it is useful to reflect further on the three dualisms that we explored the Unité d’Habitation through in the introduction: local/global,

fixity/mobility, and territoriality/relationality. This time we will relate them explicitly to the mobilisation of policy through a social constructivist lens. Beginning with the local/global dualism, urban policies are persistently local in many respects, but never purely local. Policies are learned, formulated and implemented within an increasingly global context “characterized by the intensified and instantaneous connectivity of sites, channels, arenas, and nodes of policy development, evolution, and reproduction” (Peck and Theodore, 2015: 223). Thinking both globally and locally is imperative when analysing mobile policies. But rather than treat the global and local as somehow separate or supplemental to one another, researchers have positioned local and global as intermingled, seeking to problematize “the inherent tensions between local specificity and global interconnectedness, and the continuous process of embedding and disembedding, (mis)translation and mutation that this entails” (ibid. xxviii).

This leads us to the dualism of fixity and mobility. Urban policy mobilities scholars have regularly issued ontological warnings to avoid fetishizing the mobility of urban policy as unfettered and untethered. Instead, the mobility of urban policies involves aspects of immobility and fixity. As McCann and Ward (2015: 829) point out: “even within the most ‘mobile’ of policies there are elements of immobility, not least the institutional and physical infrastructures through which they travel and are conditioned ... Furthermore, since policies do not move fully formed from place to place, some parts move while others prove less mobile and remain fixed in place”. Those that remain fixed can refer to material forms such as Le Corbusier’s Unité d’Habitation or more conceptual elements such as legacies that specific policies have developed and are tied to specific places. Those which remain can also be aspects of policy that do not work elsewhere as they have been developed for a specific

locality. Recent work has explored the lack of mobility displayed by certain policies and the difficulties and resistances associated with emulating policies elsewhere (e.g. McLean and Borén, 2015; Wells, 2014).

Moving onto the third dualism – territoriality/relationality – urban policy mobility is both a territorial and relational phenomenon. Massey (2011) argues that the territorial qualities we tend to recognise in cities (e.g. institutions, streetscapes, ways of life) should be understood as the outcome of many relations that extend within and beyond any particular city. The city, for Massey, is understood as “a constellation of processes rather than a thing” (Massey, 2005: 141). Allen and Cochrane (2007) extend this notion, claiming that while urban governance and urban policy are always territorial, they are never exclusively so. Urban policy-making is also composed of various 'elsewheres'. Taking on board such insights means approaching the mobility of urban policy as both relational (displaying connections to various sites of exchange and implementation) and territorially ‘placed’ (acquiring meaning and legitimacy in territorially-embedded contexts).

The next section takes the fixity/mobility dualism further by considering what exactly is mobile about urban policy mobilities. It outlines four elements of mobility that accompany and make possible the mobility of urban policies: knowledge, people, materials and politics.

MOBILE KNOWLEDGE, PEOPLE, MATERIALS AND POLITICS

If we consider urban policy only in its narrowest sense, as a set of prescriptions relating to the governance of cities, then studying the mobility of urban policy might well become a fairly straightforward task of figuring out where and when certain prescriptions were adopted. This understanding would spectacularly underestimate and misinterpret what urban policy mobilities entail and, more particularly, it would miss most of what is ‘mobile’ about urban policy. In fact, the appearance of a policy idea in multiple jurisdictions is merely where investigation begins. It is the initial clue, or the visible tip of an otherwise large iceberg. What lies below is a series of related mobilities involving knowledge, people, materials and politics, each of which we now discuss (see table one).

Table 1: Elements of mobile policy: Some examples

Knowledge	People	Materials	Politics
Expert knowledge, local Knowledge	Bureaucrats, politicians, activists, lobbyists, service managers; Global Intelligence Corps, architects, designers, consultants	PowerPoints, reports, spreadsheets, speech transcripts, maps, visualizations	Political economic conditions, policy advocacy, activism

First, the mobility of urban policy would be impossible without the mobility of knowledge. Although policy decisions get made based on the accounts of various actors with various sources of knowledge, *expert knowledge* is particularly powerful. It refers to “specialist knowledge that cannot be adjudicated on its own terms by actors from outside

the community [of recognised experts]" (Prince, 2010: 876). Expert knowledge is often seen as globally mobile knowledge because there is often the "perception that local expertise is lacking and/or that a global approach is needed" (Rapoport, 2015a: 112). Such globally mobile expert knowledge is however always mediated through relationships with local practitioners and local experts (Robinson, 2015). The power of expert knowledge varies depending on the political, geographical and historical contexts in which certain experts and forms of expertise are positioned. For instance, calculative forms of expertise, which involve claims based on quantification and measurement, are increasingly important to government decision-making, especially in contexts where evidence-based policy is idealised. But this was not always the case, and it may not be the case in the future. The status and effectiveness of expert knowledge differs depending on the time and place in which it is located.

Another powerful form of mobile knowledge relates to modelling. Policy models are often informed by expert knowledge but are distinguishable insofar as they contain a specific combination of features or a programmatic philosophy. Policy models are made with an explicit attention to their mobility (McCann, 2011). They are 'flat-packaged' (Allen and Cochrane, 2007) in order to be implemented with supposedly similar outcomes despite territorial differences (see also Peck and Theodore, 2015; Temenos and McCann, 2013). On one hand, models are mobile because they are framed as models *for* other places. On the other hand, policy models are made mobile through the codification and packaging of ostensibly reproducible features. Globally engaged policy makers, think tanks, design firms and other actors aim to provide proven solutions, models that 'work', across a variety of

places. However, it is important to consider that in order for models to be mobilized, they must also have a receptive local audience (Robinson, 2015).

The ways in which models are adopted, implemented, and shape the formation of urban spaces often have as much to do with local knowledge as it does with mobile expert knowledge. As Robinson (2015: 832) reminds us: "[p]olicy ideas might have wider circulations and histories, but the relevant histories and processes by which they come to policymakers' attention might be entirely localized". She goes on to caution that attention to expert mobile knowledge without attention to local knowledges produce "the possibility of incapacitating local policy expertise through the prolific circulation of good-practice examples and policy ideas by relatively powerful agents" (ibid: 833). Attention to such arguments highlights the necessity of unpacking the value attributed to globalized, expert knowledge and the erasure of local expertise and innovation, particularly in less-than-global, or 'ordinary' cities.

The second element of the mobility of urban policy is strongly related to the practices of mobile people. Urban policy-making requires a diverse cast of actors. And despite information and communications technologies having brought people and places closer together, there remains a need for face-to-face encounter and shared experience through events such as conferences and study tours. Examining the role of conferences in the spread of Business Improvement District models, Cook and Ward (2012: 141) note that these events offer "opportunities for policy makers and practitioners to compare, evaluate, judge, learn, and to situate their city in relation to others". All types of policy actors — including bureaucrats, activists and social service managers — are 'mobile actors' at times.

Temenos (2016), meanwhile, examines how conferences offer opportunities to educate attendees about apparently innovative local approaches, and can be used strategically to advance local political agendas drawing public attention to problems and grievances. By temporarily convening a group of mobile people in one place, conferences are 'ephemeral fixtures' in the landscape of urban policy making (ibid). Another type of event involving mobile people is policy tourism. This involves policy actors visiting different places on 'study tours' for the purposes of experiencing and learning about past, present or forthcoming policies and practices. Like conferences, study tours result from the continuing demand for face-to-face interaction as well as a desire to see and experience places in transition and policies 'in action' (Cook *et al.*, 2015; González, 2011; Wood, 2014). Likewise, conferences and study tours are selective in the ways places and policies are presented to, and discussed with, audience members or delegates.

While the mobility of urban policy and the mobility of people are closely related, policy actors are not equally mobile. Stratification exists between locally-tethered actors, who lack the economic and reputational resources to visit and learn from places elsewhere, or promote their ideas to distant audiences, and a cast of mobile or even hyper-mobile actors. Tracing the influence of a number of architects, planners and engineers constituting the 'global intelligence corps', Rapoport (2015a) shows the mobilities of certain people make a significant difference to the mobile capacity of certain policy ideas. By virtue of their global presence, such actors are able to authoritatively frame urban problems and harness a diverse but carefully curated range of 'local' lessons as solutions. This puts them in the enviable and privileged position of being able to steer urban agendas, even if local authorities and actors have the last say on which policy ideas are implemented.

Third, the mobility of urban policy is sustained by the mobility of materials. Although urban policy ideas are often mobilised through embodied interactions between mobile people, these interactions are informed, even prefigured, by various kinds of materials which circulate through virtual and physical spaces. As McCann (2008: 890) points out, materials such as reports, spreadsheets, speech transcripts and maps have their own complex itineraries: they get “passed around at conferences and meetings, move[d] from place to place on laptop hard drives or other electronic storage devices, ... transferred electronically ... and are repeatedly the topic of discussion among a broad range of urban policy actors—from politicians, to policy professionals, to political activists and journalists”. Materials, in a sense, are productive: they spur conversations, inform ways of thinking and, in turn, shape the intentionality of policy actors.

Images also function as mobile materials, particularly in the realm of urban policy and development where seductive images of urban modernity circulate widely. Rapoport (2015b: 312) demonstrates how visual images act as powerful educational resources because of their ability to redirect peoples’ thinking “from the realm of the abstract to that of the lived and experienced”, but stresses that imagery is far from being a neutral window onto the world. Remarking on stylised depictions of urban redevelopment, which her respondents referred to as ‘cappuccino pictures’, Rapoport (ibid: 321) notes that in such images, “the sun is always shining and children are always playing. The more negative features of urban life, such as traffic congestion and pollution, are entirely absent.”

Finally, the mobility of urban policy is inseparable from mobile forms of politics. When we take ‘politics’ to reflect ideological contests over the appropriate forms and functions of the state, and ‘policy’ as the means by which those forms and functions are

realised, it follows that policy and politics are closely intertwined. If policies are vehicles for the achievement of political-ideological projects, then *mobile* policies signify the existence of *mobile* political-ideological projects. One of the primary reasons that geographers are interested in the mobility of policy is because it allows them to better understand the way political-ideological projects such as roll-back welfare reform spread, become hegemonic and in doing so structure the scope of the possible.

Of course, the type of political-ideological projects that assume hegemonic status will vary historically and geographically, and will involve negotiation and contestation. For example, in Anglo-American cities, where neoliberal ideology and its subsequent policy projects has experienced a 30-year ascendancy and has become dominant to varying degrees, policy ideas that go with the grain of established neoliberal preferences (i.e. market allocation, minimal government spending, self-reliance) have a significantly greater chance of uptake than those that do not. In previous historical periods, however, hegemonic political projects based on progressive and socialist ideologies supported the mobility of different kinds of urban policies in many cities of the global North (Clarke, 2012; Cook *et al.*, 2014).

Reflecting on the political-ideological conditions structuring policy mobility in cities of the global South, Phelps *et al.* (2014) explain how progressive-developmental political projects often set the terms on which policy decisions are made. This account joins urban policy mobility research with broader debates about the applicability of theoretical templates tending to originate from cities of the global North. Kate Swanson's (2014) study of the mobilization of zero-tolerance policing in Latin America and Tarini Bedi's (2016) examination of cultural and political change accompanying the importation of the Singapore

model of taxi transport in Mumbai have urged scholars to appreciate that the mobility of urban policies reflects many different political-ideological projects that are in-the-making. This pluralism constitutes the basis for debates arising within policy mobilities, and shapes the current and future research agenda.

CRITIQUES AND FUTURES

While there has been a noticeable degree of consensus within policy mobilities research, it is important to highlight some of the critiques within the literature. Critique has generally come from those working within, or close to, the policy mobilities approach – although see Marsh and Evans' (2012) critique from a political science perspective and McCann and Ward's (2013) response. Early critiques centred on the tendency for scholars to (a) focus on neoliberal policies and privilege empirical and theoretical orientations towards cities in the global North (Bunnell, 2013); (b) display a presentist outlook (Jacobs, 2012); and (c) take unreflexive methodological stances on a new theoretical approach (Harris and Moore, 2013).

As the literature has matured, it has begun to respond to each of these criticisms (cf. Kuus, 2015; Temenos and Baker, 2015). On the centrality of neoliberalism and the global North, Cohen (2015) and Söderström and Geertman (2013), for example, have respectively written about the importance of understanding ad hoc networks and less-than-neoliberal planning practices for evaluating geographies of global urban development. Both studies argue that it is specifically a focus in Southeast Asian cities that have led to such conceptual

insights. A general predisposition towards the neoliberal present in the global North may still dominate current research but it is now one (valuable) orientation among many in the literature. With regard to the critique of presentism, Barber (2013), Cook *et al.* (2015), and Quark (2013) among others, have enthusiastically engaged in rich historical studies of pathways, conditions, and mutations of policies as they are mobilized. These interventions have quashed any notion that the mobility of policy knowledge is somehow specific to the present.

A number of methodological papers have emerged, notably a special issue of *Environment and Planning A* convened by Cochrane and Ward (2012 vol 44,1). There is no methodological monopoly when it comes to policy mobility research. Indeed, studying mobile policies has been approached from ethnographic (Roy, 2012), comparative (Robinson, 2015; Temenos, 2016), tracery (Cook *et al.*, 2015; McCann and Ward, 2011) and assemblage (Baker and McGuirk, 2016) approaches, among others. They cater to different empirical circumstances, different conceptualisations of policy (and of cities), different epistemologies, and different styles of 'research politics'.

One of the more prominent approaches has been to 'follow the policy' as it moves across global landscapes. Peck and Theodore (2015) provide what is perhaps the most comprehensive account of what this approach means for researchers, working across cities in the global North and global South, traveling to conferences, think tank headquarters, and sites of (in this case welfare service) operations. 'Following the policy' encompasses following various policy elements such as people, policies and places (McCann and Ward, 2011). Yet, following such things takes both time and substantial resources. Bok (2014) provides an insightful discussion on how to manage challenges to time, resources, and

access to research informants — challenges that all researchers face at one point or another — while being able to produce a richly detailed account of policy mobility. In so doing, Bok advocates for greater attention to discourse and document analysis. Likewise, Baker and McGuirk (2016) argue that documents act “as texts that reveal particular ways of thinking and acting... whose itineraries and effects can be apprehended by following their ‘traces’ in different contexts.” This type of understanding can be found in studies of contemporary policy mobilization, and studies that use archival material to investigate previous historical periods (Clarke, 2012, Cook *et al.*, 2015).

So where next for the studies of urban policy mobilities? This could be a very long list of avenues for future research but we restrict ourselves to four. The first is to expand the repertoire of policies and cities documented in the literature in order to avoid seeing all examples of urban policy mobility through the prism of Anglo-American experiences. This would put scholars in a better position to differentiate what is specific and what is general about processes of urban policy mobility. The second is to conceptualise policies and cities as being simultaneously local/global, fixed/mobile, territorial/relational as well as thinking about the movement of policies as being accompanied by a series of related mobilities involving knowledge, people, materials and politics. The third is to think more critically about notions and discourses of ‘success’ and ‘failure’ that shape policy development and circulation. Finally, it is important to engage with other conceptual questions in the field of urban studies. For example, Affolderbach and Schulz (2015) note that there have been many calls for a stronger conversation between policy mobilities and science and technology studies, yet few have come to fruition (see also Clarke, 2012). Throughout such a future

research agenda, we argue that it is essential to keep in the forefront the question of how policy mobility is imbricated into the socio-spatial configurations of cities and urban life.

CONCLUSION

We opened this chapter with a vignette of Le Corbusier's Unité d'Habitation in Marseille and we close it with a brief account of another post-war development, Park Hill in Sheffield.

Designed by Ivor Smith and Jack Lynn and commissioned and built by Sheffield City Council, Park Hill was built to rehouse families living in the city's slums. Opening nine years after the Unité d'Habitation and perched on a hillside next to Sheffield city centre, the development—reaching 13 storeys at its highest point—looks like a series of snake-like buildings joined together with 3.5 metres-wide elevated walkways. Initially comprised of 955 dwellings (both apartments and maisonettes) as well as shops, pubs and other facilities, Park Hill would attract considerable media attention and host numerous 'policy tourists'.

While Park Hill is a much larger development than the Unité d'Habitation, the two display a striking physical resemblance, particularly in their concentric structure and use of colourful balconies. Indeed, Smith and Lynn were open about their admiration for Le Corbusier's ideas and the Unité d'Habitation, which they visited (*'Streets in the Sky'*, 2009). Yet, they were also influenced by two other architects, Alison and Peter Smithson, who were also enthusiasts of Le Corbusier. In their uncommissioned plans for the Golden Lane development in London, the Smithsons drew on the Unité d'Habitation's interior street and

moved them to the outside the building – streets in the sky – an idea emulated by Smith and Lynn for Park Hill, and subsequently by many other architects (Hollow, 2010).

While the streets in the sky remain, today Park Hill is being redeveloped. Beginning in the late 2000s, the redevelopment is led by the private developers Urban Splash, known for ‘reimagining’ old inner city buildings in other UK cities. The redevelopment has stalled somewhat with only one building having been redeveloped thus far (see Figure 1). All buildings in Park Hill are due to retain their concentric structure and the walkways but now features chic interiors, vibrant external colours and extensive window space. The most significant change however has been the occupants: out go the remaining tenants who have been rehoused elsewhere, in comes a ‘mixed community’ according to the developers, entering the redeveloped, overwhelmingly private accommodation alongside reduced social housing and business space.



Figure 1: Park Hill in 2016 (with a renovated block on the left adjoined to an evocated block awaiting renovation on the right)

Photo Credit: Author IR Cook 2016

The example of Park Hill speaks directly to the issues of mobile urbanism and, in particular, policy mobilities. It is a development in which thousands of people have moved in and out of over the years, and a place that is fixed, territorial and local as well as mobile, relational and global. Park Hill's construction and recent reconstruction have involved drawing on policies – as well as people, knowledge, materials and politics – from places elsewhere. Yet its links to places elsewhere are multiple, messy and evolving. For instance,

the initial construction was much more than a simple policy transfer from Marseille to Sheffield. It is also a building that has changed over time and its relations with Sheffield and places elsewhere have morphed too. This speaks to Peck and Theodore's (2015) notion that policy models and their emulators are always hybrids and continually evolving. Both Park Hill and the Unité d'Habitation are entities that are better understood through the lens of urban policy mobilities. Like so many other aspects of urban life and urban policy though, they also require further academic investigation and such studies are needed to help refine our empirical and conceptual knowledge of mobile urbanism and policy mobilities.

REFERENCES

- Adey, P., Bissell, D., Hannam, K., Merriman, P. and Sheller, M. (2014) (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. London: Routledge.
- Affolderbach, J., and Schulz, C. (2015) Mobile transitions: Exploring synergies for urban sustainability research. *Urban Studies* 53 (9): 1942-1957.
- Allen, J., and Cochrane, A. (2007) Beyond the territorial fix: Regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies*, 41 (9): 1161-1175.
- Baker, T. and McGuirk, P. (2017) Assemblage thinking as methodology: Commitments and practices for critical policy research. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5 (4): 425-442.
- Baker, T. and Temenos, C. (2015) Urban policy mobilities research: Introduction to a debate. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 824-827.
- Bedi, T. (2016) Mimicry, friction and trans-urban imaginaries: Mumbai taxis/Singapore-style. *Environment and Planning A*, 48 (6): 1012-1029.
- Bok, R. (2015) Airports on the move? The policy mobilities of Singapore Changi Airport at home and abroad. *Urban Studies*, 52 (14): 2724-2740.
- Clarke, N. (2012) Urban policy mobility, anti-politics, and histories of the transnational municipal movement. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36 (1): 25-43.

- Cochrane, A. and Ward, K. (2012) Guest editorial: Researching the geographies of policy mobility: Confronting the methodological challenges. *Environment and Planning A*, 44 (1): 5-12.
- Cook, I.R. (2015) Policy mobilities and interdisciplinary engagement. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 835-837.
- Cook, I.R., and Ward, K. (2012) Conferences, informational infrastructures and mobile policies: the process of getting Sweden "BID ready". *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19 (2), 137-152.
- Cook, I.R., Ward, S.V. and Ward, K. (2014) A springtime journey to the Soviet Union: Postwar planning and policy mobilities through the Iron Curtain. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38 (3): 805-822.
- Cook, I.R., Ward, S.V. and Ward, K. (2015) Post-war planning and policy tourism: The international study tours of the Town and Country Planning Association 1947-61. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 16 (2): 184-205.
- Cohen, D. (2015) Grounding mobile policies: Ad hoc networks and the creative city in Bandung, Indonesia. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 36 (1): 23-37.
- Cresswell, T. (2006) *On the Move: Mobility in the modern western world*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Delmar, A. and Messias, J. (2009) Unité d'Habitation. Web Address: <http://www.acaixanegra.com/works/unite-dhabitation-marseille/>. Date Accessed: September 16, 2016.
- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (2000) Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13 (1): 5-23.
- Fishman, R. (1977) *Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- González, S. (2011) Bilbao and Barcelona 'in motion'. How urban regeneration 'models' travel and mutate in the global flow of policy tourism'. *Urban Studies*, 48 (7): 1397-1418.
- Harris, A.J. and S.M. Moore (2013) Planning histories and practices of circulating urban knowledge. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37 (5): 1499-509.
- Hall, P. (2014) *Cities of Tomorrow: An intellectual history of urban planning and design since 1880*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hollow, M. (2010) Governmentality on the Park Hill estate: The rationality of public housing. *Urban History*, 37 (1): 117-135.
- Jacobs, J. M. (2012) Urban geographies I: Still thinking cities relationally. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36 (3): 412-422.

- Kuus, M. (2015) For slow research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 838-840.
- Marsh, D. and Evans, M. (2012) 'Policy transfer: Coming of age and learning from the experience'. *Policy Studies*, 33 (6): 477-481.
- Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Massey, D. (2011) 'A counterhegemonic relationality of place'. In: In McCann, E. and Ward, K. (eds) *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and policymaking in the global age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 1-14.
- McCann, E. (2008) Expertise, truth, and urban policy mobilities: Global circuits of knowledge in the development of Vancouver, Canada's "four pillar" drug strategy. *Environment and Planning A*, 40 (4): 885-904.
- McCann, E. (2011) Urban policy mobilities and global circuits of knowledge: Toward a research agenda. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 101 (1): 107-130.
- McCann, E. and Ward, K. (2011) (eds.) *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and policymaking in the global age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCann, E. and Ward, K. (2013) A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: Geographies, assemblages, mobilities, and mutations. *Policy Studies*, 34 (1): 2-18.
- McCann, E. and Ward, K. (2015) Thinking through dualisms in urban policy mobilities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 828-830.
- McLean, B.L. and Borén, T. (2015) Barriers to implementing sustainability locally: A case study of policy immobilities. *Local Environment*, 20 (12): 1489-1506.
- Park, R. and Burgess, E. (1967) (eds.) *The City*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2001) Exporting workfare/importing welfare-to-work: Exploring the politics of Third Way policy transfer. *Political Geography*, 20 (4): 427-460.
- Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2015) *Fast Policy: Experimental statecraft at the thresholds of neoliberalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Phelps, N.A., Bunnell, T., Miller, M.A., and Taylor, J. (2014) Urban inter-referencing within and beyond a decentralized Indonesia. *Cities*, 39: 37-49.
- Prince, R. (2010) Fleshing out expertise: The making of creative industries experts in the United Kingdom. *Geoforum*, 41 (6): 875-884.
- Quark, A.A. (2013) Institutional mobility and mutation in the global capitalist system: A neo-Polanyian analysis of a transnational cotton standards war, 1870-1945. *Environment and Planning A*, 45 (7): 1588-1604.
- Rapoport, E. (2015a) Globalising sustainable urbanism: The role of international masterplanners. *Area*, 47 (2): 110-115.

- Rapoport, E. (2015b) Sustainable urbanism in the age of Photoshop: Images, experiences and the role of learning through inhabiting the international travels of a planning model'. *Global Networks*, 15 (3): 307-324.
- Robinson, J. (2015) 'Arriving at' urban policies: The topological spaces of urban policy mobility. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 831-834.
- Rose, R. (1991) What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy*, 11 (1): 3-30.
- Roy, A. (2012) Ethnographic circulations: space-time relations in the worlds of poverty management. *Environment and Planning A*, 44 (1): 31-41.
- Söderström, O. and Geertman, S. (2013) Loose threads: The translocal making of public space policy in Hanoi. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 34 (2): 244-260.
- 'Streets in the Sky' (2009) *Saving Britain's Past*. BBC Two, 31 October.
- Swanson, K. (2014) Zero tolerance in Latin America: Punitive paradox in urban policy mobilities. *Urban Geography*, 34 (7): 972-988.
- Temenos, C. (2016) Mobilizing drug policy activism: conferences, convergence spaces and ephemeral fixtures in social movement mobilization. *Space and Polity*, 20 (1): 124-141.
- Temenos, C. and Baker. (2015) Enriching urban policy mobilities research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39 (4): 841-843.
- Temenos, C. and McCann, E. (2013) Geographies of policy mobilities. *Geography Compass*, 7 (5): 344-357.
- Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Walker, J. (1969) The diffusion of innovations among American states. *American Political Science Review*, 63 (3): 880-899.
- Ward, K. (2006) "Policies in motion", urban management and state restructuring: The trans-local expansion of Business Improvement Districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30 (1): 54-75.
- Wells, K. (2014) Policyfailing: The case of public property disposal in Washington, DC. *ACME*, 13 (3): 473-494.
- Wood, A. (2014) Learning through policy tourism: Circulating Bus Rapid Transit from South America to South Africa. *Environment and Planning A*, 46 (11): 2654-2669.