CPRN RCRPP
Fresh Ideas for Canada's Future

Urban Nexus

Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) / Réseaux canadiens de recherche en politiques publiques (RCRPP)

Urban Nexus

An e-bulletin of the Family Network of CPRN

Welcome to *Urban Nexus*, a monthly e-bulletin of policy research, news and events on cities and communities launched by Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) in October 2002. *Urban Nexus* is for policy-makers, researchers and interested members of the public seeking up-to-date information, from Canadian and non-Canadian sources, about new research on cities.

To view archived *Urban Nexus* summaries on the CPRN Web site, simply click here: www.cprn.org/en/nexus-list.cfm

June 22, 2005 – Place-Based Public Policy

Recently there has been much interest in understanding and applying spatially targeted policy interventions. On the one hand, this interest is fuelled by evidence of increasingly concentrated pockets of poverty in many large cities and, on the other hand, by recognition that processes of economic innovation seem to thrive in urban spaces that are networked and collaborative. The connecting thread is the importance of place – or the local milieu – to the quality of life for all citizens and to the prosperity of firms, regions, and nations. Cities, large and small, are where today's major public policy issues play out. But for many governments, including those in Canada, adapting their policies and programs to this new reality is a challenge. In Canada, all three orders of government are active in cities – spending, regulating, owning property and so forth – but the activities are typically not coordinated, either within each government, or across the levels. Effective place-based policy requires that federal and provincial/state governments find new ways to relate to one another and "join-up." Equally important, however, these governments need to empower local actors such as municipal officials and non-profit organizations who have the knowledge and assets critical to good public policy in their communities. This issue of *Urban Nexus* highlights the findings and controversies in the growing body of place-based public policy research and practice in Europe and North America.

FRANÇAIS

subscribe

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Resumés

Bradford, Neil. 2005. *Place-Based Public Policy: Towards a New Urban and Community Agenda for Canada.* CPRN Research Report F|51.
www.cprn.com/en/doc.cfm?doc=1186

Considine, Mark. 2004. *Community Strengthening and the Role of Local Government: A Discussion Paper.* Local Government Victoria.
www.vlga.org.au/publications/public/items/2004/03/00262-upload-00001.pdf

Arundel, Caryl, Peter Clutterbuck and Shelly Cleverly. 2005. *Putting Theory into Practice: Asset Mapping in Three Toronto Neighbourhoods.*
action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=74922

Rural Policy Research Institute and Rural Poverty Research Center. 2004. *Place Matters: Addressing Rural Poverty.*
www.rprconline.org/synthesis.pdf

These four documents explore the prospects and problems of the place-based policy approach from a variety of perspectives. Bradford examines the Canadian setting, finding that a growing recognition of the significance of "place quality" has not yet been translated into a coherent policy framework or consistent government action. He proposes four key elements to a robust place-based framework: tapping into local knowledge; balancing spatially targeted programs with macro level social and economic policies; governing through collaboration among governments and civil society organizations; and empowering municipal governments. Bradford provides case studies of innovations in Europe and the United States, and emerging community-driven collaborations in Canadian cities. He concludes with proposals for new intergovernmental and democratic accountability relationships to support place-based policy.

Considine offers a comparative discussion of the "alternative pathways" for local policy collaborations to strengthen community. He compares experiences in Ireland, the United Kingdom, Italy, Austria, and Norway. Four dimensions of community strengthening guide the analysis: increased connectedness; distributed leadership; inclusive partnerships; and new governance institutions. Considine highlights the strengths and weaknesses of each country's approach, and concludes with a conceptual discussion of three pathways to place-based collaboration: decentralized governance; joint governance; and devolved governance.

Arundel, Clutterbuck, and Cleverly develop a research framework for mapping community assets (physical, social, diversity-related, service, and safety/mobility) and apply it to three neighbourhoods in Toronto experiencing high concentrations of poverty. The research highlights the diversity and dynamic nature of neighbourhoods and identifies factors in defining neighbourhoods and in guiding place-based investment strategies. Three common policy priorities emerge: investment in multi-use, accessible neighbourhood centres; investment in community development activities; and investments in housing, employment, and income support.

The Rural Policy Research Institute reports on a 2004 national policy conference in

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

the United States designed to set an agenda for the future of rural poverty research and policy. Emphasis is placed on developing "multiple strategies" to tackle place-based rural policy concerns, taking account of differences among rural communities and between rural and urban centres. The authors call for a new balance between "tailored policies" and federal funding, guidelines and oversight.

Gyourko, Joseph. 1998. "Place-Based Aid Versus People-Based Aid and the Role of an Urban Audit in a New Urban Strategy." ***Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*** **Vol. 3, No. 3.**
www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL3NUM3/article9.pdf

Partridge, Mark D., and Dan S. Rickman. 2005. ***Persistent Pockets of American Poverty: People or Place Based?***
www.rprconline.org/WorkingPapers/WP0502.pdf

Kraybill, David, and Maureen Kilkenny. 2003. ***Economic Rationales For and Against Place-Based Policies.*** **AAEA-RSS Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.**
cenet.aers.psu.edu/pubs/kraybillandkilkennypaper.pdf

Castle, Emery N., and Bruce A. Weber. 2004. ***Policy and Place: Requirements of a Successful Place-Based Policy.***
www.rupri.org/ruralPolicy/publications/P2004-2.pdf

These four documents engage long-standing debates about the relative merits of place-based and people-based public policy. Gyourko makes the case for place-based government aid to American cities with relatively high poverty rates, specifically to eliminate the cost differentials between such places and their surrounding suburbs. Higher costs for cities arise from the spatial concentration of social challenges such as poverty, immigrant settlement, and unemployment. To determine the form and content of place-based urban aid, Gyourko proposes an "urban audit." The audit would measure the costs of the burdens that cities bear for the rest of the country, allocate those costs more efficiently across the entire citizenry, and provide an incentive structure for municipal governments to use resources more efficiently.

Partridge and Rickman observe that over the past four decades almost 400 American counties have persistently had poverty rates in excess of 20 percent. Using a variety of regression approaches, including geographically weighted analysis, they find that local job growth especially reduces poverty in persistent-poverty counties. They also find persistent-poverty counties do not experience more adverse spillover effects from their neighbouring counties, and that there are some key geographic differences in the "poverty determining mechanism." On this basis, they conclude that place-based economic development has a potential role in reducing poverty.

Kraybill and Kilkenny discuss the role of "place" in classical, neoclassical, and new economic growth theories and present arguments for and against place-based rural development policies. Emphasizing that "getting the mix of place and people right in rural development discussions is not easy," they identify specific instances of market failure that provide strong justification for place-based policy. These include situations where rural communities are experiencing intensive economic change and "small town entrepreneurs" are seeking to retool or upgrade. Such targeted investments may have significant spread effects in the locality.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Castle and Weber present a framework for the formulation of place-based policy based on nearly two decades of research and evaluation in the United States. It is essential to know three things about the place: its geographic location, population density, and history. On this foundation, they identify the policy building blocks, including the intermediate decision-making units required for local autonomy, the different forms of capital and assets characterizing the place, and the extent to which the local government can adequately represent the communities of interest at play. They illustrate the issues through case studies of the Endangered Species Act and Welfare Reform.

Barraket, Josephine. 2005. *Communities of Place.* Griffith Review.
www3.griffith.edu.au/01/griffithreview/past_editions.php?id=25

Lupton, Ruth. 2003. *"Neighbourhood Effects": Can We Measure Them and Does It Matter?* CASE Paper 73, London School of Economics.

Collaborative Economics. 1999. *Innovative Regions: The Importance of Place and Networks in the Innovative Economy.*
www.coecon.com/publications/InnovativeRegions.pdf

Florida, Richard. *Place and the New Economy*. Sustainable Pittsburgh Lecture Series.
www.heinz.cmu.edu/~florida/pages/new_economy/quality_place.pdf

These four articles present various arguments for appreciating "the difference place makes" to economic and social well-being. Barraket provides a discussion of the uncritical usage of "community" in much contemporary policy discourse. She makes the point that most community problems originate in "broader structural issues" that impact and constrain local actors, and further that "communities of place" are, in fact, diverse places with their own power dynamics that can privilege certain voices. For policy-makers, the challenge is to address the structural inequalities, both in communities and at the macro scale.

Lupton critically reviews the research on the effects of neighbourhood contexts on individual outcomes. Acknowledging the controversies and uncertainties surrounding the concept of "neighbourhood effects," Lupton argues that spatially targeted policies remains important on equity grounds and in relation to effective program implementation. She calls for more collaboration between quantitative and qualitative researchers to better understand the causal mechanisms at work in neighbourhoods.

Collaborative Economics explores issues of place and networks from the perspective of economic innovation rather than social development. They argue that innovation is rooted in local and regional networks that connect assets, enable trial and error learning, and value face-to-face contacts. Case studies are highlighted from a number of innovative American cities. They identify four cornerstones of regional innovation: assets, networks, culture, and community. Ten action principles are outlined based on the idea that innovation is both a social process and place-based.

Florida develops the connection between place and economic innovation. He introduces the notion of "place quality," arguing that it is important both as a source

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

of identity in the new economy and as a way to conceptualize the urban milieu. Emphasizing that place quality goes beyond creating high technology incubators, Florida describes a number of priorities for city leaders including preserving neighbourhoods, celebrating diversity, facilitating a vibrant street culture, and integrating educational institutions into the urban fabric.

Burton, Paul, Jacqui Croft, Annette Hastings, Tom Slater, Robina Goodlad, Jo Abbott, and Geraldine Macdonald. 2004. *What Works in Community Involvement in Area-Based Initiatives? A Systematic Review of the Literature*. Home Office, United Kingdom.
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/rdsolr5304.pdf

Smith, Gillian. 1999. *Area-Based Initiatives: The Rationale and Options for Area Targeting.*
sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper25.pdf

Greenbaum, Robert T. and Daniele Bondonio. 2004. *Losing Focus: A Comparative Evaluation of Spatially Targeted Economic Revitalization Programs in the US and the EU*.
www.prova.org/Doc/Paper_Bondonio_Greenbaum.doc

Katz, Bruce. 2004. *Neighborhoods of Choice and Connection: The Evolution of American Neighborhood Policy and What It Means for the United Kingdom.* Brookings Institution.
www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20040713_katz.htm

These four documents bring into focus aspects of the European approach to place-based policy-making. Burton and his colleagues review the research evidence on the effectiveness of community involvement in area-based initiatives (ABIs). They report that community involvement in ABIs has increased in recent years to enhance social cohesion, service delivery, and citizenships rights. They explore the techniques used for community involvement and the difficulties of representation and participation. Among the conclusions are the need for more tangible outcomes from community involvement, the importance of local circumstances in influencing the form of involvement, and the need for support and training in governance.

Smith explores the rationales and growth of Britain's area-based initiatives. Finding evidence of the need for targeted interventions, she argues for a closer link between area-based approaches and national level "main programs," given the time limited nature of the former and that fact that they only reach a minority of all deprived people. She concludes that an important role for area-based programs is to facilitate development of innovative approaches that could be ultimately incorporated into mainstream policy for the entire country. She also identifies directions for future research such as generating small area data and studying possible displacement effects of ABIs.

Greenbaum and Bondonio address the question of whether spatially targeted initiatives can "keep their focus strictly on very needy places." Using an econometric model, they comparatively analyze place-based programming in the American Empowerment Zones and the European Union Objective 2 urban programs. They find that while both programs initially targeted very distressed areas, subsequent rounds of

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

designation greatly expanded the programs, leading to less precise targeting. Political factors are proposed to explain the program changes, and the authors call for research to assess the impact of such expanded coverage on the distressed areas initially targeted.

Katz's discussion of place-based policy focuses on neighbourhood policy since the 1960s in the United States and the United Kingdom. He traces three distinct sets of neighbourhood policy ("improving the neighbourhood," "expanding opportunity," and "transforming the neighbourhood") revealing the strengths and limitations of each. He develops a new neighbourhood paradigm for policy-makers on both sides of the Atlantic designed to attract residents of all strata while linking them to economic and educational opportunities.

Germain, Annick, and Philippe Estèbe (eds.). 2004. "Le territoire, instrument providentiel de l'État social." ***Lien social et Politiques*** **No. 52 (Fall). Available in French only.**
www.erudit.org/revue/lsp/2004/v/n52/

This collection of articles probes the concept of place as an instrument of the State, examining a variety of current approaches and policies in France, the Netherlands, the United States and Quebec. The first group of articles examines the utility of place as a multi-purpose concept: useful as a means of redistribution; and as an approach towards education, health and social development. In the second set of articles, the focus is on neighbourhoods in relation to poverty, youth, urban renewal and social integration. In the final series of articles, place-based interventions are examined as a tool of civil society. The overarching conclusion, drawn from these articles, is that place-based approaches have become ubiquitous across social and economic policy domains both in Europe and North America, however there are clear limits to its uses and utility. General agreement is found that place-based interventions cannot adequately resolve the need for redistribution of wealth, nor appropriately address necessary improvements in education or health, these requiring a more universal approach. Place-based approaches can serve numerous purposes, namely to fulfill social development goals and to impact on the range of social determinants of health of individuals and groups.

What's New?

On the Bookshelf

Dreier, Peter, John Mollenkopft, and Todd Swanstrom. 2005. ***Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-First Century.*** **Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2nd Edition, Revised.**

This book demonstrates how inequality and place are intertwined in American cities. The authors argue that public policy plays a critical role in shaping social and spatial segregation and they propose a political strategy and policy agenda for metropolitan change.

OECD. 2003. ***The Future of Rural Policy: From Sectoral to Place-Based Policies in Rural Areas.*** **Paris.**

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

This volume traces significant shifts in rural policy-making in the past two decades. Moving from sectoral to place-based policies, it is argued, recognizes the importance of bottom-up initiatives, the interdependence of economic and social development, and the need to involve local actors across all stages of the policy process.

Taylor, Marilyn. 2003. *Public Policy in the Community*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

This book explores how ideas such as community, participation, and social capital have been used in policy debates and development since the 1960s. Taylor supports putting community at the centre of public policy but emphasizes the need for a sophisticated understanding of the institutional and political transformations involved.

Cars, Goran, Patsy Healey, Madanipour Ali, and Claudio de Magalhes. 2002. *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity, and Social Milieux*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

This edited collection provides a place-based conceptual framework for urban governance and public policy, as well as a series of European case studies illustrating the dynamics in different localities. In the global age, they conclude, place and territory become a "focus for integration."

Conferences and Events

International Making Cities Livable. **"43rd International Making Cities Livable Conference on True Urbanism and the European Town Square."** June 20-24, 2005. Venice, Italy.
www.livablecities.org/43ConfVenice.htm

3rd Annual Competitive Cities Conference. **"Performance Measurement of Federal, Provincial, Muncipal Initiatives in Urban Economic Development."** June 21-23, 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.federatedpress.com/products/conferences/CompetitiveCities/frameset.htm

Canadian Urban Institute. **"re.THINK re.INVENT re.URBANIZE: Seizing Opportunity in Urban Development."** June 22-23, 2005. Kitchener, Ontario.
www.canurb.com/events/event_details.php?id=114

The University of Manchester. **"Visualizing the City."** June 26-28, 2005. Manchester, England.
www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/subjectareas/drama/events/visualisingthecity/

Community Development Society. **"Linking Community Development Practice to Public Policy: Does Practice Inform Public Policy? Does Public Policy Promote Creative Practice?"** June 26-29, 2005. Baltimore, Maryland.
www.comm-dev.org/

Urban Land Institute. **"Developing Green: The Case for High-Performance Buildings and Sustainable Development."** June 28-29, 2005. Washington, DC.
www.uli.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Conferences&CONTENTID=21576&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

3rd World City Forum. **"International Rendez-vous for Political Leaders and Economic Players of the City."** June 30-July 1, 2005. Paris, France.
www.worldcityforum.com/wcf_eng/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=89&Itemid=120&mos_change_template=wcf_eng

Research Committee, Environment and Society. **"Technonatures 111: Environments, Technologies, Spaces and Places in the 21st Century."** July 6-9, 2005. Stockholm, Sweden.
www.scasss.uu.se/IIS2005/total_webb/frame.html

Strategy Summit. **"Canadian National Summit on Municipal Governance: Strategic Sponsorship Partnering."** July 11-12, 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.strategyinstitute.com/sponsorship/dsp_mun_gov.php

The Canadian Institute. **"Canada's Best Cities."** July 12-13, 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.canadianinstitute.com/BestCities.htm

Core Cities UK. **"Core Cities Summit."** July 14-15, 2005. Leeds, England.
www.corecities.com/

Alliance for Nonprofit Management and National Council of Nonprofit Associations. **"The Communities We Serve: Building Capacity for Impact."** July 14-17, 2005. Chicago, Illinois.
fdncenter.org/pnd/calendar/calendar_item.jhtml?id=97200012

Canadian Institute of Planners Conference. **"Frontiers in Planning and Design."** July 17-20, 2005. Calgary, Alberta.
www.aacip.com/cip_2005/index.htm

Connection Main Street Center. **"Economic Realities of Downtown Revitalization."** July 26, 2005. Berlin, CT.
www.ctmainstreet.org/dri1.html

Sister Cities International. **"2005 Annual Conference – Connecting Global Villages."** July 27-31, 2005. Spokane, Washington.
www.sister-cities.org/www/sci/pdf/2005ACBrochure.pdf

United Nations and Government of Queensland. **"International Conference on Engaging Communities."** August 14-17, 2005. Queensland, Australia.
www.engagingcommunities2005.org/home.html

Council for European Urbanism. **"30 Years: The European City – Review and Prospects."** September 8-10, 2005. Berlin, Germany.
www.ceunet.de/events.htm

International Congress on Environmental Planning and Management. **"Environmental Challenges of Urbanization."** September 11-15, 2005. Brasilia, Brazil.
www.urbenvironcongress.com

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

WIT Transactions on Ecology & the Environment. **"Sustainable Planning 2005."** September 12-14, 2005. Bologna, Italy.
www.wessex.ac.uk/conferences/2005/spd05/

American Institute of Architects. **"Eco-DESIGN: Design for the Living Environment.**" September 15-17, 2005. Syracuse, New York.
www.aianys.org/convention/index.html

Heritage Canada Foundation. **"2005 Annual Conference – Heritage and Sustainability: Canadian Communities and Kyoto."** September 15-17, 2005. Regina, Saskatchewan.
www.heritagecanada.org/eng/conference.html

Winnipeg Inner City Research Alliance. **"CUexpo2005 – Community University Research Partnerships: Leaders in Urban Change."** September 15-18, 2005. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
cuexpo.uwinnipeg.ca/

Organization of World Heritage Cities. **"8th World Symposium."** September 19-23, 2005. Cusco, Peru.
www.cusco8col.com.pe/

Colorado Community Revitalization Association. **"2005 Annual Conference."** September 21-23, 2005. Durango, Colorado.
www.ccraonline.org/pageinpage/conference.cfm

Urban Land Institute. **"Place Making: Developing Town Centers, Transit Villages and Main Streets."** September 26-27, 2005. Woodlands, Texas.
www.uli.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Conferences&CONTENTID=9428&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm

Fondation Rues principales 2005 Conference. **"Au centre, ça marche!"** September 28, 2005. Quebec City.
www.fondationruesprincipales.qc.ca/english/colloque.htm

Artscape. **"Creative Places + Spaces 2: Risk Revolution."** September 30-October 1, 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.torontoartscape.on.ca/index.php?Main=57&Aes=1a7b46d161

49th IFHP World Congress. **"Urban Futures, Continuities and Discontinuities."** October 2-5, 2005. Rome, Italy.
www.ifhp.org

Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACRPH). **"11th Biennial Conference on Planning History."** October 20-23, 2005. Coral Gables, Florida.
www.urban.uiuc.edu/sacrph/conference/conference.html

PASCAL Observatory. **"Making Knowledge Work: Building Sustainable**

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Communities through Partnerships in Place Management, Social Capital and Lifelong Learning." October 25-28, 2005. University of Stirling, Scotland.
www.niace.org.uk/Conferences/PASCAL.htm

Main Street New Jersey Downtown Revitalization Institute. **"Promoting Downtown."** October 26-27, 2005. Trenton, NJ.
www.nj.gov/dca/dcr/msnj/msnj_dri.shtml#4

Search Institute. **"2005 Healthy Communities, Healthy Youth Conference."** November 3-5, 2005. Dallas, Texas.
www.search-institute.org/hchy/

Policy Research Reports

Aalbers, Manuel B. 2005. **"Place-Based Social Exclusion: Redlining in the Netherlands."** *Area* Vol. 37, No. 1.
www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/area/2005/00000037/00000001/art00012

Action for Neighbourhood Change. 2005. ***Action Research and Place-Based Learning.***
www.anccommunity.ca

Albany Consulting Group. 2002. ***Assessment of Evaluation Strategies and Tools for Place Management and Community Renewal Projects.*** NSW Premier's Department.
www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/eval_premiers.pdf

Anani, K. 1999. ***Sustainable Governance of Livelihoods in Rural Africa: A Place-Based Response to Globalism in Africa.***
www.livelihoods.org/static/kanani_NN271.htm

Bakvis, Herman, and Luc Juillet. 2004. ***The Horizontal Challenge: Line Departments, Central Agencies and Leadership.*** Canada School of Public Service.
www.myschool-monecole.gc.ca/Research/publications/pdfs/hc_e.pdf

Ballas, D., D. Rossiter, B. Thomas, G. Clarke, and D. Dorling. 2005. ***Geography Matters: Simulating the Local Impacts of National Social Policies.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1859352669.pdf

Bay Area School Reform Collaborative. ***All of a Place: Connecting Schools, Youth and Community.***
www.communityschools.org/AllofaPlace.pdf

Beauvais, Caroline, and Jane Jenson. 2003. ***The Well-Being of Children: Are There "Neighbourhood Effects"?*** CPRN Discussion Paper F|31.
www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=156

Berube, Alan. 2005. ***Mixed Communities in England: A US Perspective on Evidence and Policy Prospects.*** Brookings Institution.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20050527_mixedcomm.htm

Caldwell, Alan. 2004. ***Re:sourcebook: Planning for Your Community.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/resourcebook.pdf

CCEDNet. 2002. ***Investing in Canada's Communities: CCEDNet's Policy Framework.***
www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/docs/pubs/Policy_Framework_2002.pdf

Cheng, Antony, and Steven Daniels. 2003. **"Examing the Interaction Between Geographic Scale and Ways of Knowing in Ecosystem Management: A Case Study of Place-Based Collaborative Planning."** *Forest Science.*
www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4019/is_200312/ai_n9307995

College of Urban, Labor and Metropolitan Affairs. Wayne State University. 1998. ***Place-Based Community and Economic Development Programs in Michigan: A Report Card.***
www.culma.wayne.edu/spc/ResearchPublications/PublicationsAssets/CEDEvaluation1998.pdf

Committee on Identifying Data Needs for Place-Based Decision Making. 2002. ***Community and Quality of Life: Data Needs for Informed Decision Making.***
www.nap.edu/catalog/10262.html

Community Services Council of Newfoundland and Labrador. 2002. ***Submission to the Royal Commission on Renewing and Strengthening Our Place in Canada.***
envision.ca/pdf/cscpub/RoyalCommDec2002.pdf

Craig, David. 2004. ***Building on Partnership: Sustainable Local Collaboration and Devolved Coordination.*** Local Partnerships and Governance, University of Auckland.
www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/lpg/researchpaper15.pdf

Devon Dodd, Julie, and Michelle Hébert Boyd. 2000. ***Capacity Building: Linking Community Experience to Public Policy.*** Atlantic Regional Office, Health Canada.
www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/regions/atlantic/pdf/capacity_building_e.pdf

Dewar, Margaret. 2002. ***Can Evaluation for Empowerment be Applied to Economic Development in Empowerment Zones?*** Urban and Regional Research Collaborative, University of Michigan.
sitemaker.umich.edu/urrcworkingpapers&mode=single&recordID=308467&nextMode=list

Donovan, Evelyn, and Wendy Au. 2004. ***The Vancouver Agreement, Moving Ideas Forward Together.***
www.cip-icu.ca/English/conference/proceedings/donovan.pdf

Dressner, Juliane, Wendy Fleischer, and Kay Sherwood. 1998. ***Next Door: A Concept Paper for Place-Based Employment Initiatives.*** Corporation for Supportive Housing.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

www.csh.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageID=3273

Fisher, Monica G., and Bruce A. Weber. 2002. ***The Importance of Place in Welfare Reform: Common Challenges for Central Cities and Remote-Rural Areas.*** Brookings Institution.
www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/es/urban/publications/weber.pdf

Fluharty, Charles W. 2005. ***Toward a Place-Based Rural Policy: Implications for a Texas Rural Policy.*** Rural Policy Research Institute.
www.rupri.org/ruralPolicy/presentations/fluharty020205.pdf

Freiler, Christine. 2004. ***Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter: Implications for Policy and Practice.***
action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=73239

Geddes, Mike. 2003. ***Limits to Local Governance: Recent Experience in the UK.*** Local Government Centre, University of Warwick.
www.public-policy.unimelb.edu.au/events/Geddes.doc

GHK International (Canada) Ltd. ***Measuring Neighbourhood Vitality.*** Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force Research.
action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=73241

Gillen, Mike. 2004. **"Promoting Place: Elevating Place-Based Discourse and New Approaches in Local Governance in New South Wales."** *Urban Policy and Research* Vol. 22, No. 2.
www.ingentaconnect.com/content/carfax/cupr/2004/00000022/00000002/art00006

Goering, John. 2003. **"Place-Based Poverty, Social Experimentation, and Child Outcomes: A Report of Mixed Effects."** *Children, Youth and Environments* Vol. 13, No. 2.
www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/13_2/Goering/PlaceBasedPoverty.htm

Greenbaum, Robert T. 2001. ***Selecting the Right Site: Where Do States Locate Place-Based Economic Development Programs?*** School of Public Policy and Management, Ohio State University.
wc.wustl.edu/workingpapers/Greenbaum.pdf

Iannotta, Joah G., and Jane L. Ross. 2002. ***Equality of Opportunity and the Importance of Place: Summary of a Workshop.*** Center for Social and Economic Studies.
www.nap.edu/books/0309084679/html/52.html

Imbroscio, David L., and Thad Williamson. 2003. ***Local Policy Responses to Globalization: Place-Based Ownership Models of Economic Enterprise.***
www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/alperovitz/policystudiesarticle.html

Jargowsky, Paul. 2003. ***Stunning Progress, Hidden Problems: The Dramatic Decline of Concentrated Poverty in the 1990s.*** Brookings Institution.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

www.brookings.edu/metro/publications/jargowskypoverty.htm

Johnson, Stanley. 2001. **"Focusing on Differences: A New Approach for Rural Policy?"** *The Mainstreet Economist.* Center for the Study of Rural America. www.kc.frb.org/RuralCenter/mainstreet/MSE_0701.pdf

Ladd, Helen F. 1994. **"Spatially Targeted Economic Development Strategies: Do They Work?"** *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* Vol. 1, No. 1.
www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL1NUM1/ch10.pdf

Leopold Center's Marketing and Food Systems Initiative. ***A Geography of Taste: Iowa's Potential for Developing Place-Based and Traditional Foods.***
www.leopold.iastate.edu/pubs/staff/taste/summary.pdf

Lydon, Maeve. 2000. ***Mapping and Eco-Activism – Re-Discovering Our Common Ground***. Common Ground: Community Mapping Project.
www3.telus.net/cground/lydon%20article.htm

Macdonald, Kelvin. 2003. ***Sustaining Networks: How Regeneration Partnerships Learn and Develop.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1842631209.pdf

Macfarlane, Richard. 2000. ***Local Jobs from Local Development: The Use of Planning Agreements to Target Training and Employment Outcomes.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubID=251

Macleod Institute. 2004. ***In the Spirit of the Vancouver Agreement: A Governance Case Study.***
www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/audit/va/va_e.pdf

McGregor, Alan, Andrea Glass, Kevin Higgins, Lynne Macdougall, and Victoria Sutherland. 2003. ***Developing People – Regenerating Place: Achieving Greater Integration for Local Area Regeneration.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubID=543

Project for Public Places. 2005. ***Making Places: 30 Years of Placemaking.***
www.pps.org/info/newsletter/thirtieth_anniversary/

Rawlings, Lynette, Laura Harris, and Margery Austin Turner with Sandra Padilla. 2004. ***Race and Residence: Prospects for Stable Neighborhood Integration.*** Urban Institute.
www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310985_NCUA3.pdf

Reddel, Tim. 2004. ***Exploring the Institutional Dimensions of Local Governance and Community Strengthening: Linking Empirical and Theoretical Debates.*** Griffith University Urban Policy Program.
www.griffith.edu.au/centre/urp/UPP_RP2_Reddel_Final.pdf

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Reddel, Tim. 2002. **"Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: 'New' Governance and Place Policies."** *Australian Journal of Public Administration* Vol. 61, No. 1: 50-63.
www.blackwellpublishing.com/abstract.asp?ref=0313-6647&vid=61&iid=1&aid=258&s=&site=1

Rural School and Community Trust. 2003. ***Engaged Institutions: Impacting the Lives of Vulnerable Youth through Place-Based Learning.***
www.ruraledu.org/docs/kellogg/kellogg.pdf

Sampson, Robert. 1999. **"What 'Community' Supplies."** In Ronald F. Ferguson and William T. Dickens (eds.). *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
brookings.nap.edu/books/0815718756/html/241.html

Sanmartin, C., N.A. Ross, S. Tremblay, M. Wolfson, J.R. Dunn, and J. Lynch. 2003. **"Labour Market Income Inequality and Mortality in North American Metropolitan Areas."** *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* Vol. 57: 792-797.
jech.bmjjournals.com/cgi/content/abstract/57/10/792

Séguin, Anne-Marie, and Gérard Divay. 2002. "**Urban Poverty: Fostering Sustaining and Supportive Communities."** In Leslie F. Seidle (ed.). *The Federal Role in Canada's Cities: Four Policy Perspectives.* CPRN Discussion Paper F|27.
www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=159

Silver, Jim. 2002. ***Building on Our Strengths: Inner-City Priorities for a Renewed Tri-Level Development Agreement.*** Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
ius.uwinnipeg.ca/pdf/citizenpartJimSilverpm6.pdf

Smith, Ralph, and Sherri Torjman. 2004. ***Policy Development and Implementation in Complex Files.*** Canada School of Public Service.
www.myschool-monecole.gc.ca/Research/publications/pdfs/p125_e.pdf

Somers Smith, Daniel. 2005. ***Place-Based Environmentalism and Global Warming: Conceptual Contradictions of American Environmentalism.*** Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs.
www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php/prmTemplateID/8/prmID/499

Spencer, James. 2005. **"How to Think about Place and People Approaches to Poverty: The Significance of the Earned Income Tax Credit as Neighborhood Investment."** *Journal of Planning Education and Research* Vol. 24, No. 3.
jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/292

Spencer, James, and Paul Ong. 2004. **"An Analysis of the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone: Are Place-Based Investment Strategies Effective Under Moderate Economic Conditions?"** *Economic Development Quarterly*.
edq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/18/4/368

Stewart, Murray, and Joanna Howard. 2004. ***Mainstreaming in NDC Areas:***

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Evidence from the National Evaluation 2003/04. Research Report 25, Cities Research Centre, University of the West of England. ndcevaluation.adc.shu.ac.uk/ndcevaluation/Documents/Research%20Reports/RR25.pdf

Taylor, Marilyn, Mike Kinghan, and Stephen Thake. 2002. ***Networking Across Regeneration Partnerships: A National Study of Regional Approaches.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/networkingregeneration.pdf

Tonkin, L. 2004. **"Place-Based Action in Wollongong: The Role of Union-Community Alliances in Constructing Labour Geographies of Steel."** *Australian Geographer* Vol. 35, No. 1: 59-77.

Torjman, Sherri, Eric Leviten-Reid, and Mark Cabaj. 2004. ***Who Does What in Comprehensive Community Initiatives?*** Caledon Institute of Social Policy. www.caledoninst.org/PDF/55382086X.pdf

University of Queensland Community Service & Research Centre. 2002. ***Evaluation of Brisbane Place Projects: An Evaluation Plan.*** www.uq.edu.au/csrc/lcandsc/media/Evaluation.pdf

Welfare Information Network. 1999. ***Housing and Welfare Reform: Strategic Intersections in Place-Based Strategies.*** www.financeprojectinfo.org/Publications/housingresource.htm

Whitelaw, Graham S. 2002. ***Organizing Community Based Ecosystem Monitoring in Canada.*** The Canadian Community Monitoring Network. www.ccmn.ca/english/library/whitelaw/intro.html

Send information on submissions you would like to have considered for a future update to nexus@cprn.org. If you have not already done so, subscribe to the *Urban Nexus* list-serve at www.cprn.org/en/nexus.cfm

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus

unsubscribe

Nexus des enjeux urbains

Un bulletin életronique du Réseau de la famille des RCRPP

Bienvenue au *Nexus des enjeux urbains*, un bulletin électronique mensuel de recherche sur les politiques, d'actualités et d'informations sur des événements relatifs aux villes et aux collectivités, qu'ont lancé les Réseaux canadiens de recherche en politiques publiques (RCRPP) en octobre 2002. Le *Nexus des enjeux urbains* s'adresse aux décideurs, aux chercheurs et aux personnes intéressées parmi la population qui sont à la recherche de renseignements à jour, de sources canadiennes et autres, sur de nouvelles recherches portant sur les villes.

Pour consulter le répertoire des résumés du *Nexus des enjeux urbains* qui sont conservés sur le site Web des RCRPP, cliquez ici : www.cprn.org/fr/nexus-list.cfm

22 juin 2005 – Des politiques publiques axées sur la dimension locale

On a manifesté beaucoup d'intérêt récemment à l'égard de la compréhension et de l'application de mesures de politiques spatialement ciblées. D'une part, cet intérêt est alimenté par l'existence de foyers de pauvreté concentrés de plus en plus dans de grandes villes et, d'autre part, par la reconnaissance du fait que des processus d'innovation économique semblent s'épanouir dans des espaces urbains qui sont branchés et ouverts à la concertation. Le fil conducteur est l'importance que représente le lieu ou le milieu local pour la qualité de vie de tous les citoyens et la prospérité des entreprises, des régions et des nations. Les villes, grandes ou petites, sont les endroits où se jouent les grands enjeux des politiques publiques. Mais, pour beaucoup de gouvernements, y compris ceux du Canada, l'adaptation des programmes et des politiques à cette nouvelle réalité demeure un défi. Les trois ordres de gouvernement au Canada sont actifs au niveau des villes – par l'intermédiaire de leurs dépenses, de la réglementation, des propriétés qu'ils y détiennent, et ainsi de suite – mais ces activités manquent généralement de coordination, que ce soit à l'intérieur d'un niveau de gouvernement ou entre ceux-ci. L'efficacité des politiques axées sur la dimension locale nécessite que le gouvernement fédéral et les provinces ou les États trouvent de nouveaux moyens de « faire équipe ». Mais, il est tout aussi important pour ces gouvernements de s'employer à habiliter les intervenants locaux, comme les responsables municipaux et les organisations à but non lucratif, qui possèdent les connaissances et les atouts indispensables à l'élaboration de saines politiques publiques dans leurs collectivités. Ce numéro du *Nexus des enjeux urbains* met en évidence les conclusions et les controverses que l'on retrouve dans l'inventaire croissant des recherches sur les politiques publiques et les pratiques axées sur la dimension locale en Europe et en Amérique du Nord.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Résumés

Bradford, Neil. 2005. *Place-Based Public Policy: Towards a New Urban and Community Agenda for Canada.* RCRPP Rapport de recherche F|51.
www.cprn.com/fr/doc.cfm?doc=1186

Considine, Mark. 2004. *Community Strengthening and the Role of Local Government: A Discussion Paper.* Gouvernement municipal de Victoria.
www.vlga.org.au/publications/public/items/2004/03/00262-upload-00001.pdf

Arundel, Caryl, Peter Clutterbuck et Shelly Cleverly. 2005. *Putting Theory into Practice: Asset Mapping in Three Toronto Neighbourhoods.*
action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=74922

Rural Policy Research Institute et Rural Poverty Research Center. 2004. *Place Matters: Addressing Rural Poverty.*
www.rprconline.org/synthesis.pdf

Ces quatre documents sont consacrés à un examen des perspectives et des problèmes que soulève la stratégie des politiques axées sur la dimension locale selon une diversité d'optiques. Bradford examine le contexte canadien et conclut qu'une reconnaissance croissante de l'importance de la « qualité des lieux » ne s'est toujours pas traduite par l'élaboration d'un cadre de politiques systématique ou des interventions gouvernementales cohérentes. Il propose d'intégrer quatre éléments majeurs afin de former un solide cadre de politiques : mettre à profit les connaissances locales; assurer un équilibre de programmes spatialement ciblés à l'aide de politiques économiques et sociales à l'échelle macroéconomique; gouverner en s'appuyant sur une collaboration entre les pouvoirs publics et les organismes de la société civile; et habiliter les gouvernements municipaux. Bradford présente des études de cas d'innovations en Europe et aux États-Unis, et de nouvelles initiatives de collaboration à l'échelle communautaire dans des villes canadiennes. Il conclut en proposant l'établissement de nouveaux liens de responsabilité intergouvernementale et démocratique pour appuyer des politiques axées sur la dimension locale.

Considine présente une analyse comparative de « cheminements de remplacement » pour des initiatives de collaboration au niveau des politiques locales dans le but de renforcer les communautés. Il compare les résultats observés en Irlande, au Royaume-Uni, en Italie, en Autriche et en Norvège. Quatre dimensions du renforcement des communautés ont servi à orienter l'analyse : une interdépendance plus poussée; une répartition du leadership; des partenariats inclusifs; et de nouvelles institutions pour la gouvernance. Considine met en évidence les forces et les faiblesses des approches utilisées dans chacun des pays, et il conclut en procédant à une analyse conceptuelle de trois cheminements menant à une collaboration à l'échelle locale : gouvernance décentralisée; gouvernance coopérative et gouvernance dévolue.

Arundel, Clutterbuck et Cleverly mettent au point un cadre de recherche pour délimiter les atouts communautaires (physiques, sociaux, liés à la diversité, services et sécurité/mobilité) et ils l'appliquent à trois quartiers de Toronto où l'on retrouve de fortes concentrations de pauvreté. La recherche a permis de mettre en relief la

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

diversité et la nature dynamique des quartiers, et d'identifier des facteurs pour définir les quartiers et guider des stratégies d'investissement axées sur la dimension locale. Trois priorités connexes en matière de politiques se dégagent de l'analyse : investissements dans des centres communautaires polyvalents et accessibles; investissements dans des activités de développement communautaire; et investissements dans le domaine du logement, de l'emploi et du soutien du revenu.

Le Rural Policy Research Institute présente un compte rendu d'une conférence nationale sur les politiques qui s'est tenue en 2004 aux États-Unis dans le but d'établir un programme de recherche futur sur les politiques et la pauvreté rurale. L'accent fut mis sur l'élaboration de « stratégies multiples » en vue de s'attaquer aux préoccupations que soulèvent les politiques rurales axées sur la dimension locale, en tenant compte des différences entre les communautés rurales ainsi qu'entre les centres urbains et les zones rurales. Les auteurs préconisent un nouvel équilibre entre des « politiques personnalisées » et le financement, les lignes directrices et la surveillance du gouvernement fédéral.

Gyourko, Joseph. 1998. "Place-Based Aid Versus People-Based Aid and the Role of an Urban Audit in a New Urban Strategy." ***Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*** **Vol. 3, No. 3.**
www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL3NUM3/article9.pdf

Partridge, Mark D., et Dan S. Rickman. 2005. ***Persistent Pockets of American Poverty: People or Place Based?***
www.rprconline.org/WorkingPapers/WP0502.pdf

Kraybill, David, et Maureen Kilkenny. 2003. ***Economic Rationales For and Against Place-Based Policies.*** **AAEA-RSS Assemblée annuelle, Montréal, Canada.**
cenet.aers.psu.edu/pubs/kraybillandkilkennypaper.pdf

Castle, Emery N., et Bruce A. Weber. 2004. ***Policy and Place: Requirements of a Successful Place-Based Policy.***
www.rupri.org/ruralPolicy/publications/P2004-2.pdf

Ces quatre documents renouent avec les débats de longue date portant sur les mérites relatifs des politiques axées sur la dimension locale et sur les aspects humains. Gyourko établit le bien-fondé d'une aide gouvernementale axée sur la dimension locale à l'intention des villes américaines qui possèdent des taux de pauvreté relativement élevés, avec l'objectif précis d'éliminer les différentiels de coûts entre ces endroits et les banlieues qui les entourent. Les coûts plus élevés dans ces villes découlent d'une concentration spatiale de défis sociaux comme la pauvreté, l'établissement des immigrants et le chômage. Pour déterminer la forme et le contenu de l'aide urbaine axée sur la dimension locale, l'auteur propose de procéder à une « vérification urbaine ». La vérification permettrait de mesurer les coûts des fardeaux que les villes absorbent au nom du reste du pays, de répartir ces coûts avec plus d'efficience entre l'ensemble des citoyens et d'offrir aux gouvernements municipaux une structure d'incitations en vue d'utiliser les ressources plus efficacement.

Partridge et Rickman ont constaté que, pendant les quatre dernières décennies, près de 400 comtés américains avaient affiché des taux de pauvreté dépassant les 20 pour

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

cent. En utilisant une diversité de techniques de régression, y compris une analyse avec pondération géographique, ils ont observé que la croissance de l'emploi à l'échelle locale contribue notamment à réduire la pauvreté dans les comtés touchés par une pauvreté persistante. Ils ont aussi constaté que les comtés aux prises avec une pauvreté persistante n'éprouvent pas d'effets de déversement nuisibles plus nombreux en provenance de leurs comtés voisins et qu'il existe d'importantes différences géographiques en ce qui concerne le « mécanisme de détermination de la pauvreté ». Pour ces raisons, les auteurs concluent que le développement économique axé sur la dimension locale a un rôle potentiel à jouer dans la réduction de la pauvreté.

Kraybill et Kilkenny analysent le rôle de la « localité » dans les théories de la croissance économique classiques, néoclassiques et modernes, et ils présentent des arguments en faveur et à l'encontre de politiques de développement rural axées sur la dimension locale. Après avoir rappelé qu'il n'est pas facile de trouver le juste milieu dans l'importance à accorder aux dimensions géographiques et humaines dans les analyses du développement rural, les auteurs identifient des cas précis d'inefficacité du marché qui donnent une solide justification au recours à des politiques axées sur la dimension locale. Entre autres, ils font état de situations en vertu desquelles des collectivités rurales font face à d'importants changements économiques, tandis que les « entrepreneurs locaux » cherchent à se rééquiper ou à se moderniser. Ces investissements ciblés peuvent avoir d'importants effets de propagation dans la localité.

Castle et Weber présentent un cadre pour la formulation de politiques axées sur la dimension locale en s'appuyant sur près de deux décennies de recherches et d'évaluation aux États-Unis. Il est essentiel de connaître trois choses au sujet de la localité : son emplacement géographique, sa densité de population, et son histoire. À partir de ce fondement, les auteurs identifient les composantes de base des politiques, y compris les unités de prise de décisions intermédiaires nécessaires pour assurer l'autonomie locale, les différentes formes de capital et d'atouts qui caractérisent la localité et la mesure dans laquelle le gouvernement local peut représenter adéquatement les communautés d'intérêts en cause. Ils illustrent les enjeux à l'aide d'études de cas portant sur la Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition et la réforme de l'aide sociale.

Barraket, Josephine. 2005. *Communities of Place.* Griffith Review.
www3.griffith.edu.au/01/griffithreview/past_editions.php?id=25

Lupton, Ruth. 2003. *"Neighbourhood Effects": Can We Measure Them and Does It Matter?* CASE Paper 73, London School of Economics.

Collaborative Economics. 1999. *Innovative Regions: The Importance of Place and Networks in the Innovative Economy.*
www.coecon.com/publications/InnovativeRegions.pdf

Florida, Richard. *Place and the New Economy*. Sustainable Pittsburgh Lecture Series.
www.heinz.cmu.edu/~florida/pages/new_economy/quality_place.pdf

urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus

Ces quatre articles présentent divers arguments pour évaluer « la différence que le lieu peut faire » sur le plan du bien-être économique et collectif. Barraket présente une analyse de l'usage inconsidéré que l'on fait de la « communauté » dans un large segment du discours contemporain sur les politiques. Elle soutient que la plupart des problèmes communautaires trouvent leurs origines dans des « enjeux structurels de portée plus vaste » qui ont une incidence sur les intervenants locaux et gênent leurs mouvement, et que, de plus, « les communautés géographiques » sont en fait des endroits diversifiés et dotés de leur propre dynamique de pouvoirs qui peuvent privilégier certaines voix. Pour les responsables des politiques, le défi consiste à s'attaquer aux inégalités structurelles, tant dans les communautés qu'à une échelle plus vaste.

Lupton procède à une revue critique de la recherche sur les effets des externalités de voisinage sur les résultats individuels. En reconnaissant les controverses et les incertitudes qui entourent la notion des « externalités de voisinage », Lupton soutient que des politiques géographiquement ciblées demeurent importantes sur le plan de l'équité et dans le contexte de la mise en application efficace de programmes. Elle préconise une collaboration plus étroite entre les chercheurs orientés vers les travaux qualitatifs et quantitatifs afin de parvenir à mieux comprendre les relations de causalité entre les mécanismes à l'œuvre dans les quartiers.

Le groupe Collaborative Economics a examiné les questions de la localité et des réseaux dans l'optique de l'innovation économique plutôt que sous l'angle du développement social. Les auteurs soutiennent que l'innovation est enracinée dans des réseaux locaux et régionaux qui relient les atouts, permettent l'apprentissage par essai et erreur, et privilégient les contacts en face-à-face. Des études de cas sont mises en relief concernant plusieurs villes américaines innovatrices. Les auteurs identifient quatre pierres angulaires de l'innovation régionale : les atouts, les réseaux, la culture et la collectivité. Dix principes d'action sont énoncés en s'appuyant sur l'idée que l'innovation est un processus social et qu'elle possède aussi une dimension locale.

Florida s'intéresse aux liens entre la localité et l'innovation économique. Il introduit la notion de « qualité de la localité », en soutenant qu'elle est importante tant comme une source d'identité dans la nouvelle économie qu'en tant que moyen pour conceptualiser le milieu urbain. En insistant sur le fait que la qualité de la localité s'étend au-delà de la création d'incubateurs de haute technologie, Florida décrit plusieurs priorités pour les leaders des villes, y compris la préservation des quartiers, la promotion de la diversité, l'épanouissement d'une culture de quartier dynamique et l'intégration des établissements d'enseignement au tissu urbain.

Burton, Paul, Jacqui Croft, Annette Hastings, Tom Slater, Robina Goodlad, Jo Abbott, et Geraldine Macdonald. 2004. *What Works in Community Involvement in Area-Based Initiatives? A Systematic Review of the Literature*. Home Office, Royaume-Uni.
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/rdsolr5304.pdf

Smith, Gillian. 1999. *Area-Based Initiatives: The Rationale and Options for Area Targeting.*
sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper25.pdf

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Greenbaum, Robert T. et Daniele Bondonio. 2004. *Losing Focus: A Comparative Evaluation of Spatially Targeted Economic Revitalization Programs in the US and the EU*.
www.prova.org/Doc/Paper_Bondonio_Greenbaum.doc

Katz, Bruce. 2004. *Neighborhoods of Choice and Connection: The Evolution of American Neighborhood Policy and What It Means for the United Kingdom.* Brookings Institution.
www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20040713_katz.htm

Ces quatre documents mettent en perspective des aspects de l'approche européenne concernant l'élaboration de politiques axées sur la dimension locale. Burton et ses collègues analysent les résultats de la recherche sur l'efficacité de la participation communautaire à des initiatives axées sur la dimension locale. Ils indiquent que la participation communautaire à des initiatives de cette nature s'est accrue ces dernières années dans le but de renforcer la cohésion sociale, la prestation de services et les droits de citoyenneté. Ils examinent les techniques utilisées pour stimuler la participation communautaire et les difficultés que suscitent la représentation et la participation. Parmi leurs conclusions figurent le besoin d'obtenir des résultats plus tangibles de la participation communautaire, l'importance des conditions locales en raison de l'influence qu'elles exercent sur la forme de participation et la nécessité de soutenir la gouvernance et la formation.

Smith examine le bien-fondé et la croissance des initiatives axées sur la dimension locale en Grande-Bretagne. En s'appuyant sur la nécessité de procéder à des interventions ciblées, elle préconise d'établir un lien plus étroit entre les approches axées sur la dimension locale et les « principaux programmes » au niveau national, étant donné le caractère limité de ces approches et le fait qu'elles n'atteignent qu'une minorité des démunis. Elle conclut qu'un rôle important pour les programmes locaux est celui de faciliter le développement de stratégies innovatrices qui pourront éventuellement être incorporées aux grands courants des politiques pour l'ensemble du pays. Elle détermine aussi des orientations pour des recherches futures, comme la création de données pour des zones restreintes et l'étude des effets de déplacements possibles que peuvent susciter des initiatives axées sur des localités.

Greenbaum et Bondonio se demandent si des initiatives géographiquement ciblées « peuvent maintenir leur point de mire strictement sur des localités très démunies ». En faisant appel à un modèle économétrique, ils ont procédé à une analyse comparative entre les programmes axés sur des localités dans le cadre des American Empowerment Zones et les programmes urbains établis en vertu de l'Objectif 2 de l'Union européenne. Ils concluent que, même si les deux programmes avaient pour cible au départ des zones dans un très profond marasme, les désignations faites dans les étapes subséquentes ont eu pour effet d'étendre considérablement la portée des programmes, ce qui s'est traduit par un ciblage beaucoup moins précis. Selon l'interprétation des auteurs, les changements apportés aux programmes furent motivés par des considérations politiques; ils proposent donc d'entreprendre d'autres recherches pour évaluer l'impact de cette couverture plus vaste des programmes sur les zones dans le marasme qui furent ciblées au départ.

L'analyse des politiques axées sur la dimension locale faite par Katz a comme point

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

de mire les politiques de quartiers mises en place depuis les années 60 aux États-Unis et au Royaume-Uni. Il délimite trois volets distincts des politiques de quartiers (amélioration des quartiers, expansion des possibilités et transformation des quartiers) et il examine les points forts et les limites de chacun des volets. Il élabore ensuite un nouveau paradigme des quartiers à l'intention des artisans des politiques des deux côtés de l'Atlantique en vue d'attirer des résidants de toutes les strates, tout en les reliant aux possibilités économiques et éducationnelles.

Germain, Annick, et Philippe Estèbe (dir.). 2004. « Le territoire, instrument providentiel de l'État social ». *Lien social et Politiques* N° 52 (automne).
www.erudit.org/revue/lsp/2004/v/n52/

Cette collection d'articles traitant des politiques territoriales, examine dans un premier temps comment l'équité territoriale n'est pas toujours compatible avec l'équité sociale (Estèbe), ensuite sa mise en place dans deux domaines de l'action publique (l'éducation avec Buisson-Fenet et la santé avec Schweyer), pour enfin questionner, de façon forte, cette obsession du territoire (Davezies).

Dans un deuxième temps, les auteurs s'attardent sur un territoire qui incarne particulièrement bien l'évolution de l'action publique dans la gestion du social et plus particulièrement la lutte contre la pauvreté et l'exclusion, alias le quartier et ses qualificatifs (« difficile », « ciblé », « sensible »…), et ce, dans différents contextes nationaux incarnant des régimes sociaux parfois fort différents (Baillergeau, Augustin et Montané, Séguin et Divay, Kirszbaum).

Ensuite, le dernier groupe d'articles se concerne avec ce qui se passe du côté de la société civile (Germain, Morin et Sénécal, Gulian, Boudreau, Fontan et Klein), tant en France qu'au Québec et aux États-Unis. Le tour d'horizon est complété par un essai sur la régulation territoriale (Proulx) dans la tradition des sciences régionales, qui sont d'une certaine manière issues de ce virage territorial.

La conclusion générale de ce numéro pourrait être celle-ci : le territoire est bel et bien devenu, depuis vingt ans, un instrument protéiforme de l'État social, souvent à l'interface de l'administration et des sociétés locales. En ce sens, il constitue un instrument intéressant pour les politiques sociales et sanitaires qui interagissent avec les groupes sociaux et les individus. En revanche, il n'est pas un bon instrument pour traiter de l'allocation des ressources et de la redistribution : celles-ci doivent demeurer, le plus possible, « aveugles au territoire », autrement dit universelles, et sensibles aux situations sociales des individus, des familles ou (s'agissant de l'école) des établissements.

Au final, la plupart des articles s'accordent pour souligner un même risque : celui que les politiques de redistribution s'alignent sur une lecture de plus en plus territoriale du social, au détriment des politiques a-territoriales, dont l'efficacité demeure très forte dans la réduction de la pauvreté et le maintien des solidarités sociales.

Quoi de neuf ?

À la librairie

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Dreier, Peter, John Mollenkopft, et Todd Swanstrom. 2005. *Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-First Century.* Lawrence: Presses de l'Université du Kansas, 2ème édition, édition révisée.

Cet ouvrage vise à démontrer comment l'inégalité et l'endroit sont des facteurs qui sont intimement liés dans les villes américaines. Les auteurs soutiennent que les politiques publiques jouent un rôle important en contribuant à façonner la ségrégation sociale et spatiale et ils proposent une stratégie politique et un programme stratégique pour modifier le caractère des centres métropolitains.

OCDE. 2003. *The Future of Rural Policy: From Sectoral to Place-Based Policies in Rural Areas.* Paris.

Ce volume retrace des changements significatifs qui se sont produits au niveau de l'élaboration des politiques rurales pendant les deux dernières décennies. On y soutient que le fait de passer de politiques sectorielles à des politiques axées sur la dimension locale permet de reconnaître l'importance d'initiatives qui proviennent de la base, l'interdépendance du développement économique et social, et la nécessité de faire participer les intervenants locaux à toutes les étapes du processus d'élaboration des politiques.

Taylor, Marilyn. 2003. *Public Policy in the Community*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cet ouvrage examine de quelle façon des notions comme la communauté, la participation et le capital social ont été utilisés dans les débats sur les politiques et le développement depuis les années 60. Taylor appuie l'idée de placer la communauté au centre des politiques publiques mais elle insiste sur la nécessité d'une compréhension approfondie des transformations institutionnelles et politiques en cause.

Cars, Goran, Patsy Healey, Madanipour Ali, et Claudio de Magalhes. 2002. *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity, and Social Milieux*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ce recueil de textes présente un cadre conceptuel axé sur la dimension locale pour la gouvernance urbaine et les politiques publiques, ainsi qu'une série d'études de cas qui illustrent la dynamique dans différentes localités. On y conclut qu'à l'ère de la mondialisation, le lieu et le territoire deviennent un « point de mire pour l'intégration ».

Colloques et événements

International Making Cities Livable. **"43rd International Making Cities Livable Conference on True Urbanism and the European Town Square."** 20-24 juin, 2005. Venise, Italie.
www.livablecities.org/43ConfVenice.htm

3rd Annual Competitive Cities Conference. **"Performance Measurement of Federal, Provincial, Muncipal Initiatives in Urban Economic Development."** 21-

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

23 juin 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.federatedpress.com/products/conferences/CompetitiveCities/frameset.htm

Canadian Urban Institute. **“re.THINK re.INVENT re.URBANIZE: Seizing Opportunity in Urban Development.”** 22-23 juin 2005. Kitchener, Ontario.
www.canurb.com/events/event_details.php?id=114

Université de Manchester. **“Visualizing the City.”** 26-28 juin 2005. Manchester, Angleterre.
www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/subjectareas/drama/events/visualisingthecity/

Community Development Society. **“Linking Community Development Practice to Public Policy: Does Practice Inform Public Policy? Does Public Policy Promote Creative Practice?”** 26-29 juin 2005. Baltimore, Maryland.
www.comm-dev.org/

Urban Land Institute. **“Developing Green: The Case for High-Performance Buildings and Sustainable Development.”** 28-29 juin 2005. Washington, DC.
www.uli.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Conferences&CONTENTID=21576&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm

Troisième Forum mondial de la Ville. **“Rendez-vous international des responsables politiques et des acteurs économiques de la ville.”** 30 juin au 1er juillet 2005. Paris, France.
www.worldcityforum.com/wcf/index.php?mos_change_template=wcf

Research Committee, Environment and Society. **“Technonatures 111: Environments, Technologies, Spaces and Places in the 21st Century.”** 6-9 juillet 2005. Stockholm, Suède.
www.scasss.uu.se/IIS2005/total_webb/frame.html

Strategy Summit. **“Canadian National Summit on Municipal Governance: Strategic Sponsorship Partnering.”**11-12 juillet 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.strategyinstitute.com/sponsorship/dsp_mun_gov.php

The Canadian Institute. **“Canada’s Best Cities.”** 12-13 juillet 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.canadianinstitute.com/BestCities.htm

Core Cities UK. **“Core Cities Summit.”** 14-15 juillet 2005. Leeds, Angleterre.
www.corecities.com/

Alliance for Nonprofit Management and National Council of Nonprofit Associations. **“The Communities We Serve: Building Capacity for Impact.”** 14-17 juillet 2005. Chicago, Illinois.
fdncenter.org/pnd/calendar/calendar_item.jhtml?id=97200012

Institut canadien des urbanistes. **“Frontières de l’urbanisme et du design.”** 17-20 juillet 2005. Calgary, Alberta.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

www.aacip.com/cip_2005/index.htm

Connection Main Street Center. **“Economic Realities of Downtown Revitalization.”** 26 juillet 2005. Berlin, Connecticut.
www.ctmainstreet.org/dri1.html

Mouvement international de ville-soeur. **“Conférence annuelle 2005.”** 27-31 juillet 2005. Spokane, Washington.
w4.systranlinks.com/trans?systran_lp=en_fr&systran_url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.sister-cities.org%2Fsci%2Fsciprograms%2FConference%2FSpokane

Nations Unies et Gouvernement de Queensland. **“International Conference on Engaging Communities.”** 14-17 août 2005. Queensland, Australie.
www.engagingcommunities2005.org/home.html

Conseil pour l’urbanisme européen. **“30 Years: The European City – Review and Prospects.”** 8-10 septembre. Berlin, Allemagne.
www.ceunet.de/events.htm

International Congress on Environmental Planning and Management. **“Environmental Challenges of Urbanization.”** 11-15 septembre 2005. Brasilia, Brésil.
www.urbenvironcongress.com

WIT Transactions on Ecology & the Environment. **“Sustainable Planning 2005.”** 12-14 septembre 2005. Bologne, Italie.
www.wessex.ac.uk/conferences/2005/spd05/

American Institute of Architects. **“Eco-DESIGN: Design for the Living Environment.”** 15-17 septembre 2005. Syracuse, New York.
www.aianys.org/convention/index.html

Fondation Héritage Canada. **“Conférence annuelle 2005 – Patrimoine et durabilité : les collectivités canadiennes face à Kyoto.”** 15-17 septembre, 2005. Régina, Saskatchewan.
www.heritagecanada.org/fre/conf.html

Winnipeg Inner city Research Alliance. **“CUexpo2005 – Community University Research Partnerships: Leaders in Urban Change.”** 15-18 septembre 2005. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
cuexpo.uwinnipeg.ca/

Organisation des villes du patrimoine mondial. **“8ème Colloque mondial.”** 19-23 septembre 2005. Cusco, Pérou.
www.cusco8col.com.pe/fr/index.php

Colorado Community Revitalization Association. **“2005 Annual Conference.”** 21-23 septembre 2005. Durango, Colorado.
www.ccraonline.org/pageinpage/conference.cfm

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Urban Land Institute. **“Place Making: Developing Town Centers, Transit Villages and Main Streets.”** 26-27 septembre 2005. Woodlands, Texas.
www.uli.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Conferences&CONTENTID=9428&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm

Fondation Rues principales. Conférence 2005. **“Au centre. Ça marche!”** 28 septembre 2005. Ville de Québec, Québec.
www.fondationruesprincipales.qc.ca/francais/colloque.htm

Artscape. **“Creative Places + Spaces 2: Risk Revolution.”** 30 septembre au 1er octobre 2005. Toronto, Ontario.
www.torontoartscape.on.ca/index.php?Main=57&Aes=1a7b46d161

49ème Congrès mondial de l’IFHP. **“Urban Futures, Continuities and Discontinuities.”** 2-5 octobre 2005. Rome, Italie.
www.ifhp.org

Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACRPH). **“11th Biennial Conference on Planning History.”** 20-23 octobre 2005. Coral Gables, Floride.
www.urban.uiuc.edu/sacrph/conference/conference.html

PASCAL Observatory. **“Making Knowledge Work: Building Sustainable Communities through Partnerships in Place Management, Social Capital and Lifelong Learning.”** 25-28 octobre 2005. Université de Stirling, Écosse.
www.niace.org.uk/Conferences/PASCAL.htm

Main Street New Jersey Downtown Revitalization Institute. **“Promoting Downtown.”** 26-27 octobre 2005. Trenton, New Jersey.
www.nj.gov/dca/dcr/msnj/msnj_dri.shtml#4

Search Institute. **“2005 Healthy Communities, Healthy Youth Conference.”** 3-5 novembre 2005. Dallas, Texas.
www.search-institute.org/hchy/

Recherches en politiques publiques

Aalbers, Manuel B. 2005. **“Place-Based Social Exclusion: Redlining in the Netherlands.”** *Area* Vol. 37, No. 1.
www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/area/2005/00000037/00000001/art00012

Quartiers en essor. 2005. ***Action Research and Place-Based Learning.***
www.accommunity.ca

Albany Consulting Group. 2002. ***Assessment of Evaluation Strategies and Tools for Place Management and Community Renewal Projects.*** Office du Premier Ministre.
www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/eval_premiers.pdf

Anani, K. 1999. ***Sustainable Governance of Livelihoods in Rural Africa: A Place-***

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Based Response to Globalism in Africa.
www.livelihoods.org/static/kanani_NN271.htm

Bakvis, Herman, et Luc Juillet. 2004. ***Le défi de l'horizontalité: ministères responsables, organismes centraux et leadership.*** École de la fonction publique du Canada.
www.myschool-monecole.gc.ca/Research/publications/pdfs/hc_f.pdf

Ballas, D., D. Rossiter, B. Thomas, G. Clarke, et D. Dorling. 2005. ***Geography Matters: Simulating the Local Impacts of National Social Policies.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1859352669.pdf

Bay Area School Reform Collaborative. ***All of a Place: Connecting Schools, Youth and Community.***
www.communityschools.org/AllofaPlace.pdf

Beauvais, Caroline, et Jane Jenson. 2003. ***The Well-Being of Children: Are There "Neighbourhood Effects"?*** RCRPP Rapport de recherche F|31.
www.cprn.org/fr/doc.cfm?doc=156

Berube, Alan. 2005. ***Mixed Communities in England: A US Perspective on Evidence and Policy Prospects.*** Brookings Institution.
www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20050527_mixedcomm.htm

Caldwell, Alan. 2004. ***Re:sourcebook: Planning for Your Community.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/resourcebook.pdf

RCDÉC. 2002. ***Investir dans nos collectivités canadiennes: Programme des politiques du RCDÉC.***
www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/fr/docs/pubs/Programme_politiques_2002.pdf

Cheng, Antony, et Steven Daniels. 2003. **"Examing the Interaction Between Geographic Scale and Ways of Knowing in Ecosystem Management: A Case Study of Place-Based Collaborative Planning."** *Forest Science.*
www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4019/is_200312/ai_n9307995

College of Urban, Labor and Metropolitan Affairs. Wayne State University. 1998. ***Place-Based Community and Economic Development Programs in Michigan: A Report Card.***
www.culma.wayne.edu/spc/ResearchPublications/PublicationsAssets/CEDEvaluation1998.pdf

Committee on Identifying Data Needs for Place-Based Decision Making. 2002. ***Community and Quality of Life: Data Needs for Informed Decision Making.***
www.nap.edu/catalog/10262.html

Community Services Council of Newfoundland and Labrador. 2002. ***Submission to the Royal Commission on Renewing and Strengthening Our Place in Canada.***

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

envision.ca/pdf/cscpub/RoyalCommDec2002.pdf

Craig, David. 2004. ***Building on Partnership: Sustainable Local Collaboration and Devolved Coordination.*** Local Partnerships and Governance, University of Auckland. www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/lpg/researchpaper15.pdf

Devon Dodd, Julie, et Michelle Hébert Boyd. 2000. ***Développement des moyens d'action : Établir un lien entre l'expérience communautaire et la politique gouvernementale.*** Bureau régional de l'Atlantique, Santé Canada. www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/les-regions/atlantique/pdf/capacity_building_f.pdf

Dewar, Margaret. 2002. ***Can Evaluation for Empowerment be Applied to Economic Development in Empowerment Zones?*** Urban and Regional Research Collaborative, University of Michigan. sitemaker.umich.edu/urrcworkingpapers&mode=single&recordID=308467&nextMode=list

Donovan, Evelyn, et Wendy Au. 2004. ***The Vancouver Agreement, Moving Ideas Forward Together.*** www.cip-icu.ca/English/conference/proceedings/donovan.pdf

Dressner, Juliane, Wendy Fleischer, et Kay Sherwood. 1998. ***Next Door: A Concept Paper for Place-Based Employment Initiatives.*** Corporation for Supportive Housing. www.csh.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageID=3273

Fisher, Monica G., et Bruce A. Weber. 2002. ***The Importance of Place in Welfare Reform: Common Challenges for Central Cities and Remote-Rural Areas.*** Brookings Institution. www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/es/urban/publications/weber.pdf

Fluharty, Charles W. 2005. ***Toward a Place-Based Rural Policy: Implications for a Texas Rural Policy.*** Rural Policy Research Institute. www.rupri.org/ruralPolicy/presentations/fluharty020205.pdf

Freiler, Christine. 2004. ***Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter: Implications for Policy and Practice.*** action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=73239

Geddes, Mike. 2003. ***Limits to Local Governance: Recent Experience in the UK.*** Local Government Centre, University of Warwick. www.public-policy.unimelb.edu.au/events/Geddes.doc

GHK International (Canada) Ltd. ***Measuring Neighbourhood Vitality.*** Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force Research. action.web.ca/home/uwgt-sn/documents.shtml?x=73241

Gillen, Mike. 2004. **"Promoting Place: Elevating Place-Based Discourse and New Approaches in Local Governance in New South Wales."** *Urban Policy and Research* Vol. 22, No. 2. www.ingentaconnect.com/content/carfax/cupr/2004/00000022/

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

00000002/art00006

Goering, John. 2003. **"Place-Based Poverty, Social Experimentation, and Child Outcomes: A Report of Mixed Effects."** *Children, Youth and Environments* Vol. 13, No. 2.
www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/13_2/Goering/PlaceBasedPoverty.htm

Greenbaum, Robert T. 2001. ***Selecting the Right Site: Where Do States Locate Place-Based Economic Development Programs?*** School of Public Policy and Management, Ohio State University.
wc.wustl.edu/workingpapers/Greenbaum.pdf

Iannotta, Joah G., et Jane L. Ross. 2002. ***Equality of Opportunity and the Importance of Place: Summary of a Workshop.*** Center for Social and Economic Studies.
www.nap.edu/books/0309084679/html/52.html

Imbroscio, David L., et Thad Williamson. 2003. ***Local Policy Responses to Globalization: Place-Based Ownership Models of Economic Enterprise.***
www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/alperovitz/policystudiesarticle.html

Jargowsky, Paul. 2003. ***Stunning Progress, Hidden Problems: The Dramatic Decline of Concentrated Poverty in the 1990s.*** Brookings Institution.
www.brookings.edu/metro/publications/jargowskypoverty.htm

Johnson, Stanley. 2001. **"Focusing on Differences: A New Approach for Rural Policy?"** *The Mainstreet Economist.* Center for the Study of Rural America.
www.kc.frb.org/RuralCenter/mainstreet/MSE_0701.pdf

Ladd, Helen F. 1994. **"Spatially Targeted Economic Development Strategies: Do They Work?"** *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* Vol. 1, No. 1.
www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL1NUM1/ch10.pdf

Leopold Center's Marketing and Food Systems Initiative. ***A Geography of Taste: Iowa's Potential for Developing Place-Based and Traditional Foods.***
www.leopold.iastate.edu/pubs/staff/taste/summary.pdf

Lydon, Maeve. 2000. ***Mapping and Eco-Activism – Re-Discovering Our Common Ground***. Common Ground: Community Mapping Project.
www3.telus.net/cground/lydon%20article.htm

Macdonald, Kelvin. 2003. ***Sustaining Networks: How Regeneration Partnerships Learn and Develop.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1842631209.pdf

Macfarlane, Richard. 2000. ***Local Jobs from Local Development: The Use of Planning Agreements to Target Training and Employment Outcomes.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubID=251

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

Macleod Institute. 2004. ***Dans l'esprit de l'accord de Vancouver: Étude de cas sur la governance.***
www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/audit/va/va_f.pdf

McGregor, Alan, Andrea Glass, Kevin Higgins, Lynne Macdougall, et Victoria Sutherland. 2003. ***Developing People – Regenerating Place: Achieving Greater Integration for Local Area Regeneration.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubID=543

Project for Public Places. 2005. ***Making Places: 30 Years of Placemaking.***
www.pps.org/info/newsletter/thirtieth_anniversary/

Rawlings, Lynette, Laura Harris, et Margery Austin Turner avec Sandra Padilla. 2004. ***Race and Residence: Prospects for Stable Neighborhood Integration.*** Urban Institute.
www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310985_NCUA3.pdf

Reddel, Tim. 2004. ***Exploring the Institutional Dimensions of Local Governance and Community Strengthening: Linking Empirical and Theoretical Debates.*** Griffith University Urban Policy Program.
www.griffith.edu.au/centre/urp/UPP_RP2_Reddel_Final.pdf

Reddel, Tim. 2002. **"Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: 'New' Governance and Place Policies."** *Australian Journal of Public Administration* Vol. 61, No. 1: 50-63.
www.blackwellpublishing.com/abstract.asp?ref=0313-6647&vid=61&iid=1&aid=258&s=&site=1

Rural School and Community Trust. 2003. ***Engaged Institutions: Impacting the Lives of Vulnerable Youth through Place-Based Learning.***
www.ruraledu.org/docs/kellogg/kellogg.pdf

Sampson, Robert. 1999. **"What 'Community' Supplies."** Dans Ronald F. Ferguson et William T. Dickens (dir.). *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
brookings.nap.edu/books/0815718756/html/241.html

Sanmartin, C., N.A. Ross, S. Tremblay, M. Wolfson, J.R. Dunn, et J. Lynch. 2003. **"Labour Market Income Inequality and Mortality in North American Metropolitan Areas."** *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* Vol. 57: 792-797.
jech.bmjjournals.com/cgi/content/abstract/57/10/792

Séguin, Anne-Marie, et Gérard Divay. 2002. "**Pauvreté urbaine : la promotion de communautés viables."** RCRPP Rapport de recherche F|27.
www.cprn.org/fr/doc.cfm?doc=159

Silver, Jim. 2002. ***Building on Our Strengths: Inner-City Priorities for a Renewed Tri-Level Development Agreement.*** Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

ius.uwinnipeg.ca/pdf/citizenpartJimSilverpm6.pdf

Smith, Ralph, et Sherri Torjman. 2004. ***L'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre des politiques dans les dossiers complexes.*** École de la fonction publique du Canada. www.myschool-monecole.gc.ca/Research/publications/pdfs/p125_f.pdf

Somers Smith, Daniel. 2005. ***Place-Based Environmentalism and Global Warming: Conceptual Contradictions of American Environmentalism.*** Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs. www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php/prmTemplateID/8/prmID/499

Spencer, James. 2005. **"How to Think about Place and People Approaches to Poverty: The Significance of the Earned Income Tax Credit as Neighborhood Investment."** *Journal of Planning Education and Research* Vol. 24, No. 3. jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/292

Spencer, James, et Paul Ong. 2004. **"An Analysis of the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone: Are Place-Based Investment Strategies Effective Under Moderate Economic Conditions?"** *Economic Development Quarterly.* edq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/18/4/368

Stewart, Murray, et Joanna Howard. 2004. ***Mainstreaming in NDC Areas: Evidence from the National Evaluation 2003/04.*** Research Report 25, Cities Research Centre, University of the West of England. ndcevaluation.adc.shu.ac.uk/ndcevaluation/Documents/Research%20Reports/RR25.pdf

Taylor, Marilyn, Mike Kinghan, et Stephen Thake. 2002. ***Networking Across Regeneration Partnerships: A National Study of Regional Approaches.*** Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/networkingregeneration.pdf

Tonkin, L. 2004. **"Place-Based Action in Wollongong: The Role of Union-Community Alliances in Constructing Labour Geographies of Steel."** *Australian Geographer* Vol. 35, No. 1: 59-77.

Torjman, Sherri, Eric Leviten-Reid, et Mark Cabaj. 2004. ***Initiatives communautaires intégrées: qui fait quoi?*** Institut Caledon sur les politiques sociales. www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/451FRE.pdf

University of Queensland Community Service & Research Centre. 2002. ***Evaluation of Brisbane Place Projects: An Evaluation Plan.*** www.uq.edu.au/csrc/lcandsc/media/Evaluation.pdf

Welfare Information Network. 1999. ***Housing and Welfare Reform: Strategic Intersections in Place-Based Strategies.*** www.financeprojectinfo.org/Publications/housingresource.htm

Whitelaw, Graham S. 2002. ***Organizing Community Based Ecosystem Monitoring in Canada.*** The Canadian Community Monitoring Network.

urban nexus urban nexus urban nexus

www.ccmn.ca/english/library/whitelaw/intro.html

Faites-nous parvenir des renseignements sur des textes que, à votre avis, nous devrions considérer pour une mise à jour future en nous écrivant à l'adresse suivante : nexus@cprn.org. Si vous ne l'avez pas encore fait, inscrivez-vous au serveur de liste du *Nexus des enjeux urbains* à : www.cprn.org/fr/nexus.cfm

urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus
urban nexus urban
nexus urban nexus

désabonner