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Metromobility and transit-led urbanisation in London and Toronto

Theresa Enright

Mass transit systems have long played multiple roles in urban development. This trend is captured by the concept of metromobility, a reference both to the social systems of metro rail and to the metropolises they bring about (Enright 2016). A key socio-technical institution shaping modern cities, mass transit indelibly shapes regional space and is an important vehicle in the transformation of the built environment, land use and governance. In this chapter, I consider various dimensions of metromobility in London and Toronto with a focus on mass transit’s capacity to render cities global. Not only do urban rail systems influence local territories and populations, but increasingly they are vectors of global engagement, providing the material and symbolic supports for extra-local connections and flows. Through this analysis of the ‘worlding’ practices (Roy and Ong 2011) enacted on and through mobility systems, I identify transit as a key institution of contemporary urbanism.

London and Toronto represent two different pathways of globalising cities. Whereas London has long been an imperial power and its contemporary authorities have explicitly developed urban strategies to assert and maintain global dominance, Toronto is better understood as a settler-colonial city turned ‘accidental metropolis’ (Berridge 2019) where global integration has proceeded in an incremental and haphazard manner. In both of these cases, however, mass transit is central to these development trajectories and is a pivot upon which recent worldly ambitions turn. In London, transit was explicitly leveraged in pursuit of global competitiveness and was a driver of post-industrial urban transformations. In Toronto, in contrast, transit frequently lagged behind massive spatial reform, which remained wedded to the automobile, and only recently has been envisioned as a necessary precondition for new capital projects. Examining recent trends of transit-led urbanisation in each city reveals transit as a key institution of urban reform, and it clarifies how global pathways and networks rely upon distinct and contingent patterns of engagement and connection.

This chapter has two main aims. First, it identifies the various practices through which urban rail transit systems are tied up in global city pursuits. Second,
it compares the experiences of London and Toronto in order to suggest that the
global repertoires of transit-led urbanisation are best understood as place- and
space-specific. Understanding the contingent political economic dynamics of
metromobility clarifies some of the ways in which contemporary global cities are
being built and reordered.

Global regimes of metromobility

The provision of mass urban transit has become a key policy agenda in large urban
regions around the world based on the widespread consensus that passenger rail is
a vehicle of development and prosperity. Improving transport through the construc-
tion of new or extension of existing urban rail systems is one of the primary means
for cities to manage growth, organise vast and diverse spaces, integrate populations,
enhance economic productivity, facilitate intergovernmental coordination
and improve quality of life (Dittmar and Ohland 2004; Grescoe 2012). In response
to the now well-established woes of automobility, transit-oriented development
(TOD) has become a best practice (though by no means universally accepted prac-
tice) of contemporary planning. The intensified promotion and investment in rapid
urban rail projects around the world is testament to their rising importance across
a range of cities (Cervero 1998; see also http://www.urbanrail.net).

In comparison with other emerging modes of urban mobility (e.g. bicycle,
scooter, tram, gondola), urban rail has an unprecedented capacity to dramati-
cally reconfigure metropolitan space. Beyond their most immediate function to
meet local commuter travel demands, urban rail networks are vast socio-technical
complexes that bring together multiple economic sectors and political institutions
at various scales (Dupuy 2008). They are, as Wiig and Silver (2019, 913) argue
of infrastructure networks in general, ‘where globalized circulations – people,
goods, and information – enter and reconfigure urban spaces, creating, facilitat-
ing or exacerbating spatial figurations and cities integrated into global capitalism’.
Just as the metropole invokes local urban territory as well as the place of a city in
world-spanning networks, metromobility, as a set of political, economic, cultural
and social relations, has this dual character. In this chapter I look to the practices
through which cities articulate global ambitions and to the processes by which
deterritorialised global flows become territorialised and embedded in local urban
contexts (Peck and Tickell 2002; Sassen 2001). As transit plays an active role in
local and global circuits, it is a particularly useful site from which to understand
these power-laden worlding engagements (Roy and Ong 2011).2

Broadly speaking, rapid urban rail is frequently used as a tool to deal with
urban expansion and to manage the economic and social contradictions of rapidly
transforming city-regions (Kantor et al. 2012). Urban rail also plays more active
roles in generating growth, acting as a map to guide investment and to signal priority
areas for development. In the context of competitive global urbanisation, many
urban authorities are seeking priority investment in select infrastructure – such as
rapid urban rail – as a means to enhance the attractiveness of regional territory, to anchor investment and to integrate into transnational value chains (Brenner 2004; Enright 2016). Through explicit TOD, or through more implicit growth imperatives or tax incentives, urban rail systems are essential to infrastructure-driven economic and territorial restructuring.

In a world of neoliberal imperatives, transit is particularly prized for its ability to produce urban rent. Urban transport schemes seeking global city status unabashedly aim to unlock potentials and to raise the value of land in underperforming regional territories through targeted developments. Most prominently, major transit initiatives seek to link international airports with regional hubs of the new economy, thereby projecting the city into global networks at the same time that they dramatically transform metropolitan space. In these spatial and social restructurings, transit is a vehicle of uneven development, the ‘splintering’ of urban space (Graham and Marvin 2001) and the entrenchment – and even heightening – of existing class hierarchies and relations of domination. Tied to the physical and normative models of financialisation, transit is implicated in the gentrification, spatial polarity and racialised inequality that are hallmarks of the global city (Enright 2016; Hulchanski 2018; Massey 2007; Sassen 2001).³

In terms of its concrete geographies, it is notable that this uneven production of global city space occurs not only in central areas but also through complex dynamics of polycentric and post-suburban territorial restructuring (Soja 2000; Phelps and Wood 2011). Keil (2018, 84), for example, emphasises the importance of suburbs in these processes, stressing that peripheries play a key role in ‘defining globalization both through their importance to globalizing economies and due to their socio-demographic diversification’. It is also in these suburban spaces – where transit is not well integrated – that conflicts over transit, and the urban values it represents, become most pronounced.

Processes of suburban and regional transit planning and policy-making also offer a particularly useful lens onto the reconfiguration of governance because they necessarily involve the interaction of diverse stakeholders traversing multiple administrative boundaries. In this sense, the emergence of metromobility is inextricable from shifts in urban politics beyond the state and beyond the traditional territorial borders of the city. Preliminarily, these shifts in politics and governance include development models based on megaprojects and public–private partnerships (Flyvbjerg et al. 2003; Siemiatycki 2009), multilevel and collaborative governance arrangements (Brenner 2004; Pinson 2009), multi-scalar and multi-sectoral ‘networked’ urbanisms (Dupuy 2008), new transit-led regionalisms and nationalisms (Enright 2016; Wachsmuth 2017) and diffuse patterns of contentious politics (Attoh 2012; Caldeira 2013). This leads to new experiments in collective action as well as inter-institutional and civil society battles over who controls, manages, finances, owns, operates and uses transit systems.

If in its economic, spatial and political functions urban rail forges physical connections between and among territories, the extra-material dynamics of transit
networks concretise cities’ ideological commitments to globality and globalism. Underground transit networks, as much as vertical skyscrapers, are gleaming icons to progress and modernity. The messages, stories and aesthetics of metro-mobility convey collective dreams and desires, sometimes in line with, but often at odds with, a transit network’s technical functioning (Easterling 2014; Siemiatycki 2006). Metros are a permanent stamp of urban legitimacy, and the integrity of a city’s urban rail system is a metric of its arrival to ‘true’ city-dom. Real or proposed transit systems thus frequently function as tools to present and project utopian images of a better society and an improved future on which current plans are to be based. A transit network is a particularly salient tool for inward- and outward-facing rebrandings as it promises to solve economic, social and environmental problems simultaneously. Even when they fail – and the tangible benefits of transit-led development are unpredictable – urban rail projects do important work in articulating global and regional development and sparking territorial transformation.

The influence of metro systems on urban development can be seen globally, but individual metropolises and metro networks are rendered global very particularly. Mass transit moves people, places, ideas and capital in ambivalent, contested and contingent ways. What results from the growing prominence of metromobility is not a smooth frictionless world, or the same patterns of mobility everywhere, but a variegated and uneven global urban landscape. An analysis of London’s and Toronto’s respective trajectories reveals the contextual nature of these general trends.

Mobilising London as a global city

London’s historical development has long been shaped by its transport and infrastructure systems. Its iconic bridges, docklands, railways, airports and highways have responded to London’s evolution and have transformed the city’s role within the United Kingdom and in the world. From the construction of the Metropolitan Railway in 1863 through to the extensive multimodal rail networks of Transport for London (TfL), rapid urban rail has been central to London’s development from imperial metropole to alpha global city.

If the Underground rail network has indelibly shaped London’s development (Bownes et al. 2012), the planning of the global city as it relates to mass transit emerged in 1996 with a document by the central public authority, London Transport, titled Planning London’s Transport to Win as a Global City. Claiming that London’s ‘greatest strength’ is its status as a world city (London Transport 1996, 1), the report analyses how transport can best support and enhance this position in the years ahead to help London adapt to changing conditions and maximise its comparative advantage. The central claim of the report is that ‘in order to maintain its status as a world city London requires a modern efficient transport system which meets the needs of its residents, businesses and visitors while respecting and improving the environment’ (1). While the report aims at all transport modes, particular
attention is given to the promises and shortcomings of London’s Underground and urban rail networks in meeting existing and future travel demands.

The spatial strategy outlined by London Transport relies on a number of interconnected goals. These include connecting downtown and suburbs, linking the centre of the city to international corridors and amenities and enhancing the quality of travel conditions ‘serving increasingly affluent and discriminating passengers’ (London Transport 1996, 27). In these changes, transit should facilitate four priority world city sectors: creative and cultural industries, finance and business services, tourism, and power and influence (15). The report emphasises mass transit’s role in generating regional coherence, promoting international rail and airport links, attracting elite users and growing priority sectors of a post-industrial economy. Maintaining and improving mass transit, and urban rail in particular, was identified as an imperative and urgent need. ‘Promoting the competitive position of London as a world city is the top priority for this transport strategy, because the future of London depends on it and because of the importance of London’s invisible earnings to the economy of the UK as a whole’ (23).

The desire and seeming requirement to become global by following this market-oriented development path was further supported by the ‘Four World Cities Transport Study’ in 1999, which put London in comparison with New York, Tokyo and Paris in order to identify comparative advantages of London as well as best practices to be learned from perceived competitors (London Research Centre 1999). Comparing London with other similarly positioned cities vying for global influence, the report found that London’s main weaknesses lay in the overcrowding of the current system and in a lack of long-term vision and investment. This concretised the priorities and values that would set the path for transit planning into the twenty-first century.

In 2000, as part of the institution of the regional Greater London Authority (GLA) (replacing the Greater London Council), responsibility for urban-regional transit was shuffled from the central government agency London Transport to the new Transport for London corporation. London’s transport system was named as one of the Mayor of London’s four key policy areas and was seen by Ken Livingstone (and his successors Boris Johnson and Sadiq Khan) as key to realising success for London as a whole (GLA 2001; Johnson 2013). Indeed, as a regional body the GLA has responsibility over transport, land use and economic development and the three are considered interdependent. Since its origin, the mandate for TfL’s transport and transit planning is to ‘unlock’ development potentials in regional sites while responding to the city’s growth needs. At the same time, then, that the state was rescaled to the regional level, the GLA and Department of Communities and Local Government adopted a narrative about development and globalism seeing world market integration as the solution to the problems plaguing the city at the turn of the century. Successive London Plans (see especially Mayor of London 2004) would later provide the broad development framework for the city based on these values.
Transit was absolutely essential to the various post-industrial strategies employed by London’s governing elites to create the world city. The immense project to revitalise Canary Wharf and the London Docklands, for example, would have been impossible politically and materially without the extension of the Jubilee line of the London Underground and the construction of Docklands Light Rail. While the Docklands held a central position in local and national debates over strategic development priorities, debates over what kind of transit should be built, where and for what purposes were at the heart of virulent struggles over the city’s future more generally (Massey 2007). New transit links were imperative in the transformation of the fading imperial city into a new centre of international finance (Massey 2007) and they invariably contributed to the devastating social and spatial problems inherent in such a transition.

Throughout the early 2000s, notions of transit’s world-class potential were closely aligned with the British urban policy of ‘urban regeneration’, a normative concept to deal with urban decline, decay and transformation through territorial restructuring and welfare provision (Cochrane 2007; Couch et al. 2003; Imrie et al. 2009). Regeneration was a local social and spatial policy, but it was also embedded within ‘the broadcloth of international relations and transnational processes relating to the capital’s position as a global city and as a pre-eminent player in the global economy’ (Imrie et al. 2009, 4). Transit solidified regeneration by assuring the capital’s economic competitiveness at key economic hubs and through jump-starting land and property markets. In addition to Canary Wharf, twenty-first-century regeneration megaprojects such as Paddington Basin, King’s Cross, Thames Gateway and Stratford Olympic Park have been achieved through vast investments in new and improved urban rail. Transit was thus a significant, if often unacknowledged, participant in the neoliberal deregulation, commercialisation and financialisation of urban life that has defined the recent history of London.

The Crossrail, London’s newest railway, is the latest project to cement the city’s growth-first regional and national development priorities (see Cochrane 2007). The vast network (renamed the Elizabeth Line) is expanding the scale of the city while bringing Heathrow and other international infrastructure hubs (including the Royal Albert Docks, also the new site of China’s Belt and Road network; see Wiig and Silver 2019) in connection with each other and with major employment hubs. Crossrail promises to completely transform movement throughout London by providing a high-speed east–west link and by increasing the capacity of London’s rail transit by 10 per cent (Crossrail 2018). Even more impressively, the Crossrail is exemplary of property-led transit regeneration, characterised by the stimulation of regional office parks, retail centres and telecommunications districts along the network. It has been a major catalyst for large-scale gentrification across London and the South East. Building on this rent and realty focus of the Crossrail, TfL (which will eventually take over operations of the line) has recently launched a much broader programme to leverage its land assets in financial markets and to offset shortfalls in public revenue (Financial Times 2018).
Not merely a technical megaproject, the Crossrail has ‘world-class design’ at its heart (Crossrail 2020) and investment in this immense infrastructure has been paired with notable programmes of heritage, arts and culture. From impressive starchitecture to blue-chip arts installations along the central portion of the railway known as ‘the Culture Line’, the railway is generating support for metromobility while reworking what Asher Ghertner (2015) calls ‘world class’ aesthetics. This yoking of culture and infrastructure, along with the cultivation of the Underground ‘superbrand’ (Bownes et al. 2012, 227), exemplifies how imaginative changes are essential to transit’s role in development. A highly cultivated imaginary network supports ideals of transit urbanity, while also consolidating urban identities and selling the physical network abroad. Building on its brand recognition and prestige, TfL has also vastly expanded its international consultancy wing and is becoming an influential global policy actor in its own right (Transport for London 2018).

Toronto

Not unlike London, Toronto’s history can be written through its infrastructures of transport. Yet in contrast to the rich historical legacy of London’s railways and Underground, Toronto’s mass transit system has a more modest history. Urban dynamics remain dominated by automobility (Filion 2003, 2010; Walks 2014, 2015). While a recent consumer-led civic renewal in the city has created a market for Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) paraphernalia and sparked nostalgia for the city’s beloved streetcars, transit – and, in some cases, its absence – is more often than not seen as an obstacle to Toronto’s global ambitions and not its wellspring (OECD 2010; Toronto Board of Trade 2009). Nevertheless, metromobility has not been absent from Toronto’s recent development and it is useful to understand transit’s role in what J. P. Addie (2013, 198) calls ‘Toronto’s growth from provincial city to global metropolis’.

The TTC subway network emerged in the 1950s following citywide battles over transport that cut across urban–suburban and partisan viewpoints on how the city should develop. In its early days, the TTC rail network was used by reformist politicians to support infrastructure-led growth through a Fordist-Keynesian regime of growth and collective consumption. In contrast to many North American cities where planning was sacrificed to the car, Toronto at this time gained a favourable reputation for visionary planning that emphasised mass transit alongside, if not in place of, the private automobile. The TTC’s early planning was driven by social reproduction as much as by economic rationales. By the late 1980s, however, the system had not kept pace with the population or the sprawling urbanisation of the Greater Toronto region and began to be seen as a hindrance both to daily travel and to sustained growth.

The dynamics of the city’s mobility systems – and in particular contests between auto- and metromobility – would prove central to Toronto’s post-Fordist
transition and entry into the twenty-first century (see especially Walks 2015). In Toronto, urban neoliberalisation originally featured a disinvestment in mass transit in favour of continued support for the automobile and automobile manufacturing. When Mike Harris was elected Premier of Ontario in 1995, for example, his ‘Common Sense Revolution’ viewed transit as an unnecessary service cost. Rather than positioning mass transit as a lever to restore growth to the province and support his large-scale state restructuring, and with a decidedly anti-urban bias, mass transit was downloaded from the province onto the City of Toronto, effectively halting the roll-out of ambitious capital projects and regional schemes.

Through what Julie Anne Boudreau and co-authors (2009, 61) call a ‘reluctant global city strategy’, Harris and his Progressive Conservative government were antagonistic toward urban issues yet ‘consistently pushed Toronto as a location for international capital accumulation’. Transit was not part of the framework for urban boosterism that otherwise fuelled commitment to large-scale development and regeneration activity. As Toronto’s version of neoliberalism had been ideologically and politically expressed along the lines of automobility (Walks 2015), entrepreneurial and global regimes of metromobility did not have a strong pull. The somewhat paradoxical strategy of emphasising regional and global competitiveness, while disinvesting in infrastructure, however, eventually proved untenable.

Following the Harris reforms, business leaders as well as reformist politicians responded to the lack of investment, the poorly integrated network and the drawbacks of intergovernmental conflict. Although they differed in aim and approach, repeated attempts by business and progressive city-politicians to implement comprehensive overhauls of the transit system cohered around the need to build new rapid links, especially to the underserved suburbs. The Toronto Board of Trade (2001) wrote a publication outlining their ‘Strategy for Rail Based Transit in the GTA’ in which they saw mass transit as a way to project the wealthy city-region onto the world stage and into world markets. The Board of Trade had an ambitious regional vision for transport, with an emphasis on rail over bus service, stressing the importance of connections between supra-local circuits of transport rather than local transit in its own right. They also demanded a governing body at the metropolitan scale that would be capable of arranging such a service. Transit, write Keil and Young (2008), had become ‘a bottleneck to the very economic competitiveness that largely drives public policy in the region’ (181).

At the same time, progressives under Mayor David Miller put forward a holistic plan in 2006 called Transit City that also sought to use transit as a lever for radical urban transformation. Featuring 120 kilometres of Light Rail Transit (with a rapid route to Pearson International Airport), Transit City aimed primarily to weave a dense mesh of local links, with priority given to underserved areas of the city, especially the inner suburbs. Transit City did have extra-local connections, but its main purpose was to equalise territory within the existing City of Toronto. This plan, however, never received funding and was overturned in 2010 when Rob Ford became mayor. With this stalling, a lack of adequate transit provision is a central
element in Toronto’s entrenched urban social spatial inequity (Boudreau et al. 2009; Hertel et al. 2015; TTCriders 2012).

For its part, in its ‘Ridership Growth Strategy’ the TTC (2003) also did not seek to create a new global network or lead the global city charge. Rather, it adopted a ‘defensive strategy’ of service improvements, fare initiatives and small-scale improvements (Keil and Young 2008, 741). Strikingly, in the last two decades of TTC annual reports, there is almost no mention of worldly ambition, global vision or international competitiveness.

The discourses of competitive metromobility, however, did rise in prominence and influence after the provincial government of Dalton McGuinty established a new regional body with significant powers for planning and management of transport in the Greater Toronto region in 2008. This authority, later to become Metrolinx, explicitly sought to build Toronto’s regional competitiveness. With the speculative development and the creation of regional growth poles guiding their ‘Big Move’ Regional Transport Plan (RTP), Metrolinx crystallised mass transit’s role as a driver of urban development and verified the link between Toronto’s regional transformation and global ambition. ‘The RTP will not only reclaim our region’s traditional transport advantage, but also bolster our global competitiveness, protect the environment and improve quality of life. For the first time, like so many of our competitors, we are truly thinking like a single region’ (Metrolinx 2008, i). While Metrolinx frequently mentions international connections, competitiveness and regional prosperity in the same breath, the discourses of the global city are far less developed than they are in London and competition is only one of a number of other priorities and goals.

Overall, a less reluctant global city strategy began to take shape through infrastructure-led growth coalitions. All three levels of government used signature projects – both ‘soft’ cultural initiatives such as arts and cultural investments, and ‘hard’ endeavours such as waterfront restructuring – to drive renewal and regeneration projects in Toronto. The revitalisation of Union Station (the keystone of the regional Metrolinx Big Move initiative) is particularly notable here on both of these fronts. These renovations were leveraged as a selling point in advance of the Pan American Games in 2015 and as a launching pad for a potential 2024 Olympic bid. With extensive design and cultural programming associated with the rebuild, a major aspect of upgrading the station is to convince residents of Toronto as well as investors and tourists that the city’s transit network is a state-of-the-art amenity fit for the world-class city it aspires to become (Enright 2018).

The creation of a new privately operated airport connection, the Union Pearson Express (UP Express), also exemplifies an emerging globalising rationality – and its limits. The UP Express was created to provide high-speed connections between Pearson International Airport, located in the suburb of Missisauga, and Union Station in the centre of Toronto. It opened in 2015, but from the outset plans for the link were plagued with controversy. Residents along the proposed route, for example, were concerned about the environmental impact of the link and
questioned the choice of diesel over electric rail cars. Community organisations in Weston village were also concerned about how the line would cut through their neighbourhood. Residents in Weston – home to many airport workers – were eventually given a new station along the line as a compromise. Despite this, many were not able to use the new ‘premium’ train as the fares were priced out of their reach. Indeed, due to its exorbitantly high fares (especially when compared with other TTC options), the UP Express ran well below capacity throughout its first years of operation. The debacle over UP Express shows the continued disconnections from the world, despite global world-class imaginaries and marketing.

Nevertheless, a more explicit – if tenuous – political consensus on the importance of urban rail to urban prosperity and global urbanisation after 2010 facilitated the completion of transit projects, such as the TTC’s Spadina subway extension and Metrolinx’s Eglinton Crosstown Express, and it prompted new leadership, including the appointment of Andy Byford (formerly of TfL) as CEO of the TTC in 2011. New flagship stations along the Spadina extension and elite art, architectural and design features announced an era defined by ambitious vision. Despite ongoing obstacles to long-term renovations and growth of the network, these changes appeared to be a bold new direction for a city that is repeatedly criticised for lack of ambition and action (Levine 2014; Lorinc 2012).

The provincial government of Doug Ford has also recently embraced a very particular variant of metromobility, mobilising subways to ‘open up’ Ontario for business. Through a re-upload of the subway system from the City of Toronto in 2019, they have proposed an aggressive strategy of attempting to take back control over Toronto’s key infrastructure network and use it as a scaffolding for massive new private developments. Transit in Toronto thus continues to be a highly contested point of convergence for many aspects of Toronto’s development. Competing plans to balance metromobility and automobility, and to determine the guiding values of these mobility systems, are at the heart of ongoing struggles between various levels of government and between civil society actors.

Conclusion

Mass urban transit is today a crucial aspect of spatial and economic planning. This chapter has considered the emergence of metromobility systems in London and Toronto and the way that mass transit is bound up with worlding practices. Through attention to urban rail infrastructures as complex social systems, it has argued that transit mediates global and local connections and is the structure whereby internal space comes to align with the role of cities in the global economy. Moreover, as metromobility systems are extensive and topological, these cities cannot be thought of as isolated from one another but must be seen as part of the same networks of personnel, corporations and ideological agendas. The comparison between Toronto and London is not a story of standardisation, nor is it offered to
claim either city as a ‘success’ or ‘failure’ along a given pathway to global city status. Rather, these cases demonstrate the varied and ambivalent functions of transit in global urban development.

Notes

1. By metromobility I refer primarily to mobility systems (Urry 2007) centred on metros (or subways) and rapid passenger urban rail (including commuter trains and light rail transit). In the North Atlantic, metromobility is emerging alongside and often in competition with the dominant system of automobility.

2. Urban rail systems are involved in worlding processes insofar as they comprise what Roy and Ong (2011, 312) describe as ‘practice[s] of centering, of generating and harnessing global regimes of value’. The focus in this chapter is primarily on the meso-level political economy of transit-led urbanisation, but this is understood to be embedded within a broader range of world-making practices that occur in and through transit networks (see e.g. Chattopadhyay 2012; Datta 2012).

3. Mass transit today is also, of course, a key tool of liberation, redistribution and democratisation. It is integral to a city’s quality of life, essential for collective urban access and can be mobilised in the pursuit of universal social welfare and collective spatial justice. Due to the networked importance of transit infrastructures, as well as their significance in everyday life, growth-maximising economic imperatives often dovetail with more social and environmentally oriented city building practices.

4. Doug Ford’s subway upload goes against previous conservative policies of service downloading. Yet it gives the province unprecedented control over regional governance and land use planning. The precise futures of this plan and his proposed ‘Ontario Line’, however, remain uncertain and embroiled in controversy.
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