DELACEY TEDESCO

Politicizing Urbanization

The Sustainable City Ideal in Kelowna, British Columbia

_____

Zusammenfassung

We live in an urbanizing world that is quickly running into the limits of possible growth, understood as both urban growth limits and biophysical ecological limits. Debates about sustainable urbanization are therefore debates over the politics of human communities as settlements both on a single and limited earth and in a single and shared world. This paper takes the debates around sustainable urbanization in Kelowna, B.C., as a case study through which to examine the political logics that both enable and limit the possibilities of sustainable urbanization. In Kelowna, three models of development are currently debated as alternative forms of an urban relationship with nature: Kelowna as a suburban community balancing access to nature and culture; Kelowna as a sustainable world-class urban centre; and Kelowna as a global eco-village. These models share an underlying political logic of needing to both embody and police a particular, stable relationship between nature and culture. I therefore suggest that sustainable urbanization is a crucial political problem not only in empirical or material terms – as it concerns the mode of life in which a majority of us now live – but as an uncritical discursive materialization of a political logic of idealizing the "sustainable city" and an intractable conceptual problem that forces us to confront this logic.

Zusammenfassung :

Wir leben in einer sich zunehmend urbanisierenden Welt, die im Hinblick auf fortschreitende städtische Expansion sowie biophysikalische und ökologische Ressourcen in Kürze die Grenzen ihres möglichen Wachstums erreichen wird. Bei Fragen um die Nachhaltigkeit von Urbanisierung geht es daher um grundlegende politische Prozesse menschlicher Gesellschaften, die sich sowohl auf einer einzigen, endlichen Erde als auch in einer einzigen, globalen Welt vollziehen. Am Beispiel der Stadt Kelowna in Britisch Kolumbien soll aufgezeigt werden, wie politische Prozesse um Möglichkeiten und Grenzen nachhaltiger Stadtentwicklung untersucht werden können. In Kelowna werden momentan drei Entwicklungsmodelle als Alternativen einer Beziehung zwischen Stadt und Natur diskutiert: Kelowna als suburbaner Gemeinde, die einen aus-

gewogenen Zugang zu Natur und Kultur ermöglicht; Kelowna als nachhaltigem urbanem Zentrum von Weltklasse; und Kelowna als globalem Ökodorf. Allen drei Modellen liegt eine politische Logik zugrunde, die eine spezifisch ausgewogene Beziehung zwischen Natur und Kultur konzipieren – und gleichzeitig regulieren – muss. Nachhaltige Urbanisierung stellt daher ein Kernproblem politischer Aushandlungsprozesse dar, und zwar einerseits in empirischer oder materieller Hinsicht – da ein Großteil der Menschheit heute in Städten lebt. Andererseits wird nachhaltige Urbanisierung als diskursive Verkörperung einer politischen Logik diskutiert, die die „nachhaltige Großstadt" auf unkritische Art und Weise idealisiert. Nachhaltige Urbanisierung stellt damit ein komplexes konzeptionelles Problem dar, dessen Logiken verstärkt ins Blickfeld der Forschung genommen werden müssen.

Résumé:

Nous vivons dans un monde qui s'urbanise et qui se dirige rapidement vers les limites de la croissance possible, c'est-à-dire les limites du développement urbain ainsi que les limites biophysiques et écologiques. Par conséquent, les débats sur l'urbanisme durable traitent de la politique des communautés humaines en tant que peuplements sur une terre unique et limitée, mais aussi dans un monde unique et partagé. Cet article analyse les débats concernant l'urbanisme durable à Kelowna, en Colombie Britannique, afin d'étudier les logiques politiques qui favorisent ou limitent l'urbanisme durable. À Kelowna, trois modèles alternatifs de développement sont présentement débattus pour améliorer la relation entre ville et nature : Kelowna comme communauté de banlieue proposant un accès équilibré entre nature et culture ; Kelowna comme grand centre urbain durable; et Kelowna comme écovillage global. Ces modèles partagent une logique politique sous-jacente qui cherche à incarner et régir un rapport nature-culture particulier et stable. Je propose donc que l'urbanisme durable constitue un problème politique essentiel non seulement de manière empirique ou matériel – puisqu'il concerne le mode de vie adopté aujourd'hui par la majorité d'entre nous – mais également en tant que matérialisation d'un discours non-réfléchi d'une logique politique qui idéalise la « ville durable » et qui constitue un problème insoluble auquel nous devons faire face.

———————————————

Introduction: Sustainable urbanization as a political problem

We live, we are told, in an urbanizing world that is quickly running into the limits of possible growth, understood as both urban growth limits and biophysical ecological limits. These challenges have led to an intellectual focus on understanding urbanization as a material, economic, sociological, technical, and ecolog-

ical process that contributes to redefinitions and reconfigurations of ecological conditions, spatio-temporal organizations, and political communities. Claims regarding these conditions, organizations, and communities, and projects to re-configure their limits, are intensely political, as they both open and constrain possibilities for living together in the contemporary world. Debates about urbani-zation and specifically sustainable urbanization are therefore debates over the politics of human communities as settlements both on a single and limited earth and in a single and shared world.

Within the literatures tackling urban sustainability as a political problem, it is possible to distinguish three approaches. The first – most common in urban policy and planning literatures – focuses on defining what sustainability is and deter-mining how to achieve it in an urban context. This strand employs a logic based on assumptions about the validity of the empirical study of the world. The second, characterized by the urban political ecology (UPE) literature, uses sustainability to rethink how nature and the urban are produced and how relationships between them might be reconfigured in more politically equitable ways. Advocates of the UPE framework tend to see the world through dialectical logic. The third approach uses a range of critical tools to problematize the forms of depoliticization that result from the sustainable cities project. Some of the most powerful projects in this third strand, such as those presented by Swyngedouw (2009), rely particularly on Latour (2004) to develop an ecological logic.[1] Despite the advances made through these three strands, the difficulties of understanding urban sustainability projects in political terms are greater than often recognized. Any serious attempt must confront the logic by which these approaches make their political claims, as well as the limits of these logics.

How, then, do we begin to develop analyses of the claims and projects of sus-tainable urbanization as primarily and fundamentally political? Here, I begin from home, by investigating the rapidly urbanizing community of Kelowna, in the southern interior of British Columbia. Kelowna presents a valuable site of investi-gation precisely because it does not yet display the features of the 'urban' as out-lined by paradigmatic accounts (Young 1990; Jacobs 1992) and as apparent in metropolitan conglomerations like Toronto, Vancouver, or Montreal. Instead, Ke-lowna is a site of urbanization as it is commonly understood: as a transition from a perceived rural or natural context to an urban one. I suggest that this common understanding of urbanization says more about our dreams of politics, and their limits, than we tend to recognize. This paper engages with the debates about urbanization in Kelowna, encountered through three common models of the sustainable city, in order to gain a different vantage into the way that nature and culture, rural and urban operate to sustain the logic of political community. The

---

1   There is some overlap between these characterized strands, of course, particularly between the dialectical and ecological approaches.

intent of this paper is not to evaluate how well the different models of sustainable urbanization in Kelowna – with their policy changes, bylaws, and master plans – live up to various sustainability principles (see Portney 2003 on US cities and Grant/Bohdanow 2008 on Canadian cities). Nor is it to examine the discrepancies between the formal claims each model makes and the "actually existing sustainabilities" (Krueger/Agyeman 2005) that may or may not result. Instead, it aims to complicate this established analysis, using the attempts to turn Kelowna into a sustainable city as a specific material, discursive, and conceptual site through which to reconsider the ways that sustainable urbanization is being politicized (and the ways that it is not).[2]

After introducing Kelowna, we will examine the three main analytical approaches to the politics of sustainable urbanization in depth, paying special attention to the limits imposed by the logic of their theoretical frameworks. We will then return to the models of sustainable development in Kelowna and work to identify in them an alternate account of the political logic at work. This logic is hinted at by the word urbanization, which means the process of becoming urban or being made like the urban. On this understanding, urbanization as a transition from one condition to the other cannot logically be named without the concepts of the non-urban (nature, the rural) and the urban (culture, the city), yet neither of these can exist except as a result of a process of urbanization. Therefore, urbanization, as a political logic, functions through the simultaneous and constitutive possibility, necessity, and impossibility of the separated entities it delimits. I argue that this logic is that of the aporia (Derrida 1993). An aporetic logic of urbanization constructs the boundary that distinguishes rural from urban, nature from culture, and then generates the impossible dream of their reconciliation within the sustainable urban ideal. The models of the ideal sustainable city that are being debated in Kelowna all clearly share this aporetic logic: the possibility, necessity, and impossibility of politics as a stable relationship between nature and the city and the subsequent idealization of models of sustainable community.

This suggests that debate around sustainable urbanization is a crucial problem not only for politics in empirical or material terms – as it concerns the mode of life in which a majority of us now live – but in terms of the concepts and relationships through which politics itself has come to be defined, practiced, and sustained. A political analysis of claims about sustainable urbanization both requires and enables a parallel examination of our modern definitions of politics as the possibility and necessity of embodying a particular relationship between nature and the

2   This analysis therefore both invokes and problematizes the long-standing definition of politics as the shared public spaces, forms, and practices that determine and sustain the good life of the community; this good life is secured through a resolution of the perceived tension between nature and the urban. Accounts of this constitution of politics can be read in political thinkers as varied as Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, Kant, Arendt, and Wolin. There is not space to elaborate this line of argument here, but I develop it further in other works.

urban, and the necessity yet impossibility of policing this relationship against the unsustainability that is at its logical core.[3] Ultimately, sustainable urbanization functions to both challenge and sustain the forms of modern politics that simultaneously generate the problems of unsustainability and limit the visions of possible future transformations.

Welcome to Kelowna, City of Sprawl

Kelowna is located approximately 400 kilometres north-east from Vancouver, in the long, narrow Okanagan Valley that follows the 111 kilometre length of Okanagan Lake. The valley, which is the unceded territory of the Syilx First Nation, is unique in Canada for its semi-arid climatic conditions, which give the region hot dry summers and moderately cold, snowy winters. It has several large freshwater lakes and smaller streams, grasslands of bluebunch wheatgrass, sage, rabbit-bush and antelope-bush, and high open hillsides treed mainly with Ponderosa pines. When Kelowna was incorporated in 1905, it had a non-indigenous settler population of 600 people, mostly British immigrants involved in cattle ranching and orcharding, as early irrigation of the dry valley had opened up the agricultural potential of the region. The difficult, circuitous journey from any major city and the lack of any widely-demanded natural resources kept Kelowna's growth in check: in 1958, when the first bridge across Okanagan Lake was built to connect Kelowna on the east bank to the communities on the west bank, the population was under 13,000. In 1973, when Kelowna was amalgamated with its neighbouring communities, the population of the city officially increased from around 19,000 to over 50,000 residents. However, in the last 30 years, the population has doubled (from 59,196 in 1981 to 117,312 in 2011), and it is projected that over the coming 30 years the population will nearly double again, though the rate of growth is expected to decline over that period (COEDC 2010, 10).

This growth has been driven by multiple factors. The opening of the Coquihalla highway that connected Vancouver to Merritt (1986) and then Kamloops (1987), and the highway that linked Merritt directly to Kelowna (1991), has made vehicle travel from Vancouver fast, safe, and convenient. Similar improvements to Kelowna's airport and the development of cheaper regional flights have made Kelowna easily accessible by air. Kelowna's attractive scenery, temperate climate, abundant opportunities for leisure activities, and proximity to both major cities and remote wilderness have led it to experience first-hand the growing trend towards "amenity migration" (Chipeniuk 2004). Kelowna has become known as a retirement and resort destination (Grant/Bohdanow 2008, 122), and while the

---

3   Note the similarity with Swyngedouw's (2009) use of Ranciere (1998) on the police; the distinctions in our uses and conceptions will become clear further on.

global economic recession of 2008 has put a damper on vacation-oriented prop-erty development and second homes, the ongoing expansion of the University of British Columbia's Okanagan Campus (UBCO) and Kelowna General Hospital in-creasingly draws students and young professionals along with retirees (COEDC 2010, 63). These new residents are primarily intra-provincial and interprovincial migrants; however, latest data suggests that targeted economic development strategies to draw immigrants from Europe and Jamaica are being successful, as this ratio shifted marginally towards international origins in the past year (COEDC 2010, 9; COEDC 2012). Still, the population of Kelowna is predominantly white, with only five percent of the population identifying as visible minority and a fur-ther 6,000 self-identifying as aboriginal (COEDC 2010, 18).

Land values and housing developments have increased apace with the popula-tion. Median new home prices rose from $125,000 in 1990, to $180,000 in 1996, to a high of $599,900 in 2008, and then declined somewhat to $575,000 in 2011 (forecasted) before rising again to a forecasted $585,000 in 2012. New housing starts have ranged from around 1,000 to almost 3,000 through the early 2000s, followed by a sharp decline in 2009 and subsequent slow rise to a forecasted 1,200 starts in 2012 (CMHC 2011). Statistics confirm the visual impression that Kelowna exemplifies the worst characteristics of sprawling development: 57 per-cent of Kelowna's housing is in the form of single-family dwellings, compared with 49 percent for the province as a whole; 19% is in the form of apartments (com-pared with 29% for the province) of which only 1.2% are apartment buildings with more than five storeys (compared with 7.9% for the province). Reflecting the rela-tive rate of growth in Kelowna, 49% of all dwellings in the city were constructed in the past twenty years (compared with 38% in the province as a whole) (COEDC 2010, 62).

The City of Kelowna has responded to this exceptional growth by adopting a process for developing and regularly updating an Official Community Plan (OCP).[4] The city recently completed a review and update of the OCP bylaws, called *Ke-lowna 2030: Greening our Future.* Concern with the sustainability of Kelowna's growth is the explicit foundation of principles, strategies, and policy develop-ment. The "green" vision of Kelowna is of "a vibrant city where the agricultural and beautiful natural setting, community spirit, economic stability, and stewardship of the environment enhance the quality of life for residents" (Kelowna 2009, 4). Sus-tainability is defined in the OCP as "creating the best balance between environ-mental protection, economic growth, social development and cultural vibrancy (Kelowna 2011, 4-5). Its sustainability initiatives are focused on "land use, trans-portation, and infrastructure [as] … the core decisions that the OCP is meant to

---

4   The first planning process resulted in the previous OCP bylaw, which was adopted in June 1995 and updated in March 2002 and January 2004.

help guide" (Kelowna 2011, 5). After extensive public consultations over two years, the City Council accepted the new OCP in May of 2011.

Within Canada, therefore, Kelowna is both typical and unique. Kelowna has continued to grow at a pace equal to the major Canadian metropolitan centres, yet is distinguished by its relatively small size and comparative lack of urban development. While clearly affected by the recent economic challenges, it has retained better housing values and better economic prospects than many cities of its size, thanks largely to its incomparable geography and climate and increasingly easy travel to those larger urban centres. In the major urban centres in Canada, debates around urbanization often take the form of debates around redevelopment of existing city property, or about the extension of the city beyond existing boundaries. In distinction to these urban centres, living memory in Kelowna is of a small, primarily agricultural city, with urban development occurring rapidly only during the past thirty years. Despite its unique context, it approaches the problem of sustainable urbanization with many of the same discourses and policy and planning tools as are being used across the country. This complicated context makes Kelowna an ideal site through which to examine sustainable urbanization as a material and conceptual debate over the politics of envisioning and securing political community.

The political problems with sustainable urbanization

The urbanization of global populations and the socio-ecological implications of contemporary patterns of production and consumption are increasingly leading cities to be analyzed as "dense networks of interwoven socio-spatial processes that are simultaneously local and global, human and physical, cultural and organic" (Heynen et al. 2006, 2). In thirty years, globally and within Canada specifically, the "sustainable city" has been widely adopted as the solution to the entwined problems of urbanization and ecological degradation. The political and intellectual project of sustainable cities maintains that because the urbanization of people and of nature generates these problems, a transformation in the socio-ecological processes through which people and nature are urbanized can alleviate these problems.[5] The city is therefore being analyzed and acted upon as "the nodal point for achieving sustainability: it is the scale of the city that is the nodal point for social synthesis and the platform for productive change seeking to realize sustainable development" (Yanarella 1999, 211). In Canada, sustainable urbanization has become the focus of strategic programs (whether government policy or non-governmental organization campaigns); of academic research (in disciplines

---

5 Analyses of the "urbanization of nature" are in particular the focus of urban political ecology, sharing a basis in the work of David Harvey (in particular Harvey 1996). See Desfor and Keil 2004; Keil 2003, 2005; Heynen et al. 2006; Whitehead 2005.

as varied as geography, sociology, political science, and urban planning); and of popular consideration (for example Turner 2007; Wente 2009). Clearly, contemporary practical and analytical attention to the problems and promises of sustainable urbanization react to shifting conditions in local, national, and global political environments and have become a major force in reconfiguring what is conceived as necessary and possible politics of both the environment and community. Kelowna is therefore part of a much larger political debate.

Within the growing academic literature, the focus on sustainable urbanization mobilizes a dual argument, namely that sustainability needs to happen because of global urbanization, and that sustainability needs to happen through global urbanization. It is presented first and foremost as a planning and policy problem: how can we build cities differently? How do we organize ourselves to live differently within cities (see Newman/Jennings 2008; Register 2006; Jenks/Dempsey 2005; Low et al. 2005; Girardet 1991)?[6] Urban planning discourses and practices have sought to introduce sustainability into policy and into the spaces, forms, and practices of urbanization through the related models of New Urbanism (redesigning urban spaces to include perceived elements of traditional village community) and Smart Growth (planning for density, walkability, mixed use, and other attributes perceived to be more sustainable) (Grant 2009; Filion/McSpurren 2007).[7]

This policy and planning literature operates according to the logic of empiricism: the world exists, we can study it, and if our knowledge is adequate then we can understand and influence what happens in the world, including how urbanization takes place. However, this empirical logic leads to an opposition drawn between theory and practice: there is an ongoing reliance on a language of ideals, visions, and theory versus real life, actualization, and materialization. The difficulty raised is that "the elegance of theory rarely survives in practice" (Grant 2009, 29) and "the reality being constructed therefore may bear little relationship to the rhetoric of the planning discipline" (Grant 2009, 14). This inability to directly mate-

---

6   This literature is formed from two converging strands. Those arriving at the problem of sustainable cities through a broader concern with ecological sustainability have been forced to think seriously and specifically about urbanization and urban form, often for the first time (Keil 2005). Following the Brundtland Report and the UN Habitat meetings, this literature defines urban sustainability in social, ecological, and economic terms, leading to the commonly cited "triple bottom line" evaluation (Yanarella 1999). On the other hand, those who begin from a professional-technical focus on urban planning investigate what planning for sustainability would look like.

7   Whatever the analytical distinctions, there is a frequent tendency in planning and policy debates, and even in academic literature, to align specifically environmental or ecological sustainability, "triple bottom line" sustainability, Smart Growth, and New Urbanism as variants or even synonyms (Grant 2009, 13). In both Smart Growth and New Urbanism, the concern with sustainability often arises via the more specific concerns over the different social, economic, and environmental problems associated with both suburban sprawl and decaying urban centres, rather than sustainability thought in global terms.

rialize the theoretical ideal into the world around us is taken as posing a range of challenges to planning and policy theory. There is a feeling of frustrated failure at the inability of theory to directly guide or inform practice: "[w]e are … in the presence of a yawning gap between proponents of change, who express themselves in political discourse, books, articles, and plans, and the remarkably stubborn nature of urban development" (Filion/McSpurren 2007, 502). This frustration hints at the continued reliance on the belief that there is a direct path that can be travelled back and forth between theory and practice, conceived as distinct. However, this shared sense of frustration is not the proof of failure of a task that can be accomplished, but rather an encounter with the limits of the logic that underlies this analytical approach.

The related distinction between *a priori* and *a posteriori* forms of theoretical work makes a similar claim about the necessary relationship between abstract reason and empirical observation: can we develop models of the sustainable city in the abstract, using reason alone? Alternately, can we understand the sustainable city purely from empirical observation of "actually existing sustainabilities" (Krueger/Agyeman 2005, 413)? Krueger and Agyeman make the critical suggestion that "each 'perspective' [sustainability, smart growth, and environmental justice] requires certain commitments that frame how one might view of sustainability *a priori* [sic]. Our approach, in contrast, seeks to build on these insights yet expand them so we can begin seeing sustainability in practices outside these theoretical frames" (Krueger/Agyeman 2005, 413). In other words, Krueger and Agyeman draw a distinction between *a priori* theoretical frames and *a posteriori* observation of practices. Despite their attempt to invert the focus of much of the policy and planning literature, this division between the theoretical realm and the experience of the sensible world repeats the conceptual boundary between cultural practices and a material world based in sensible nature.

Rather than focus on models or practices of sustainability, the urban political ecology (UPE) approach attempts to politicize the conceptual and material processes through which nature and cities are defined and produced as both distinct and interrelated. UPE grounds itself on a theoretical framework whereby the social and material worlds are dialectically coproduced through human labour. This has enabled UPE to offer a "critical understanding of urban environments [that reveals the] historic power relations that structure socio-ecological change and the production of nature, and links urban metabolisms with the circulation of capital and the broader political economy" (Grove 2009, 209). This framework enables researchers to connect the material production of specific urban environments to political questions of structures of (in)equality and governance in a way that most of the policy and planning literature fully avoids. Thus Keil argues that "[t]he ways in which we regulate and govern ourselves, and the urban-nature relationships that sustain our cities, are largely matters of the political regulation of urban nature" (2003, 729). Despite this commitment to politicizing the process-

es that produce nature and cities in particular forms, analyses of politics frequently slip from view within the UPE literature (Keil 2005, 647-648; Whitehead 2005, 279-280). Arguably, this slippage is due to the lack of critical engagement with the theoretical assumptions of the dialectical logic on which the approach is based. This logic enforces a particular structure on the relationship between nature and the city, one that necessitates a political ideal of sustainability that must be reached by overcoming or transcending material and conceptual divisions.

Finally Swyngedouw (2009) works to develop a more critical reading of the logic that enables the politicization and depoliticization of urban ecological politics. Swyngedouw identifies in the very consensus around sustainable urbanization the signs of foreclosure of debate. He argues that it is necessary to identify an ontologically-grounded "proper" political practice that can disrupt the enforced consensus and open space for universalizable concepts of equality and liberty. For Swyngedouw, the properly political requires a return to the *polis*, not as an automatically stable site of politics but rather for the immanent possibility of newly democratized and potentially universal modes of political relationships. Swyngedouw therefore opens an important conversation about how claims to sustainable political community can in themselves serve to limit both political analysis and political practice. However, there are three problems associated with the analysis he presents. First, he relies on the perpetuation of the claim that "true" politics must be defined as an ontologically given category, which shifts attention away from political practices and towards debates about the nature of the world. Second, he maintains the assumption that the urban, in the image of the *polis*, is the proper site for immanent practices, which re-inscribes an idealization of the city as the ontological ground of political possibility. Third, and most importantly, by maintaining that democratized practices must be universalizable to be valid forms of political practice, Swyngedouw invokes an ecological political logic, a vision of a singular and universal form of proper politics whereby proliferating networks of connectivity absorb any condition of difference or distinction encountered.

Given the limits of each of these analytical perspectives, the following investigation of the specific debates in Kelowna seeks to reexamine the logic at play in the constitution of visions of sustainable urbanization. Before turning to these examples, it is important to note that claims about the integrity or stability of these models are always already undermined in material and discursive terms: various proposals within each of the models studied here are well on their way to completion; some are running into consistent blocks that require the development proposals to undergo significant revision; and some have already been cancelled. However, I am not concerned here with an analysis of why some proposals succeed when others fail. Rather, as new proposals consistently arise within each of the three models, the focus is on the constitution of the models themselves: what vision of sustainable political community they promise and how this stability is to

be achieved (in the built community and in the model itself). Each of these models envisions a distinct material and discursive relationship between nature and the urban, yet all share a logic that structures how this relationship between nature and the urban should be defined and secured – in other words, a logic that structures the political claims about sustainable urbanization.

Three models of urbanization: From K-Town to sustainable city

In Kelowna, three models of development are debated as possible forms of political community, achieved through a particular relationship between nature and the urban: the sustainable suburban community, the densified "world-class" downtown core, and new forms of intentional eco-villages. These three distinct models of how Kelowna can reconstitute itself as a sustainable city are being explored and debated within the context of a public commitment to sustainable urbanization and a public process to determine what that entails and what spaces, forms, and practices of community will best achieve these goals. We will examine two representative projects from each proposed model: Wilden and the Village of Kettle Valley as sustainable suburbs; the downtown Comprehensive Development Zone and Central Green for the sustainable city centre; and Avalon Ecovillage and the Bluegreen Living Community Kelowna as sustainable intentional communities.

The Village of Kettle Valley,[8] on the southern edge of Kelowna, is owned and developed by Kettle Valley Development Ltd. The master plan for the village was created by Ekistics[9] urban planning and design firm, in explicit accordance with the principles of New Urbanism. The focus is primarily on developing a form of social and environmental sustainability that was seen to be lacking in suburbs and city centres alike, a "perfect hamlet … nestled on a hillside overlooking Okanagan Lake," rooted in "tradition" and "communal values." Construction on the 285 acre (115 ha) plot of land began in 1995, and at this point the majority of the planned 929 units have been built, including single-family and multi-family dwellings, a mixed-use village centre and one of two planned schools. The community also includes open spaces, several parks, and nature trails. The infrastructure costs alone for the development are estimated by Ekistics at $40 million.

Wilden[10] is a private suburban development in the highlands on the northern edge of Kelowna. The land is owned and developed by Glenwest Developments Inc., and advertised as an environmentally-sensitive community. The master plan, again created by Ekistics, uses "traditional village design" to address "Wilden's

---

8   http://www.kettlevalley.com (accessed November 8, 2009). All quotes in reference to particular developments were taken from the proposal websites as written when accessed.

9   http://www.ekistics.ca (accessed November 8, 2009).

10   http://www.wilden.ca (accessed November 8, 2009).

sensitive ecology" and "redefine the standards for hillside home construction" by working with existing topography, altering road and lot dimensions, and using geothermal energy. The development covers over 2,000 acres (720 ha), with a planned 2,800 housing units at completion, in a mix of single-family dwellings, town homes, and row houses, as well as a designated village centre with mixed-use buildings and a school site. Over 1,000 acres are committed to parks, trails, and protected waters. Wilden is the largest residential development project between Vancouver and Calgary, and, at a projected cost of $2.1 billion, it is currently listed as the second largest construction project of any sort in British Columbia. Construction began in 2002 and is projected to be completed by 2020.

   The two proposals leading the redevelopment of the downtown core as a sustainable world-class city are organized by the City of Kelowna. The first project, variously called the Comprehensive Development Zone, CD21 Zone, or Downtown Revitalization plan,[11] proposes to rebuild a four-block area of the downtown waterfront. The plan envisions a pedestrian-friendly, high-density zone in which to "live, work, and play." Downtown residential density is presented as the necessary solution to the problem of suburban sprawl. The plan calls for buildings that "should appear to 'grow' out of the earth or landscape," yet the proposal has been controversial primarily for the radical change it would bring to the built form of the area,[12] and only to a lesser extent for the perceived attempt to simply remove rather than help marginalized populations within the downtown core.[13] After consultations with property owners and a series of public advisory meetings, the election in May 2009 of a new City council led to the rejection of the plan. An alternate downtown revitalization planning process is now underway.

   Central Green,[14] the second proposed downtown reconstruction project, is directly south from the CD21 Zone. The site, a total of 13.5 acres owned entirely by the City of Kelowna, is presently bare. As sole owners, the City of Kelowna set "sustainability principles" to direct the planning process, which include twenty

---

11 http://www.kelowna.ca/CM/Page1280.aspx (accessed November 8, 2009).

12 Where the tallest existing buildings are less than ten storeys, the zoning allows 14 towers of up to 27 storeys in exchange for amenity contributions from developers. Outside the zone area but within a one kilometre radius there are a small number of buildings from 10-15 storeys, and one resort hotel that is approximately 20 storeys.

13 More controversial still is the basis of the rezoning process, as funding for the City to hire VIA Architecture in Vancouver to develop the plan was initially provided by Westcorp Development corporation, which has interests in developing a property within the proposed CD21 zone. In spring 2007, Westcorp's proposal to build a hotel and marina on a waterfront property within current CD21 Zone was rejected by the City of Kelowna in part due to federal Ministry of Environment objections to planned infill in Okanagan Lake. Many Kelowna residents feel that the Downtown Revitalization process, as funded by Westcorp, is merely a way to circumvent the initial rejection by placing the development of the proposed hotel within the context of a fully redeveloped downtown.

14 http://www.kelowna.ca/CM/Page1336.aspx (accessed November 9, 2009).

percent of the dwelling units designated affordable housing, five acres devoted to a public park, family- and pedestrian-friendly design, and buildings constructed according to LEED gold standards. The planning consortium[15] conducted "stakeholder" interviews and public consultations to determine neighbourhood and city strengths and weaknesses, develop possible site concepts, and fine-tune the site concept that was most popular. City staff recently advised council that to be an economically sustainable project it would have to decrease the affordable housing allotment and reduce the LEED building standard requirement.[16] Despite these changes, the City passed the Central Green planning guidelines as the CD22 Zone Bylaw in November of 2011, though it notes that development will be market driven and thus unpredictable in timing.

The third model of sustainable urbanization seeks to create new forms of intentional community within the city. Avalon Ecovillage,[17] a twelve acre privately-owned site in south-east Kelowna, is being developed by a consortium of allied sustainable planning and building professionals, Avalon Alliance Inc. It claims to offer "a rare opportunity to build from the ground up, rather than trying to change old institutions and community structures from within." The plan proposes an intergenerational single and multi-family residential community and wellness resort, with an environmental education centre, sewage treatment greenhouse, ethical and sustainable businesses, wellness programs, interfaith fellowship and a world art "edutainment" facility. The development plan advertised the business case for capital investment, looking to raise $6-8 million to cover initial pre-financing capital costs. However, the project is indefinitely on hold.

A second sustainable intentional community is being developed by Bluegreen Living Community (BGLC),[18] a planning consultancy group dedicated to combining ecologically sustainable building design with community-controlled neighbourhood design. Their first proposed development for Kelowna seeks to gather approximately twenty families into a cohousing community that mixes private residences with communal facilities for sharing meals, social spaces, guest rooms, and other amenities. No land has yet been acquired, but the vision proposes a community "located on the urban fringe, on repurposed land with mature trees" where "[b]y working, playing and making decisions together" residents will "foster strong friendships and strong communities." The focus of BGLC is on supporting

---

15 These are: BKDI Architects of Calgary (http://www.bkdi.com); Sustainability Solutions Group of Vancouver, Victoria, Montreal, and Tatamagouche NS (http://www.sustainabilitysolutions.ca); Garry Tomporowski Architects of Kelowna, Guam, and Hong Kong (http://www.gtarch.ca); and BTY Group of Calgary (http://www.bty.com). All accessed November 8, 2009.

16 http://www.kelowna.com/2009/10/02/central-green-must-dumb-down-environmental-and-housing-targets-report/ (accessed January 29, 2011).

17 http://www.avalonalliance.org (link not working when accessed November 8, 2009). Hard copies of the site were downloaded on a previous date.

18 http://www.livingcommunities.ca (accessed November 8, 2009).

the development of intentional communities and helping them achieve "social, ecological, and fiscal sustainability."

Each model of sustainable urbanization in Kelowna promises to establish the good life of the community through a reconstituted relationship between nature and the urban, as Bluegreen Living Community makes explicit. While the specific proposals for developments come and go, while some are built and some are abandoned, the claims regarding how sustainable urbanization is to be made *sustainable* – able to withstand the threat of change and instability – remain re-markably consistent. Thus any analysis of the politics of urban sustainability must come to terms the way that thinking about a right balance between nature and the urban is supposed to be the basis of ideal and sustainable political communi-ties.

Aporetic urbanization
and the regulative ideal of the sustainable city

I suggest that we can understand nature, the urban, and politics as concepts that are generated by and bound together through a practice of aporetic bounda-ry construction. An aporia functions according to a complicated logic, and there is only space here to gesture towards how it differs from the empirical, dialectical and ecological logics explored above. Derrida (1993) defines an aporia as a line, boundary, or distinction that creates the possibility, necessity, and impossibility of the delimited entities or concepts.[19] As the condition of possibility, the aporetic boundary enacts a separation that creates the concepts or entities on either side, in this case, rural and urban, nature and culture. This separation raises the issue of their reconciliation. However, because the aporetic boundary is contingent, it is unstable, and the dream of reconciling the two entities that are constituted by the split remains impossible. Thus the aporia ultimately represents "the difficult or the impracticable, here the impossible, passage" (Derrida 1993, 8) between the consti-tuted entities.

Sustainable urbanization seeks to resolve the aporetic boundary between na-ture and the urban into a balanced political whole. However, the aporetic bound-ary is the site of a "hiatus" (Foucault 2002), the impassable space between the constituted entities. In this aporetic relationship there is no possible "unity of opposites" (FitzSimmons 1989, 110), as the aporetic nature of the 'and' binds the terms in an unstable relation that cannot be resolved. Thus the distinction be-tween nature and the urban is not simply given in the world, as a logic of empiri-cism would claim. It cannot be traversed or transcended into unity or balance, as

---

19 Both 'entity' and 'concept' are awkward terms for what are simultaneously conceptual distinc-tions and materially-produced effects in the world. For the sake of written clarity, potentially at the expense of theoretical precision, both terms will be used as though interchangeable.

in a dialectic. And it is not surpassed by integrating the distinguished concepts into a single ecological network. Instead, the political logic of an aporia creates the ideal of a resolution between the two terms, giving rise to a conception of politics as needing to surpass the impassible separation. An aporetic logic continually reproduces the claim of stable political community as simultaneously possible, necessary, and impossible, generating precisely the insecurity that drives further attempts to constitute politics in these terms.

Therefore, the three models of sustainable urbanization in Kelowna are not mutually exclusive propositions. In logical terms, they all express a shared process of aporetic boundary construction. The aporetic logic of sustainable urbanization is not incidental, but rather crucial to the way that politics has been thought as an idealized reconciliation between nature and the urban. The attempt to develop political analyses of sustainable urbanization is therefore continually challenged by the notion that urbanization is not merely a process of material transformation. Instead, the unstable aporetic boundary practices of urbanization constitute nature and the urban as a profound political problem, and the ideal of a renewed relationship between the two, in the form of the sustainable city, is posited as a solution to this problem. However, this reconciliation is logically impossible, and attempts to reach the solution only serve to perpetuate the problem. How are we then to think about the political implications of these models and their claims about sustainable urbanization?

The question is not just about sustainable cities as a problem of socio-ecological empiricism, but the materialization in and through sustainable urbanization of the language of politics as the ideal relation between nature and the urban. This vision was first given life by Plato, who claimed that there is a model of this constitution in heaven, if only we would look to it and model ourselves on it. This constitution of politics haunts western political theory, an idealization of political community achieved through a right, proper, or necessary balance between nature and the urban. We can understand this idealized model of politics as taking a regulative form in the Kantian sense: our practical reason is supposed to show us how we need to structure our communal political relationships to materialize the ideal. Yet precisely because it is impossible to materialize an ideal that cannot be known in empirical terms, politics as the ideally balanced relationship between nature and the urban is constantly threatened with insecurity. Therefore, we need to be able to think about the continuing political stakes of practices that idealize the sustainable city. And we need to be able to think about the stakes of the continued use of nature and urban in relation to politics, a relationship that is structured according to this aporetic logic.

Encountering aporetic urbanization in Kelowna

The three seemingly distinct and competitive models of sustainable urbaniza-tion in Kelowna, when read together, demonstrate the aporetic relationship be-tween nature and the urban that is continually materialized according to a regula-tive idea of the sustainable city, envisioned as a restructured relationship between nature and the urban. The popular ideal of the transformed city – the reconstitu-tion of political community through a changed or renewed resolution of the ten-sion between nature and the urban – has a long history. The contemporary plan-ning models of Smart Growth and New Urbanism have their roots in critical anal-yses of urban development by Jane Jacobs (1992) and others in the mid-twentieth century, which in turn belong to an even older history of idealizations of renewed nature/urban relationships, from Ebenezer Howard's Garden Cities of Victorian England (Gandy 2006), back through the development of urban roadways and parks according to newly-discovered models of the circulation of blood through veins and oxygen to the lungs (Swyngedouw 2006), right to the implementation in urban architecture of idealized notions of the natural human form in ancient Greece (Sennett 1994).

Visions of how to develop Kelowna participate in this impossible ideal of the "true city" (Yanarella 1999) as a balanced relationship between nature and the urban. The regulative ideal guides the desired reconstitution of sustainable politi-cal community according to a renewed balance between nature and the urban. Images of the ideal city, transfigured into claims about what constitutes a world-class sustainable city, are woven throughout the downtown redevelopment mod-els. There is an explicit argument that Kelowna must materialize a skyline of visi-ble towers and urban density in order to have a chance at promoting itself as just such a "world-class" city (CD21 Zone Guidelines); however, as often the injunction follows a more subtle claim about the ability of a world-class city to embody the perceived balance between nature and the urban. Thus the CD21 Zone guidelines argue that

> Kelowna's skyline will be key to its urban identity. As such, building
> forms within the subject area should symbolically enhance the nar-
> rowing of the lake that has fostered human habitation. In a similar
> manner that tall trees line the bank of fast-moving streams, this loca-
> tion, as the site of the genesis of the community, should showcase
> high-quality design of slender vertical forms that thrive on the social
> nutrient of the lake edge, and express the notion of livability from
> their bases to their crowns (CD 21 Zone Guidelines, 6).

The models of the sustainable suburbs and the sustainable intentional commu-nity carry a different balance of the resolution between nature and urban, relying

primarily on spatiotemporal terms. Spatially, the proximity to 'nonurban nature' and the integration in most cases of pristine or undeveloped open spaces embodies the integration of nature, while the easy access to the services and cultural amenities of the urban centre sustains the claim to have integrated urban life. Temporally, the balance is struck through the promise to integrate nature as "tradition" and the urban as "the modern," as seen in the Village of Kettle Valley's offer of a "careful blend of time-honoured values and modern conveniences" (Kettle Valley: video transcript). Avalon Ecovillage, despite its seemingly radical retreat from the urban back into the arms of Mother Nature, is actually closer to Kelowna's city centre than is the Village of Kettle Valley and aligns itself with a range of sustainable city transformations (such as Dockyard Green in Victoria, BC, and the city of Vancouver). In other words, it does not promise a "natural" life without the spaces, forms, and practices of the city, but rather claims to be at the forefront of reconstituting the city for a post-industrial twenty-first century. Such examples of ongoing idealization of the city parallel the perspective that the process of developing "sustainable suburbs" is undertaken with the belief that each "is a suburban community in transition to becoming an urban community" (Grant 2009, 28), especially given that the suburban sustainability developments tend most to happen in places experiencing high growth.

Many more detailed and evocative examples could be gathered, but the important thing to note is that despite the different content in the proposed resolution of nature and the urban into a sustainable political community, the logical structure remains the same for each model: it is the idealized balance, which is achieved in the ideal city, that makes political community possible. However, it is precisely the imperfect present materializations of this ideal that makes a reconstitution of the balance necessary; as the architectural consultants on the Central Green project write, "we believe that engaging in environmental design is not just the right thing to do, it is the only thing to do."[20] And it is the inevitably imperfect process of materialization that makes the ideal ultimately impossible to achieve, which the Village of Kettle Valley both recognizes and claims to transcend, stating that it exists in the face of all evidence that such a mix of the traditional (nature) and the modern (the urban) is impossible (Kettle Valley: video transcript). Similarly, Avalon explains its name as "the place where Heaven meets Earth, the equivalent of Shambala, the New Jerusalem, or what other cultural traditions have called the enlightened society." Yet in the problem that Kant both recognized and fought so hard to solve, there are no "enlightened societies," but only ever processes of attempting to materialize an idealized image of what the enlightened society, the perfect political community, might be.

---

20 BDKI Architects, consultants on the Central Green (CD22 Zone) project. www.bdki.com, November 9, 2009.

Thus the logic of an aporetic relationship between nature and the urban underlies the vision of the sustainable city and the dynamic of idealized progress that is now being labeled sustainable urbanization. The regulative ideal of the stable political community, pictured now as the sustainable city, provides a vision to guide our progress and regulate which possible materializations we generate: "[t]he truth is that this is an evolving process for all of us. … we are not there yet, but we are definitely on our way. Our hope for the future [is that this] … will simply be the way that we build and the way that we live."[21] In all of the models of the ideal sustainable urbanization of Kelowna – eco-friendly suburbs, downtown densification, and intentional communities – we encounter how aporetic urbanization continues to make necessary, possible, and impossible the definition and materialization of particular political ontologies. These models, understood as different manifestations of the regulative idea of secure political community, are both responses to and further instances of an aporetic boundary practice. This practice demonstrates the impossible ideal of politics as ontological, even as it enjoins us once again to regulate ourselves according to this ideal by reconstituting a renewed, more stable ontology of nature and the urban.

This practice of idealization, and its material effects as particular forms of urbanization, has not gone unnoticed. A recent article on real estate development in British Columbia, for instance, notes that

> [i]n British Columbia, there is a long tradition of developers starting out small and becoming much larger…. But there is an even longer one of people attempting to create private visions of paradise: tiny utopias brimming with truth, beauty and love … Many among B.C.'s current crop of independent developers seem to fall in between these two extremes. Yes, the profit motive was ascendant. But no, the developers didn't view the community they were attempting to create as a stepping stone to bigger things, but rather as a life's work in itself (Sutherland 2009).

Such passing notations tell us little about the reasons for and the effects of these practices of idealization, which analyzing urbanization as an aporetic boundary practice opens up. To engage with politics in a world where urbanization is understood aporetically – rather than empirically, dialectically or ecologically – we would therefore do well to shift our attention away from political ontologies of nature and/or the city, and towards urbanization as a practice of politicization through aporetic boundary construction.

---

21 BDKI Architects, www.bdki.com, November 9, 2009.

Conclusion

This close attention to the particular idealizations of the sustainable city that are promoted and materialized in Kelowna suggests that to understand the politics of sustainable urbanization, we must continue to give theoretical attention to visions of the political ideal of a resolution between nature and the urban. In other words, a political theoretical understanding cannot be developed from focusing purely on how the empirical details of sustainable urbanization get worked out in the real world (Krueger/Agyeman 2005, 416-417), nor can it rely on an ontological, universalizable notion of a "properly political" space, form, or practice that could be achieved if only we could reconstitute the *polis* as egalitarian, democratic, and fully immanent (Swyngedouw 2009). We must look to the logical structure of the problem, constituted through an aporetic relationship between nature and the urban and the ongoing normative power of the regulative ideal of political community. Following this analysis, the problem of sustainable urbanization poses three challenges to political thought, which must be taken seriously if urban sustainability is to be more than a reinforcement of precisely the relationships between nature and the urban that it seeks to change.

First, thinking politically about urban sustainability requires disrupting the existing role of the urban as both the condition of impossibility and the condition of possibility for politics. In its former guise, the result of the arrogation by the state of political power in the form of sovereign authority, the city has become a subordinate, depoliticized entity within the discipline of political science (Magnusson 2000). Much of the empirical sustainability literature perpetuates this vision of the urban, depicting it as a place where planning can proceed as a bureaucratic, technical, and professional practice with minimal gestures towards public involvement. However, it is just as crucial to question the move to see in the urban the only form of "true" politics, as advocated by Swyngedouw's return to the *polis*. All such moves in one way or another replay the founding mythology of the urban, being the condition of possibility *and* impossibility for politics: that the city as the *polis* provides the necessary space, form, and practice through which politics comes into being, and that the city is a site for the non-political administration of social chaos. These investments contribute precisely to the ongoing practices of constructing a vision of the transformed urban that acts as a regulative ideal.

Second, thinking politically about urban sustainability requires disrupting the existing role of nature within political thought, also as the condition of both impossibility and possibility of politics. On the one hand, political theorists as varied as Strauss (1953) and Wolin (1960) have argued that it only became possible to conceive of politics – the ability to make communal decisions to change life and affect the future – after a conceptual distinction between nature and culture was first invented. It should not be surprising that this perspective is particularly

strong within those political theorists who have sought to re-politicize the public realm by returning to visions of the ancient *polis*. On the other hand, there are nearly endless versions of the way in which nature forms the necessary foundation for political thought, whether in natural law traditions, readings of Rousseauian romanticism, or more recently in Marxist materialism. Materialist readings of nature and the dialectical ontologies of urban political ecology continue this trend, as does the materialist foundation of much non-Marxist political ecology. The challenge posed by these attempts to think better, more progressive politics through ever-new claims about political ontology is that it risks keeping the debate on the terrain of the 'nature' of the world, rather than on the political practices that constitute 'the world' in powerful but contingent ways.

Third, if thinking politically about urban sustainability requires disrupting the roles that nature and the urban have played in making particular visions of politics both possible and impossible, then it is unavoidable to raise the question of what is left of 'politics' after these conceptual disruptions are pursued, or alternately, how disruptive our political analyses of nature and the urban can be if these analyses still depend upon an unexamined use of politics itself. The urban sustainability and sustainable urban planning literatures both assume common but problematic concepts of politics. The planning focus on Smart Growth and New Urbanism leaves unexamined the dream of uncontested sovereign authority that lies at the heart of the "master-planning" discourse (Grant 2009), and the separation of the social, economic, and environmental that is at the heart of "triple bottom line" sustainability reinforces a state-based conception of politics and perpetuates the de-politicization of urban spaces, forms, and practices (Magnusson 2000). Thus the private, master-planned sustainable suburb might well be criticized as an authoritarian space, form, and practice of community. Yet claims that more consultative public planning processes – such as Central Green – and to a lesser extent the CD21 Zone – are more politically democratic pose theoretical rather than empirical questions: what does it mean to talk about politics in the context of the city? What form, space, or practice of politics is being assumed? Does the move to private community planning, as evidenced by Bluegreen Living Community and to a lesser extent by Avalon Ecovillage, represent a democratization of the authority of planning in the face of unresponsive city councils? Or is this an example of a further de-politicization of the urban, of the retreat from public politics to private strata councils?

Most efforts to envision a project of urban sustainability suggest that it would be possible to construct new forms of relationships between nature and the urban while leaving existing conceptions and institutions of politics intact, without noticing that the concepts and institutions of politics are made possible (thinkable) and impossible (unworkable) by the practices that construct nature and the city as distinct but inextricably bound. What, then, would an effective politicization look like? It is too early to say, but history suggests that attempts to politicize

our contemporary modes of life together will occur precisely at the aporetic inter-
section between nature, the urban, and politics that sustainable urbanization
both constructs and undermines.

References

Alexander, Don/Ray Tomalty, 2002, "Smart Growth and Sustainable Development: Challenges,
    Solutions, and Policy Directions", *Local Environment*, 7.4, 397-409.
Boddy, Trevor, 2009 [2007], "Looking at Kelowna through a crystal ball: An American urbanist sees
    the future in the Okanagan valley", *The Globe and Mail*, first published: April 27, 2007, last up-
    date: March 13, 2009, (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/looking-at-kelowna-
    through-a-crystal-ball/article97374/), November 8, 2009.
Canadian Mortgage and Housing Commission (CMHC), 2011, *Housing Market Outlook – Kelowna
    CMA: Fall   2011*,   (http://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/esub/64359/64359_2011_B02.
    pdf?fr=1334547807062), April 16, 2012.
Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission (COEDC), 2012, *2012 Strategic Plan*.
    Kelowna, BC: COEDC, (http://investkelowna.com/documents/StrategicPlan _2012.pdf), April
    16, 2012.
Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission (COEDC), 2010, *2010 Economic Profile:
    Regional District of the Central Okanagan*. Kelowna, BC: COEDC,
    (http://www.investkelowna.com/documents/2010Regional EconomicProfile_Final.pdf), April
    16, 2012.
Chipeniuk, Raymond, 2004, "Planning for Amenity Migration in Canada: Current Capacities of
    Interior British Columbian Mountain Communities", *Mountain Research and Development*,
    24.4, 327-335.
Derrida, Jacques, 1993, *Aporias: Dying – Awaiting (One Another At) the "Limits of Truth",* translated
    by Thomas Dutoit, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Desfor, Gene/Roger Keil, 2004, *Nature and the City: Making Environmental Policy in Toronto and Los
    Angeles*, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.
Filion, Pierre/Kathleen McSpurren, 2007, "Smart Growth and Development Reality: The Difficult
    Co-ordination of Land Use and Transport Objectives", *Urban Studies*, 44.3, 501-523.
FitzSimmons, Margaret, 1989, "The Matter of Nature", *Antipode*, 21.2, 106-120.
Foucault, Michel, 2002, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences,* London, New
    York: Routledge Classics.
Gandy, Matthew, 2006, "Urban Nature and the Ecological Imaginary", in: Nikolas C. Heynen/Maria
    Kaika/Erik Swyngedouw (eds.), *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of
    Urban Metabolism*, London and New York: Routledge, 63-74.
Girardet, Herbert, 1999, *Creating Sustainable Cities*, Totnes, UK: Green Books Ltd.
Grant, Jill L., 2009, "Theory and Practice in Planning the Suburbs: Challenges to Implementing
    New Urbanism, Smart Growth, and Sustainability Principles", *Planning Theory and Practice,*
    10.1, 11-33.
Grant, Jill L./Stephanie Bohdanow, 2008, "New Urbanism Developments in Canada: A Survey",
    Journal of Urbanism, 1.2, 109-127.
Grove, Kevin, 2009, "Rethinking the Nature of Urban Environmental Politics: Security, Subjectivity,
    and the Non-human", *Geoforum*, 40, 207-216.
Harvey, David, 1996, *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub-
    lishers.

Heynen, Nik/Maria Kaika/Erik Swyngedouw (eds.), 2006, *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism*, London and New York: Routledge.

Jacobs, Jane, 1992, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jenks, Mike and Nicola Dempsey, 2005, *Future Forms and Design for Sustainable Cities*, Oxford: Architectural Press.

Keil, Roger, 2005, "Progress Report: Urban Political Ecology", *Urban Geography,* 26.7, 640-651.

----, 2003, "Progress Report: Urban Political Ecology." *Urban Geography*, 24.8, 723-738.

Kelowna, City of, 2011, *OCP Chapter One: Introduction*, (http://www.kelowna.ca/CityPage/Docs/PDFs/%5CBylaws%5COfficial%20Community%20Plan%202030%20Bylaw%20No.%2010500/Chapter%2001%20-%20Introduction.pdf), April 16, 2012.

----, 2009, OCP 2030 Open House Display Boards, June 24, (http://www.kelowna2030.ca/index.phtml?page_num=1), November 8, 2009.

Krueger, Bob/Julian Agyeman, 2005, "Sustainability Schizophrenia or 'Actually Existing Sustaina-bilities?' Toward a Broader Understanding of the Politics and Promise of Local Sustainability in the US", *Geoforum*, 36, 410-417.

Latour, Bruno, 2004, *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*, translated by Catherine Porter, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Low, Nicholas et al., 2005, *The Green City: Sustainable Homes, Sustainable Suburbs*, Abingdon, UK and Sydney Australia: Routledge and UNSW.

MacGregor, Roy, 2007, "Can We Really call a Town Without a Stoplight 'Urban?'" *The Globe and Mail*, December 10, A2, (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1395719111&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD), November 8, 2009.

----, 2007, "Who Says We're an Urban Country?", *The Globe and Mail*, November 24, F8, (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1387650531&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD), November 8, 2009.

MacHardy, Carolyn, 2005, "Reflections on 'Oasis:' Representing Kelowna, 1905-2005", *BC Studies*, 148, 93-101.

Magnusson, Warren, 2000, "Politicizing the Global City", in: Engin F. Isin, *Democracy, Citizenship, and the Global City,* New York: Routledge, 289-306.

Newman, Peter/Isabella Jennings, 2008, *Cities as Sustainable Ecosystems: Principles and Practices*, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Portney, Kent E., 2003, *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*, Cambridge, US: The MIT Press.

Rancière, Jacques, 1998, *Disagreement*, Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Register, Richard, 2006, *Ecocities: Rebuilding Cities in Balance with Nature*, revised edition, Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

Sennett, Richard, 1994, *Flesh and Stone: the Body and the City in Western Civilization*, New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Strauss, Leo, 1953, *Natural Right and History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, Jim, 2009, "The Great BC Land Bust," *The Globe and Mail*, first published: October 29, 2009. Last updated: November 5, 2009, (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-magazine/the-great-bc-real-estate-bust/article1343682/), November 8, 2009.

Swyngedouw, Erik, 2009, "The Antinomies of the Postpolitical City: In Search of a Democratic Politics of Environmental Production", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33.3, 601-620.

----, 2006, "Metabolic Urbanization: the Making of Cyborg Cities", in: Nikolas C. Heynen/Maria Kaika/Erik Swyngedouw (eds.), *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism*, London and New York: Routledge, 21-40.

Turner, Chris, 2007, "Green Acres, City Centre", *The Globe and Mail*, November 24, 2007. F7, (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1387560491&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&Vname=PQD), November 8, 2009.

Wente, Margaret, 2009, "Living in a Green 'Hood", *The Globe and Mail*, October 3, 2009, (http://v1.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/LAC.20091003.COWENT03ART2019/TPStory/TPComment/), November 8, 2009.

Whitehead, Mark, 2005, "Between the Marvellous and the Mundane: Everyday Life in the Socialist City and the Politics of the Environment", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 2.2, 273-294.

Wolin, Sheldon, 1960, *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought*, Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.

Yanarella, Ernest J., 1999, "Local Sustainability Programmes in Comparative Perspective: Canada and the USA", *Local Environment*, 4.2, 209-223.

Young, Iris Marion, 1990, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zizek, Slavoz, 1999, *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*, London: Verso.