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Dear Author,

Thank you for your interest in Cornell University Press. Because you remarked that it would be helpful to have information about what the Press looks for when assessing a book project, I have prepared the following overview. Here you will find some guidelines for proposing a book project and the preparation of a manuscript suitable for review. These are presented in general terms. Not everything that appears below will pertain to your project and on some matters important to your own work these guidelines will be silent. Of course, a lot that is important has been left out in the interest of brevity and due to the focus on the beginning of the process.

I encourage you to contact me on specifics and on matters important to you that have not been addressed. Two good comprehensive guides worth consulting are Getting It Published: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books by William Germano and An Author’s Guide to Scholarly Publishing by Robin Derricourt.

Despite these limitations, I think you will find this information to be helpful as you seek an appropriate press for your work, prepare a proposal, and develop your manuscript.

My work as an editor typically begins with your proposal. As an author, you understand quite well that the proposal is often something that follows on years of research and writing. These guidelines will look at things from my perspective—i.e., proposal first, then onto what is entailed in working with an editor, and finally to a discussion of the manuscript. This should encourage you to adapt your thinking to the habits of the Press and the demands of book publishing.

Your Proposal, Initial Cover Letter, and CV

Even if you have a polished and complete manuscript that you think is ready to go to press today, I would rather see a short (10 pp.) proposal that outlines the project, shows me why it is important, and tells me why it should be published by the Press.
At this point, before I have begun to gauge my interest in the project, manuscript pages are not helpful. You can be certain that if I want to see more (perhaps even the whole manuscript), I will let you know.

You should not rush to publish and you should not hurry to get your proposal to me. Sometimes career pressures dictate otherwise and I can occasionally accommodate your need to move ahead quickly. But if you can afford to be patient, it is in your interest to take the time necessary to develop a strong proposal and polished manuscript. When you have two strong chapters and a plan for the revision of the full manuscript, it makes sense to develop a proposal and approach an editor. (The combination of a promising proposal but weak manuscript chapters only means that the process of editorial consideration has to be put on hold until the manuscript is ready.) A proposal and two sample chapters is the minimum that can be sent out for scholarly review.

You should consider your proposal to be a public document. In some cases, a proposal is sent to scholarly reviewers and you should present your work with that potential audience in mind. Your proposal should feature the following elements:

**Working Title**
Propose an engaging and accurate title (and subtitle, if necessary) for your work.

**Rationale**
Take two paragraphs to state why your manuscript should be published. This statement should address the importance of the topic, the quality and character of your presentation, the state of current scholarship, and the interest of readers.

**Cornell University Press**
State why this is a book that should be published by Cornell University Press. In doing so, relevant comparisons to books already published by the Press are useful. If there is a book series at the Press for which you would like your project to be considered, make that clear.

**Description**
Provide an overview of the work emphasizing themes, concepts, and narrative development.

**Annotated Table of Contents**
Break out the book into its constitutive elements—e.g., chapters, introduction, conclusion—and offer a four sentence description of each element. In addition to sketching the contents of the chapters, take care to show how each moves the account forward. Make sure to include provisional chapter titles. If the work is to feature a substantial number of illustrations, charts, or tables, make a point of stating how they will be featured and contribute to the overall account.
Sources
Offer a short overview of key archives and data that will be used in the work. Do not include a full bibliography and do not review secondary literature.

Readership
State who will read the work. Be conservative when identifying readers and make sure that you are clear that the work will satisfy scholars in your discipline. A book that is said to be for everyone is likely to be read by no one; your enthusiasm about reaching a broad popular audience is as likely to scare me away as attract my interest. Be sure to address whether you think the work could be used in the classroom and, if so, in what specific classes it might be adopted.

Comparable and Competing Works
Provide an overview of books that are like your work and might be considered competitive with your work. (Include, if appropriate, books published by Cornell University Press.) Information about similar books helps me clarify the readership. In cases of competition, you should supply publication information for each competing work (e.g., publisher, price, length, and date of publication) and a short statement as to how your project is distinct from that work.

Specifications
Describe the manuscript in terms of its length and number of illustrations. The length of the manuscript should be measured in words (not pages) and use the measure of five characters and a space (six characters total) to represent a single word. Inform me as to how many of those words are in the main text and how many are in the notes. Illustrations should be identified as photographs, line drawings, or charts. Remember that, in most cases, the fewer illustrations the better.

Schedule
State when you expect to have a complete manuscript that will be ready for scholarly review. If relevant, you should briefly describe the work that needs to be done to reach that point and your schedule for completing that work. Inform me as to when representative chapters would be ready for early review.

Author Biography
Provide a short paragraph that summarizes your curriculum vitae. Place emphasis on your degrees, the scholarly institutions to which you are affiliated, and your publications.

Your proposal should be accompanied by a cover letter which should contain the following elements: your contact information; your current title and position; a working title for your project; an abbreviated rationale statement; an abbreviated description; a statement on why you consider the Press to be a suitable publisher of your work; and a statement on whether you are inquiring with other presses. As the cover letter is not to be read by anyone other than myself, this is the place to suggest three scholars who are qualified to assess your work. In making that selection, avoid clear conflicts of interest (e.g., dissertation committee members, colleagues in your current department). You should not, however, avoid
recommending people who are familiar with your work. In cases where you have had a working relationship with a potential reviewer, just state the character of your professional association in your cover letter. If there is a scholar who you think would not be good reviewer of your work, please also make that clear. Such assessments on your part will certainly be kept confidential.

Include an up-to-date curriculum vitae with your proposal and cover letter.

These three elements should constitute what you send when making your first inquiry with the Press. You are welcome to send your packet via the regular mail or as of attachments to an email. If you make your inquiry via the Internet, you should paste the text of your cover letter into the message but also make sure that it is included as an attachment.

Research
If you have a particularly hard time addressing the topics that form the key elements of a good proposal, this is an occasion to think further about your book project and your publishing options. Writing a good proposal is not easy, but if you find yourself stymied you might have to do more work before you are ready to approach a publisher. You might need to develop the concept of the work, investigate competing works in the field, or get a better grasp of publishing trends (i.e., which presses are doing what sorts of books). Much of what you need to know and present to an editor in the form of a proposal is not information that was important to your initial research and writing.

The more research you do as you prepare your proposal and develop your manuscript, the better your proposal will fare. A good proposal will go through a number of versions and will benefit from the review of colleagues who have published successfully. In doing all of this, remember that most book projects get only one serious review by an editor and you need to take care that your proposal is informed and thorough.

Working with Your Editor
If your inquiry meets with some measure of interest, we will have begun to work together on your project. Working together does not mean that our work will result in the acceptance and publication of your manuscript. But it does mean that both the author and the editor have some responsibilities toward one another. Here are some things to keep in mind, particularly early on, when working with an editor.

The Author’s Responsibilities
Your first responsibility is to be as clear as you can be about your expectations for the work and the role that its publication will play in your career. Be proud of your work and your accomplishments as a scholar, but also be realistic as to what you can expect from your publisher and from your audience.

Communicate clearly to me the time constraints and career pressures under which you are working. Part of my work involves the development of scholarly careers. If your tenure
clock is winding down or you believe that getting your manuscript out to review will help you in applying for positions, let me know. I may not always be able to accommodate your interests, but I can only be sure to try if I know what those interests are.

Be honest about the state of the work. Do not try to sell me on a project that will meet tight deadlines and make for a tidy 240-page book when you are in fact running well behind schedule and have a 500-page manuscript. No one is served by this and, ultimately, such falsehoods might prove embarrassing to you.

Inform me of what other presses are considering the manuscript and make sure the editors at the other presses are similarly informed. Some presses do not allow for multiple submissions and you must respect that policy. I do allow for multiple submissions on the part of authors, but I ask that they be limited to two other presses and that I know which presses are also reviewing the manuscript. If other presses are considering your work, please let me know if and when reviews are complete and contract negotiations begin.

Take an interest in the editorial process. Do not hesitate to ask questions about any part of the process (while keeping in mind that editors are not in the business of making predictions). I will answer as fully as I can at each step. If a stage in the review process is taking longer than you expected, drop me a note. Don’t pester. Timely reminders are appreciated, however.

The Editor’s Responsibilities
My responsibilities to you include: being clear about the level and nature of the interest the Press has in your work; providing timely feedback and moving the manuscript through the review process as quickly as possible; helping you negotiate the review process and present your work in a way that is most likely to meet with success; making sure that you are clear on what the Press can offer and ascertaining (as much as possible) how this suits your own expectations for the work and your career.

I would encourage you to look at Thinking Like Your Editor: How to Write Great Serious Nonfiction—and Get It Published, by Susan Rabiner and Alfred Fortunato. It is a very good book on the whole process, but the book is especially strong on the author-editor relationship.

Your Manuscript
If all goes well, we will start talking in some detail about the manuscript itself. In the course of our conversations and based on my reading of your proposal, I should have established a good idea of where the work stands and how much of it is in a state that is ready for review. If I have not seen much or any of the manuscript, my first interest will be to satisfy myself of the quality of the work. At this point, however, I am also thinking of the scholarly review process and measuring the work against the standards the readers are likely to bring to the work. Here are some things that you should be thinking about in advance of inquiring with a press and that you should certainly discuss with me.
The State of the Manuscript
If this is your first book project and particularly if your book project is based on a dissertation, you need to understand that you have a good amount of work to do before the manuscript will be ready for me or for scholarly reviewers. No matter the quality of your dissertation and no matter the praise your committee members offered, a dissertation is not a book and your work is no exception to this rule. I would recommend that you consult From Dissertation to Book by William Germano. This book is an excellent guide to developing a dissertation into a publishable book. It will outline what you need to do in order to revise the manuscript. You should make sure that you commence this work of revision before you approach a press.

When to Share the Manuscript
Above, when addressing the time to make your proposal, I remarked that when you have two polished chapters and a plan for the revision of the full manuscript, it then makes sense to develop a proposal and approach an editor. It is critical to have at least two chapters that are in fine shape and clearly reflect the book you want to write. Perfection is not called for, of course, but a light revision of a dissertation that simply excises discussions of method and literature is not sufficient.

In most cases, you only have one opportunity to interest a press in your work. A weak and undeveloped manuscript will undermine a strong proposal and diminish my interest in the project. A weak manuscript that goes out for review will meet with tough criticism and likely make it impossible to proceed with the consideration of the book project. This is so even if, later on, you present a wholly revised manuscript that meets those earlier criticisms. First impressions are important. When it comes to the review process, first impressions are also part of the record as every scholarly evaluation of your work is included in the dossier presented to editorial and faculty boards at the Press. If the initial reviews of your manuscript are scathing, the editors and faculty members who vet projects for the Press may see your project as irredeemable. Your dossier will be read sequentially and the first reviews will be the first ones seen.

Types of Reviews
The minimum that can be sent out for review is a proposal and two sample chapters. In most cases, the ideal scenario is to send the whole manuscript out for review. Each of these options entails different things for you as an author and for the sort of contract that the Press might offer for your work.

If you submit a proposal and two sample chapters, you are able to commence the review process earlier. In some cases this is good for you, particularly if there is pressure to meet tenure requirements. It can also be good if you are interested in inviting substantial criticism of your project in advance of crafting the whole manuscript. Projects can be transformed (for the better) in review, and early reviews can improve a plan for revision and spare an author unnecessary labor. The limitations of going to review sooner and with only a partial manuscript include the fact that sometimes the criticisms solicited are off-the-mark because the work considered was incomplete. Moreover, based on the review of such limited material, the Press will only offer a preliminary contract which will demand that the
complete manuscript go through a full round of reviews. An earlier review of sample chapters is, then, the beginning of a two-tiered review process.

If you submit a full manuscript for review, the principal limitation is that you will have taken more time in preparation for review. The benefits of submitting a full manuscript, rather than just sample chapters, are several: reviewers can see the full work and comment on the full work; presumably your manuscript will be more polished and will have benefited from informal consultations with colleagues; the Press can offer a regular contract for the book project and further rounds of review are not necessitated.

I encourage you to consult with me on how best to proceed and also to talk with colleagues regarding your plans for inquiring with presses. In making the decision on how to proceed, the specifics of your work and your career have to be considered closely, and the generalities offered above are only a place to start.

Once a project goes out for review, the editorial process is well underway. The outcome of the review will be uncertain, but you will have done what was necessary in order to get my attention, act as a responsible partner in the editorial process, and present high quality work for consideration. Those three things form the necessary foundation for a successful inquiry with a publisher.

Sincerely,

Michael J. McGandy
Acquisitions Editor
607-277-2338 x233
mjm475@cornell.edu
Selected Resources

Writing a Proposal
- *Write the Perfect Book Proposal: 10 That Sold and Why*, 2nd Edition by Jeff Herman and Deborah Levine Herman
- *How to Write a Book Proposal* by Michael Larsen
- *The Fast Track Course on How to Write a Nonfiction Book Proposal* by Stephen Blake Mettee

Getting It Published
- *An Author's Guide to Scholarly Publishing* by Robin Derricourt
- *Getting It Published, 2nd Ed: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books* by William Germano
- *Handbook for Academic Authors* by Beth Luey
- *Thinking Like Your Editor: How to Write Great Serious Nonfiction--and Get It Published* by Susan Rabiner and Alfred Fortunato

Revising a Dissertation
- *From Dissertation to Book* by William Germano
- *Revising Your Dissertation: Advice from Leading Editors* by Beth Luey

The Publishing Industry
- *2014 Writer's Market* by Robert Brewer
- *2014 Guide to Literary Agents* by Chuck Sambuchino
- *Making the Perfect Pitch: How To Catch a Literary Agent's Eye* by Katharine Sands
- http://www.writers-publish.com/

Legal Matters
- *The Writer's Legal Companion* by Brad Bunnin and Peter Beren
- *The Writer's Legal Guide: An Authors Guild Desk Reference* by Tad Crawford and Kay Murray
- http://www.authorsguild.org/
- United States Copyright Office http://www.copyright.gov/
- University of Minnesota Libraries http://www.lib.umn.edu/copyright/index.phtml
- Stanford University Libraries http://fairuse.stanford.edu/
- Creative Commons http://creativecommons.org/
Style Manuals

- *Chicago Manual of Style* http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html; also available in book form, Sixteenth Edition. (The *Chicago* style is used by most publishers)
- Purdue OWL (Online Writing Laboratory)—provides free access to MLA and APA style manuals
  * Modern Language Association
    http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/557/01/ (MLA style is used by most literary journals)
  * American Psychological Association
    http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/ (APA style is widely used in social science writing)
- Council of Biology Editors Manual
  http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/researchsources/documentation/cbe_citation/index.cfm
  http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/researchsources/documentation/cbe_name/.
  (This system is used not only in biology but in many other sciences and medical journals)
PUBLISHING WITH UTP SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

The Scholarly Publishing division publishes books for scholars, students, faculty, and the informed reader in the humanities, social sciences, and business. We welcome the addition of new authors with innovative research to our list.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Please include the following in your proposal:

1. A working title
2. An overview of the book
   - What is it about? What is its central argument?
   - Why have you written this book?
   - How does your book compare to others in this field?
   - How will it be different?
   - If the manuscript is based on a dissertation, please tell us when it was defended and the revisions you have made or propose to make.
3. Information about intended audience(s)
   - If the book is intended for course adoption, please list relevant course titles/departments. If you have information about where such courses are taught, or an idea of enrollment, please include here
   - Is your book for specialists in your field? In a particular area of a larger field?
   - Is there a broader general audience?
4. Manuscript information
   - Anticipated length including word count
   - Total number of illustrations, figures, and tables (if applicable)
   - Anticipated completion date
5. For edited collections or multi-authored works, please include a description of how the book will be thematically integrated and how the chapters will be linked
6. Table of Contents with a brief synopsis of each chapter
7. Curriculum vitae for each author
8. Sample chapter (if available)

Please do not submit a manuscript unless you have been requested to do so by your editor and please ensure you keep all originals.

Contact UTP Scholarly Publishing acquisition editors

Because of the volume of submissions we receive, it may take several weeks for one of our editors to respond to your submission. If you have not had a response in 6 to 8 weeks, please contact the editor for an update on your submission. Proposals submitted by mail should be sent to:

Editorial Department, Scholarly Publishing
University of Toronto Press
10 St Mary Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4Y 2W8
Canada

Attention: (relevant editor's name)

Please note: we do not publish new fiction, poetry, or conference proceedings.

If the editor is interested in considering your book, you will be asked to submit your manuscript for more formal review. Manuscripts will be assessed by experts in the field. If the reports are positive, the manuscript may be presented to our internal Publishing Committee. Manuscripts in humanities and social sciences approved by this committee are then submitted for the approval of our Manuscript Review Committee, an external committee consisting of senior scholars from the University of Toronto. Approved proposals and manuscripts in business are submitted to the Rotman/UTP Publishing Advisory Board, an external committee consisting of senior academics from the Rotman School of Management.
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After New Urbanism: from exception to norm

Abstract

This book takes a relational materialist approach to understanding the production of New Urbanism from an internationally comparative perspective. Rather than the presumed universalism of a global suburban movement, with one point of origin and a replicable template, we argue that the New Urbanism must now be re-framed and ‘de-universalised’ to draw critical attention to its heterogeneity, contingency and increasingly mainstream presence, evidenced through examples drawn from around the world. New Urbanism is now the norm rather than the exception, so is it no longer distinctive? In this book we theorise how New Urbanism is produced, varied, and stabilised as a locally distinct yet broadly recognisable model of development and planning. ‘After New Urbanism’ is premised on the observation that we now have multiple New Urbanisms, with a hybridity of forms and processes acknowledged as ‘New Urbanist’, suggesting a social, economic and political complexity hitherto under-explored in the existing critiques of the movement as merely a reflection back onto itself (i.e. broken promises, aspirational visions, dubious ideologies, diversions from the original vision etc.). Using assemblage thinking we reconsider the apparent mobility of New Urbanism through an unpacking of the context-specific practices of translation that illustrate the extent to which New Urbanism is becoming typified as part of mainstream development ‘best practice’ which in turn makes it potentially more mobile. The implications of this typification are drawn in relation to critical studies of post-suburban governance, particularly questions of democratic process, place-making and social equity.

I. Project Description

By the mid-1990s the planning and design movement known as the New Urbanism (NU) had gained a significant following in the USA and increasingly beyond. Originally championed in the 1980s by the enigmatic architect Andres Duany [and colleagues] and organised into the Congress for the New Urbanism in 1993, the movement proliferated on the basis of its aspirational goals: ‘to change American land use patterns, to stop suburban sprawl, to restore and reinvigorate our cities’ (Bressi, 2002: 7). The basis of its manifesto was consolidated into 27 principles constituting the Charter of the New Urbanism in 1996. The New Urbanists professed the need for a radical break from the conventions of modernist town planning (particularly zoning for the separation of land uses) which they blamed for the ‘bad growth’ associated with the sprawling metropolitan region and the social, economic and environmental decline of the traditional neighbourhood in American towns and cities. The inference was that New Urbanism, which privileged the pre-twentieth century neighbourhood as the natural unit of human agglomeration was a radical, even subversive, force which sought to challenge the hegemony of regulatory planning and urban governance which had effectively rendered the traditional neighbourhood illegal (Kunstler 1996; Kelbaugh 1997; Duany et al 2000).

Criticisms of the movement have persisted since its emergence, particularly from scholarly planning and urban geography. Neither the built form associated with the movement nor its ideological underpinnings in physical determinism have escaped critique (even ridicule). Early critique focused on the design pastiche of the nostalgic revival of traditionalist architecture (including rear laneways and front porches) and normative design principles to
promote ‘compact, mixed-use, walkable and reasonably self-contained communities’ (Grant, 2006: 3). Harvey (1997) famously questioned the communitarian rhetoric of the movement and its consumers, suggesting that those buying into such developments were cohering into enclaves based on an *image* of community that is fundamentally exclusionary in its constitution. Still others, like Beauregard (2002) cautioned that the doctrinaire principles of the movement had the potential to eclipse more inclusive and democratic alternative urbanisms.

Critical engagement with New Urbanism has tended to retain a focus on the originators of the movement and their intentions (see MacLeod, 2013). By 2015, however, New Urbanism has firmly established itself as a development trend in many parts of the world. The specificity of the (North) American fight against suburban sprawl, the promotion of transit-oriented development (Calthorpe and Fulton, 2001) and the revitalization of community through traditional neighbourhood scale design practices and planning tools is not the ‘universal’ that has travelled and proliferated. Today, the movement has significantly expanded beyond the insular, domestic concerns of Duany and his colleagues. The mainstream influence is not down to one or a few individuals as much as the early critiques of the movement suggested. In fact, the original version of what constitutes New Urbanism in the US seems to have been rationalised into a commercialised venture in ‘smart-code’ branding and benchmarking products. This is not the global phenomenon of New Urbanism.

New Urbanism is now more than ever a heterogeneous movement that produces variegated built forms and communities. It can no longer be essentialized as the Seaside, Kentlands, ‘Truman Show’ version oft-referred to when describing the projects associated with the movement. The influence of New Urbanism, its principles, but more exceptionally, its built forms can be found in disparate places, including Masdar City (UAE), Lavasa (India), Jakriborg (Sweden), Orchid Bay (Belize), Melrose Arch (South Africa), Beacon Cove (Australia). In other words, the influence of New Urbanism is now apparent on every continent. What was largely characterised as a greenfield suburban trend (or fad) in the US has increasingly found expression through inner city infill and major regeneration projects in cities world over. In the 30 years since the New Urbanism gained notoriety as a ‘force’ to be reckoned with in (sub)urban development and planning, the typology of building forms and practices associated with the movement must now be seen as a heterogeneous continuum, expressing both divergence and convergence in development cultures and built forms. New Urbanism of today needs to be reframed not as a universal but as a contingent hybrid of urban and suburban planning rationalities and development practices and outcomes.

This book intends to explore theoretically and empirically this deeper conceptualisation of New Urbanist *production* as heterogeneous, contingent and increasingly normalised practice in comparative understandings of development and planning. We argue that New Urbanism has gone from the exceptional to the mainstream; to the extent that it is perhaps no longer distinctive. The title of this volume, ‘After New Urbanism,’ invokes the significance of the typification of New Urbanism (consciously and unconsciously) into general development and planning practice. The focus on New Urbanism as a *thing*, associated with a particular ‘origin story’ (Healey 2012) that has diffused or travelled the globe (Thompson-Fawcett 2003; Hebert 2003) is re-opened for wider discussion and deeper probing of how and why
divergent practices and rationalities lead to an identifiable convergence into a continuum of built forms in different geographical contexts.

Specifically, the book will:

● Develop a relational-materialist perspective on the production of New Urbanism that contrasts with the prevailing view, which sees New Urbanism as faithfully (or unfaithfully) implementing the designs of Duany, Calthorpe, etc., and following the CNU principles (cf Macleod, 2013).
● Generate a practice-focused view of the New Urbanism as a heterogeneous movement that is both typified and contingent on place. Such a view represents a significant departure from existing book-length manuscripts on NU (see Grant, 2006; Passell, 2012).
● Unpack the processes of typification that have translated the principle-based movement into a powerful package of ‘best practices’ that have become mainstream in different parts of the world.
● Theorize the ways in which a geographic notion of ‘place’ matters for the mobility of ideas, policies and practices by focussing directly on the contingency and assemblage of place-based histories, inter-governmental relations, and extra-local influences to explain differentiated processes and forms in a continuum of products and contexts (e.g. suburban retrofits, urban infills, greenfield TNDs, centres of consumption).
● Explore and contend how and why divergent practices and rationalities lead to convergence of (variegated) urban forms in different contexts.
● Propose an ‘after’ New Urbanism perspective that resonates, responds and extends the critiques of the New Urbanism as a ‘new suburbanism’ (Lehrer and Milgrom, 1996; De Jong, 2014); takes up Phelps and Wood’s (2011) call for critical theory that is sensitive to post-suburban politics, and offers an updated perspective on how NU ideas and practices ‘travel’ and evolve in different places.

II. Research context and origin of work:

Both authors have independently pursued critical research on the New Urbanism, largely focussed on North American empirical study and critical theorisation of the production of New Urbanism-oriented projects and the movement as a whole.

Susan Moore has studied New Urbanism in Toronto Canada, identified elsewhere (Skaburskis, 2006; Gordon and Tamminga, 2002) as the largest concentration of New Urbanism-influenced projects in the world. Her work has focused on the conceptual need to de-universalise New Urbanism to draw out the context-specific development practices in order to understand NU’s capacity to proliferate and circulate. Her work has engaged with the contention that NU is both an urbanising force in the suburbs and a suburbanizing force in the city. Susan has also introduced a critical framework for questioning the typification of New Urbanism as a ‘best practice’. She argues that the governmental technology of best practice itself needs further interrogation in order to understand the apparent mobility and universalism of New Urbanism. As the primary mode of knowledge circulation, best practice is seldom questioned as a governmental practice. Susan has also looked into the reification of the traditional divide between public and private in New Urbanist development processes. This work focused on demonstrating the emergence of a hybridity consciousness
but a tendency for industry actors to discursively reproduce the traditional dichotomy despite practices to the contrary.

Dan Trudeau’s work has examined the ways in which New Urbanism operates in practice. Focusing on the movement’s implementation in the United States, he developed a continuum framework that critically addresses the common presumptions of New Urbanism as greenfield and suburban. He has critiqued the notion that New Urbanism reproduces suburbia and argues instead that nuanced views of “suburbia” and New Urbanism as it actually exists in practice are necessary to understand the movement and its effects on global urbanisation. Toward this end, he has devised a typology illustrating the heterogeneity of New Urbanism. The typology looks past the obvious descriptors of infill/greenfield and TND/TOD characteristics in order to examine the movement’s implementation, rather than its design. Dan’s ongoing research, on the one hand, examines the ways in which the different types of New Urbanism are produced through the interaction of local planning cultures, regional political economy, and the translocal circulation of planning ideas. On the other hand, his research explores the extent to which it is possible, and practical, to mitigate social inequalities through the variegated practices of New Urbanism.

Together our research and publication record on critical understandings of New Urbanism generates a rich foundation for this collaborative monograph. We both bring to the project a focus on the production (rather than consumption) of New Urbanism, which has had less attention in the academic literature. We both bring a focus on the actual practices of the producers of New Urbanism in context, without assuming the applicability of over simplified conceptualisations or models of the development process. We share an empirical evidence base that demonstrates the variability and heterogeneity of New Urbanist projects, processes and practices rather than the presumed universalism of an abstract global ‘movement’. Both of our research and writing on New Urbanism attempts to unpack the typology of built forms and the processes of typification that are propelling New Urbanism into the mainstream of development and planning practice. This is what has led us to proclaim the necessity to consider and develop an ‘After New Urbanism’ critique. The richness of our combined interests have generated a fruitful international, and interdisciplinary, dialogue about our own empirical cases and our shared motivation to question why, from a global perspective, New Urbanism matters beyond our specific case study investigations. The intention of our collaboration is not to write yet another critique of New Urbanism and its ideological claims, design doctrine or incomplete realisation of the original ‘vision’ in the built examples, but to apply and build critical urban/suburban theory that considers one of the most influential development trends in the last century.

**Relevant Publications:**


III. Table of contents

*Intended length: 75,000-80,000 words*

**Introduction: Assembling the ‘After’ (8,000 words)**

This introductory chapter outlines the theoretical perspective of the authors, which privileges an understanding of New Urbanism as a heterogeneous, contingent and normalising phenomena in urban and suburban development and planning, both ideologically and materially. The distinctiveness of this contribution is explained by demonstrating the value of assemblage thinking in what we believe to be a necessary reframing of the perceived *universalism* of New Urbanism as a global planning and design movement. The case for developing an ‘After’ New Urbanism critique is argued on the provocation that we must now acknowledge multiple New Urbanisms and the pervasiveness of New Urbanism-inspired (or hybrid) practices and products in mainstream residential development processes. The implications of this for critically engaging with the debates regarding post-suburban development, politics and governance are explored. The chapter will finish by outlining the structure of the book which is divided into two parts. Part 1, *De-Universalizing a ‘global’ movement*, presents our conceptual framework and uses examples from around the world to demonstrate its applicability. Part 2, *Typifying New Urbanism and its mobility*, uses our own empirical studies of New Urbanism in North
America to: illustrate the extent to which New Urbanism is becoming typified as part of mainstream development practice; challenge commonplace perceptions of its universality, and evidence actually occurring practices of translation that promote the apparent mobility of the movement.

Part 1: De-universalizing a global movement

Part one of the book aims to contribute a new approach for theorizing and studying the New Urbanism planning movement. This approach focuses on the movement’s production, variation, and stabilisation. The chapters in this part draw broadly on literatures considering postsuburban politics and policy mobilities, assemblage thinking, and relational materialism to theorize how New Urbanism is produced in ways that are locally distinct but broadly recognisable as belonging to a particular paradigm.

Chapter 1: From the universal to the contingent (10,000 words)

This chapter describes what a de-universalised perspective of New Urbanism entails. We construct a conceptual framework for understanding the production of New Urbanism as a set of practices that are highly contingent on localized processes that vary from place to place. We argue that narratives about New Urbanism’s normative design are translated into place-specific practices that are regulated by planning cultures, multi-actor growth coalitions and development discourses. The relevance of the framework is demonstrated through discussion of several case studies drawn from the existing literature which cover the production of New Urbanism across several national contexts. The framework thus draws attention to the actually existing ways in which New Urbanism’s ideas are translated through local planning practice and are shaped by place-based development coalitions, which often fuse a selection of New Urbanism principles with other planning ideas producing hybrid socio-spatial transformations.

The chapter ultimately offers a critical departure from established ways of thinking about the global spread of New Urbanism in two distinct ways. First, attention is placed upon the material and discursive practices that give shape to New Urbanist ideas in specific places. Here, we bring insights from assemblage thinking and literature on post-suburban governance to describe the contingent processes that produce New Urbanism. Second, by examining the political economy of New Urbanism’s production, we show how New Urbanism and localized land development practices are interwoven. This chapter provides an alternative to the elite-focused, hierarchical diffusion model of New Urbanism that proliferates in the literature. And it sets the stage for viewing New Urbanism as a hybrid product that takes multiple forms, which we explore in subsequent chapters in Part 1.

Chapter 2: New Urbanism’s double movement (10,000 words)

This chapter argues that the implementation of NU produces heterogeneous forms that are still recognisable as part of the same movement. We describe a double movement at work in the production of NU in order to capture its divergence and convergence. On the one hand, we show how NU produces divergent forms, so much so that it is now appropriate to
speak of multiple New Urbanisms or even question the utility of the label. On the other hand, we demonstrate that the implementation of this principle-based movement still generates multiple types that converge to form an identifiable pattern that appears across different geographical contexts.

We draw on examples from several regions to explain why these variations take place and how it is that the same type of variation appears in different locations. We highlight how the interaction between municipal growth imperatives, local planning practice, development priorities and aspirations, and knowledge circulation produce variations in the movement that are, at the same time, repeated elsewhere. Examples of New Urbanist development in Australia, Canada, China, India, South America, the UK, and the US highlight this process. These case studies help us show that New Urbanism’s double movement entails a localized process of development improvisation and translation that operates alongside translocal processes of policy transfer and pursuit of best practice, which channel development into specific formations and patterns of conformity.

Chapter 3: Worlding New Urbanism’s suburban assemblage (10,000 words)

This chapter describes how a global network of institutions labour to present unity amidst divergent forms of New Urbanism. In arguing for an ‘After New Urbanism’ perspective, we use this chapter to make sense of how a variety of entities throughout the world work to cohere a multitude of development interventions into a recognizable constellation of practices that exemplify the New Urbanism. Accordingly, this chapter briefly traces the origins of the New Urbanism and its institutionalization through the work of organizations such as CNU, The Prince’s Foundation for Building Community, The Australian Congress for the New Urbanism, and The Council for European Urbanism. We examine discourses framing New Urbanism as a principle-based movement that circulate through conference proceedings, foundational documents of organizations at the vanguard of the movement, and messaging that attempts to frame and reframe the movement’s relevance to emerging trends and challenges. Our examination provides a description of NU as a movement that has specific spatial-temporal origins and has evolved through its application in geographically and contextually diverse circumstances. We focus on the strategies and tactics through which movement-directing organizations labour to stabilize New Urbanism while also extending its presence and arguing for its relevance as a solution to new challenges associated with suburban development and urban revitalization. This chapter thus examines the on-going generative processes to name, identify, and characterize the New Urbanism as a coherent movement that appears throughout the world.

Part 2: Typifying New Urbanism and its mobility

Part two aims to use our relational materialism exploration of the production of New Urbanism to contribute to ongoing discussions about policy mobility and postsuburban politics. The chapters in this part offer in-depth case studies of New Urbanism in North American contexts to illustrate the ways in which the movement is typified through mainstream development practice. The chapters emphasise the ways in which local and translocal processes are part of a translation processes that produce the New Urbanism. Furthermore, the chapters in this part discuss how our study of actually occurring practices
of translation contribute to discussions of post-suburban politics, policy mobilities, and governance.

Chapter 4: New Urbanism as ‘best practice’ (10,000 words)

This chapter discusses the actually-existing practices and networks that enable the circulation of New Urbanism across the world. Others have studied this as a diffusion process, but we take a decidedly different approach to studying how New Urbanist ideas travel. Instead, we demonstrate that the ‘global’ mobility of New Urbanism can be understood through a critical examination of the principle-based nature of the movement and the promotion of a series of ‘best practices’, ready-packaged for adoption and adaptation in different contexts. Understanding the circulation of New Urbanism ideas and practices is not merely the following of New Urbanism (as an object) from one project, city or country of origin to another of adoption (as often undertaken in the policy mobilities literature) but rather a deeper articulation of what makes it a movement or formation of actors, practices, and normative truth claims in relational networks of discursive and material arrangements. Existing studies of policy mobility tell us relatively little about how and why some best practices are selected and codified more so than alternative development pathways not taken; who decides what is a best practice and for whom it is best? Using the cases of Toronto and Minneapolis-St Paul, this chapter illustrates how the abstraction of New Urbanist principles, ideas and forms into taken-for-granted practices of good planning and development implicates a powerful political force in typifying the way things are done in a given development culture, possibly at the expense of wider democratic debate on local urban futures. It also undermines the dominant narrative that New Urbanism spreads in a wave-like fashion from a single point of origin.

Chapter 5: Post-suburban politics after New Urbanism (10,000 words)

This chapter examines how the differentiation of New Urbanism in North America provides new insight for theories of governance in a post-suburban era. The chapter uses comparative case studies of New Urbanist developments in several locations in Canada and the US to analyze the ways divergent outcomes are produced. We examine how local and translocal processes interrelate to produce New Urbanist settlements of varying types and describe the applications of best practice, rationalities, logics, and political opportunity structures that circulate through, and condition growth within, specific places. By tracing the different paths that New Urbanist development follows, and outlining the continuum of forms and practices constitutive of NU projects, we argue that studies of post-suburban politics must apprehend the ways in which land development is conditioned by local political economies and development histories, planning cultures, mobile planning ideas, and inter-organisational relations at a variety of scales. This approach offers a way to sensitize, if not move beyond, urban regime theory to consider the contingent and multi-scalar processes that both differentiate and constrain development in a post-suburban era into distinct forms. At the same time, the chapter also demonstrates the relevance of integrating geographic notions of place into assemblage thinking in explaining contemporary land development and metropolitan expansion. This chapter thus uses case studies of New Urbanism to consider the relational nature of planning politics surrounding land development efforts in an era of post-suburban politics.
Chapter 6: From radical movement to mainstream practice (10,000 words)

This chapter examines the processes through which particular sets of ‘best practice’ within New Urbanism’s principle-based movement are privileged in mainstream development. We combine our preceding discussions of a) the circulation networks that typify New Urbanism in theorising why certain principles and forms are adopted in mainstream development practice, and b) the planning and development assemblages that condition land development in a post-suburban era, and. This chapter builds on the previous two in examining why it is that certain practices are taken up in New Urbanism-themed development, while other more radical practices, which are part of the movement’s portfolio, are left out or otherwise pushed to the margins. On the one hand, we argue that the ways in which multi-actor development coalitions conceptualize financial risk and create strategies to manage such risk at a variety of scales supports the typification of select best practices. On the other hand, we also describe the relationships and circumstances through which the more marginal principles, such as those concerned with social equity, are actually taken up in practice. We draw on case studies of New Urbanist development in Denver, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Toronto to illustrate the argument. Discussion of the case studies is contextualised through a summary of New Urbanism’s evolution from a radical movement to a mainstream practice, which is important to understand the implications of New Urbanism’s typification, especially in regard to the extent to which New Urbanism can be relied upon to implement social equity agendas in the context of post-suburban politics.

Conclusion: Ever After? (6,000 words)

The concluding chapter will focus on drawing out some wider implications that an ‘After New Urbanism’ critique has for understanding how powerful ideas circulate and influence local governance and development models. The book’s emphasis on practice-based enquiry is reiterated and the insights gained from this fine-grained approach are contrasted with existing treatments of New Urbanism, characteristically pre-occupied with its design minutia and seemingly ‘global’ reach. The conclusion further develops the point that an ‘After’ perspective requires a decidedly different conceptualization of New Urbanism as both always becoming and unequivocally hybrid. This conceptualization impacts what is known about the movement and opens up new questions for further research.

IV. Relation to existing literature

There are three primary literatures that relate to this monograph. The first most obviously is the literature specific to New Urbanism. This can be subdivided into academic and practical; critical and promotional. From the late 1990s and early 2000s a number of books and papers were published that sought to position the New Urbanism as a potential solution to suburban sprawl and help the design-oriented movement find its intellectual-anchor in sociological and ideological concepts such as the transect. Some of these early influential texts include: Kelbaugh (1997); Krieger and Lennertz (1991); Kunstler (1996); Calthorpe (1993); Calthorpe (2000); Duany (2000); Duany et al (2000), Duany and Talen (2002); Talen (1999).

These were followed by a wave of more critical commentaries (largely in academic journals) which predominantly focused on critiques of the communitarian promises of the NU and the
questionable ‘success’ of its design elements (rear laneways and detached garages, porches etc) [See Harvey (1997); Beauregard (2002); Audirac (1999); Ford (2001); Thompson-Fawcett and Bond (2003); Clarke (2005); Hirt (2009)]. During this time the early critiques of the movement as the new ‘sub’urbanism emerged (Scully (1994); Lehrer and Milgrom (1996); McCann (1995); Shibley (1998); Marshall (2001); Falconer Al-Hindi (2001); Falconer Al-Hindi and Till (2001); Kohn (2004); Grant (2007). Still others were published to demonstrate the value-added from NU (Duany et al. (2000); Duany and Talen (2002); Talen (2000); Brain, 2005). These pro-and-con articles largely focused on projects scattered across the United States (and to a lesser extent Canada). A somewhat separate literature also emerged documenting the ‘diffusion’ of NU as an idea and was particularly focused on drawing out the sociological, design and planning antecedents to the ‘not so new’ New Urbanism [see Hebbert (2003); Rees (2003); Thompson-Fawcett (2003); Hirt (2009)].

Two relatively recent full-length books are particularly noteworthy in relation to the themes proposed for this monograph. Grant (2006) and Passell (2012) both provide comprehensive attempts at theorising the significance of the New Urbanism from a social science perspective. Grant (2006) is an internationally-relevant analysis which provides a broad introduction to some of the key evaluative frameworks we seek to probe considerably more deeply via this monograph. In particular, Grant (2006) acknowledged the hybridity of forms attributed to New Urbanism in (what she calls ‘faux New Urbanism’) arguing that it is becoming increasingly mainstream, in several countries (particularly Canada, USA, UK). Grant traces the ascendance of the movement and explores the mobility of the ideas and practices and the role of various institutions and personalities in its proliferation. In particular, Grant follows the global reach of NU via the discourse of diffusion from the USA to Canada, UK, Europe, and Asia. Grant is critical of the New Urbanism for privileging elite development interests and is sceptical of the long term influence of the movement, globally. By contrast Passell (2012) [outlined below under Competition], offers an american-centric analysis of why New Urbanism emerged and sustained its influence on planning and development in US cities and suburbs. Like us, Passell focuses on the production of New Urbanism and the networks of actors engaged in the NU emergence narrative of different places. His efforts are however directed at gleaning normative lessons from the movement’s progression to date in order to identify a framework for building better (New Urbanist) places. This is not our intent.

The proposed monograph rather, treats the production of New Urbanism as a lens to engage broader questions about two further bodies of academic literature: suburban governance and the global circulation of planning ideas and their in situ practice (commonly referred to now as policy mobilities). Indeed, following Brain’s (2005) observation that much of the literature about NU examines the movement based on its own aspirations, we seek to instead investigate how the production of NU provides theoretical insight into post-suburban politics and the circulation of dominant (sub)urban development ideas. We start from the discourse of NU as a global movement and using the mobilities literature (and the influences of assemblage theory, e.g., McFarlane (2011)) seek to dis-assemble the context-specific constitutive practices of translation and mutation. Work in the policy mobilities literature has touched on New Urbanism, particularly that of Eugene McCann (2011), but is complicated by the difficulty of defining what is mobile. NU is not a ‘thing’ or even a policy, but rather a movement or formation (following Anderson and McFarlane 2011 and Allen 2011) of actors, practices, principles, rationalities and material forms that have been abstracted into ‘best practice’ bundles collectively identified as New Urbanism
and applied to varying extents in different geographical and social contexts. The mobilities literature on NU to date (almost exclusively McCann 2011, McCann and Ward 2010) briefly traces the ‘travel’ of it as an exemplar, but the details of the practices which constitute it as an exemplar (or best practice) are scant. Part two of this monograph will take up this theme and deepen the critical questioning of the formation of best practice as a governmental technology (Moore 2013) and the significance this has for political rationalities supportive of New Urbanism.

The understanding of New Urbanism as a form of best practice, and the recognition of best practice itself as a politically-loaded concept, connects our monograph with the third literature on post-suburban politics and governance (Phelps and Wood 2011; Phelps and Wu 2011; Hamel and Keil 2015). In particular, our book challenges some of the assumptions made about local development coalitions and explores the extent to which a post-political paradigm is reinforced by the stabilisation of social actions in particular cities which reproduce and frame local urban problems and solutions in favour of New Urbanism via a politics of consensus and conformity (Swyngedouw 2011, Ranciere 2003). In other words, the abstraction of New Urbanist principles into matter-of-fact or taken-for-granted default planning and development practices and forms, valorised within particular territories, implicates a powerful political force typifying the way things are done in a given development culture, possibly at the expense of democratic debate on local urban futures and the promotion of social equity. This has implications for wider concerns of metropolitan social and spatial structuring (Hamel and Keil 2015) and theorisations of urban and suburban governance. We share with those writing about global suburbanisms an appreciation of the multiple realities of suburbs and metropolitan expansion (Hamel and Keil 2015; Phelps and Wu 2011), with New Urbanism increasingly recognised as a physical, social and political presence. This book will explore the convergence of governance and management practices associated with pro-New Urbanism political rationalities from a global perspective and consider the significance of this for understanding local development coalitions and policy making processes, with particular attention drawn to extra-local influences on collective decisions of local and regional governance. In so doing the book will also advance a relational materialist perspective which re-orientates the focus on the mobility of New Urbanism towards a practice-based understanding of the typification of governmental technologies such as best practice.

V. Intended Audience

The intended audience is predominantly academic, within the disciplines of urban geography, urban studies, urban sociology and planning. The monograph is intended to appeal to an international audience, which is what sets it apart from its closest competitor (noted below) that maintains an American focus. The emphasis on de-universalizing a ‘global’ movement means that we start from a very internationally-relevant discourse. The examples drawn on will be from around the world, not all of which will necessarily bear a direct link back to the original CNU vision. The global story is not just one of diffusion of a design idea from an identifiable ‘origin’, but a complex assemblage of knowledge circulation practices, place-based politics, development cultures and market dynamics.

The potential also exists for the monograph to contribute to critical urban studies in higher education (e.g. geography, urban studies, planning, urban sociology) and be used for
teaching purposes. Its international scope will make it accessible for mid-level undergraduate and post-graduate programmes in many markets (especially US, Canadian, UK but possibly India, China, South America, Australia, continental Europe - based on interest in our work). In the educational field of International Planning, the critical study of the emergence and proliferation of New Urbanism as a ‘global’ urban trend is commonplace (at least from the UK-perspective). From our own teaching profile we can foresee the book being used as a secondary text on upper-year undergraduate specialist geography or planning modules or post-graduate modules for which there is a substantial market in both our respective national contexts (US, Canada and UK).

**VI. Competition**

The most recent monograph on New Urbanism is that by Aaron Passell (2012) *Building the New Urbanism: Places, Professions and Profits in the American Metropolitan Landscape*, Routledge. This book is premised as the ‘first in-depth sociological investigation of the emergence of this phenomena’ which is arguable. It is a normative undertaking focused on establishing an analytical framework for how to effect improved community building and it is not very critical of New Urbanism. The primary area of overlap with our proposed manuscript is the focus on the production of New Urbanism. Our treatment of New Urbanism is more critical and theoretically underpinned within assemblage urbanism, relational materialism and practice theory. It is also international. We open our critique not as a descriptive summary of the emergence and proliferation of the movement but as the post-script to this now familiar story. We begin with the ‘after’ New Urbanism problematic, to direct critical attention to the contingent and the hybrid characteristics of a movement which has arguably gone mainstream. We pose more critical questions of what this means for post-suburban development, politics and governance.

It is perhaps appropriate to consider a wider field of competition in the area of critical (sub)urbanism. Recent full-length publications that we would consider of interest to readers of our monograph include:


**VII. Illustrations**

40 photographs and 10 illustrations as follows:
The majority of illustrative material will be produced in-house at the authors’ expense and not require copyright authorisation. In the case of site-specific third party reproductions (e.g. maps, site plans, documents etc.) the authors will ensure all relevant permissions are obtained and where possible negotiate for copyright permission.

VIII. Schedule

Draft monograph to be submitted August 2016.
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