

Policy-Implementation Process in the Establishment of BID Analyses by the Coordination Model

SUMIYA Yoshinori¹⁾

Philip Yifeng CHEN²⁾

Maggie Mo JIA³⁾

Abstract

This article clarifies the collaborative relationships between business, government, and academia in the management of Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). Such management includes all activities designed to maintain or enhance the value of the land and improve the attractiveness of city centres, such as clean-up activities, the hiring of security personnel, sightseeing guidance, and event management. There are many BIDs in North America, Europe, Africa, and Oceania. However, analyses from a policy-implementation perspective are few, and an analytical model has yet to be established. Therefore, this article aims to show an analytical model of the policy-implementation process from the results of a case study. To this end, we conducted both a literature review and semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders. We begin by describing the background of BID policy formation regarding BID in the United Kingdom and Japan. We then conducted an analysis on the city of Sheffield, focusing on the city council officials. A number of conclusions are drawn. First, that BID was legislated as a successor to regeneration programmes for the city centre. Second, the officials of Sheffield city council played roles as coordinators, encouraged the establishment of BID, and revealed to us how the programmes aims changed over time for the city centre. Finally, we explained the analytical model of coordination concept, which we used to analyse the policy-implementation process.

1) Professor at Faculty of Economics, Momoyama Gakuin University, Japan. sumiya@andrew.ac.jp

2) Research Associate at the Institute for Manufacturing, Department of Engineering, Cambridge University, United Kingdom. yc318@cam.ac.uk

3) Lecturer in Economics at Bader International Study Centre (BISC), Queen's University, Canada. mj86@queensu.ca

Keywords : BID, City Centre Management, Coordination, Policy-implementing Process, Sheffield City Centre BID Limited

1. Introduction

Why were laws enacted to promote Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) ? Why have BIDs replaced city centre support as a tool for urban regeneration? To answer these questions, we need to focus on the processes of policy-making policy-implementation. The “Policy Window” model of Kingdon (1984) and the “Garbage Can” model of Cohen, March, and Olsen (1968) are some wellknown analytical tools that can shed light on this endeavour.

The “Garbage Can” model analyses the decision-making process in which it is not possible to treat problem solving as a neat and structured process. Based on the vague selection process of organized disorder, Cohen, March, and Olsen (1968) anthropomorphized ‘problem’, ‘solution’, ‘participant’ and ‘choice opportunity’ and analysed the situation in which they arised. As a result, in the process of solving the problem, the tendency of the decision-makers of ‘overlooking’ prior to the problem is discovered and such ‘overlooking’ to postpone the problem is clarified. Many researchers have paid attention to this research, and its problems have been pointed out (Tanaka 1989, Enda 1994, Toma 1994, Inami 2012). One such empirical study mentioned that the relationships between ‘problems’ and ‘solutions’ and ‘participants’ were independent, and that participants were at the same time the carriers of both problems and solutions (Tanaka 1989). In other words, problems and solutions are brought in based on the knowledge and motivation of a participant, and hence it should be acknowledged that the occupation and status of a participant are simultaneously affected.

On the other hand, the ‘Policy Window’ model (Kingdon 1984) revised the ‘Garbage Can’ model, offering some suggestions. In his model, Kingdon argues that ‘We will find our emphasis being placed more on the “organized” than on the “anarchy”, as we discover structures and patterns in the processes⁴⁾. Kingdon (1984) interviewed decision-makers and staff involved in federal insurance and transport policy in the United States and determined that there were three policy processes in the federal government: public policy, problem awareness, and political opportunities. The three streams were independent, not controlled by a specific actor, and participants were fluid. When these three areas intersected, agendas were set and there was an opportunity to initiate change. In this situation, policy entrepreneurs become vital. Such individuals—who often have expert knowledge, are well versed in political skills, and are in a position to make decisions—are often the people able to take advantage of convergences between policy, a problem, and politics to set an agenda. Policy entrepreneurs work with central figures such as presidents, parliamentarians,

4) Kingdon (1984), p.92.

staff, and others who influence policy, including for-profit organisations, academics, and consultants. The 'Policy Window' model analyses the policy-formation process under causal relationships. However, it is not an analytical model of the policy-implementation process.

In addition, Yuri (1997), Joshua et al. (2007), and Karin and Bjoorn (2009) examined the situation in the context of financial, ecological, and health policies, respectively. However, they did not examine the legislations governing BIDs and area management.

The analytical method used in this study is a model based on the coordination concept. The concept of coordination is considered an important keyword in the New Institutional Economics or Comparative Institutional Analysis (Milgrom and Roberts 1992, Shavans 2007, Aoki 2001; 2008). Aoki (2001; 2008) defines the organisational mechanism of information sharing as coordination, such as 'information collected by each individual in connection with corporate activities is exchanged within the organisation and used collectively'. He categorised the work of improving information efficiency within a corporate organisation. He also shows that differences in coordination within a company make a difference in the competitiveness and productivity of the company. However, the definition assumes a company as a coordinator in the market. Therefore, no individual coordinator is envisioned in the process of information gathering, exchange, and use between individuals.

On the other hand, there is a subdivided definition of the coordination function by the volunteer coordinator. Hayase and Tsutsui (2009) described the functions as "① function to better combine goods and services, ② function to adjust roles and characteristics to create overall harmony, ③ function to create connections between people, ④ function to create an equal relationship between different beings, ⑤ function to encourage participation and participation in activities and organisations, ⑥ function to encourage participation and participation in activities and organisations, and ⑦ function to connect different efforts and create comprehensive power and new solution power." Relying on Hayase and Tsutsui (2009), the definition of coordination in this paper is "a coordination function that allows us to build equal relationships in order to create new solutions to problems that are currently difficult to solve."

Sumiya (2010, 2015, 2016) has been building a model to better understand the coordination process. Coordination is the process by which the coordinator's intention (discretionary power) leads to action (solutions both within and outside an organisation), with a resulting connection. Coordination is the actions of a person who fulfills the function of coordinating relationships for promoting plans from a third-party standpoint. Coordination is a 'work' that seeks new solutions, while being stipulated at the discretion of the coordinator, with the aim of creating 'connections' that build equal relationships as a result. This equal relationship

does not indicate whether or not money is given or received for the provision of information but means that there is no superiority, inferiority, or hierarchical relationship in decision making. The purpose of this analysis is to analyse the process in which someone 'connects' with something (or someone) by 'working' with some purpose of coordination, and a solution to the problem is born. We would like to supplement the analytical viewing angle that was discarded by this in future research. Furthermore, we focus on the coordinator who is the key person and analyse his/her role by 'discretion' and 'intention'.

We believe that the coordination model could be applied to the analysis of BID. The problem setting has been corrected while proceeding with data collection and data analysis using the gradual structuring method (Sato 2002). Data were collected by interviewing key persons using semi-structured interviews. The interviewees were contacted in advance by phone or e-mail and sent questionnaires; during the interview, we interviewed them based on the questions in the questionnaire. After the interview, we reconfirmed the contents from telephone conversations or e-mail responses as necessary.

Section 2 compares the process for establishing BID law in the United Kingdom and Japan and describes the characteristics of the project. We believe that the coordination model could be applied to the case study of BIDs. Section 3 describes the case study of the BID of the City of Sheffield. Section 4 discusses the policy-implementation process at the Sheffield BID. The conclusion in section 5 shows that the coordination model is useful as an analytical method to make sense of the policy-implementation process.

Table 1: Comparison of the three models

Model	Garbage Can	Policy Window	Coordination
Causal relationship	×	○	○
Policy-making process	○	○	-
Policy-implementation process	○	×	○

2. Comparison between the United Kingdom and Japan

2.1 A history of BIDs in the UK

There are various criticisms often levelled against the practice of BID, such as the problems they pose for corporate governance in the United States, the overcommercialisation of public space in derelict areas of inner city, genre refinement, expansion of disparity, exclusion of the poor, etc. (Magalhães 2014, Lee 2016). However, an important positive aspect of BID is that it often encourages multipolar governance and that the mechanisms of BID prevent business offices or landowners within the area from free riding (Morçöl and Gautsch 2013,

Takamura 2017).

The central government strengthened regulations on the opening of large-scale retail stores and created a hierarchical order of location guidance and accumulation to promote and maintain the city/town centre under “Department of the Environment, Planning Policy Guidance Note 6 (PPG 6),” “Department of the Environment, Planning Policy Statement Note 6 (PPS 6),” and “National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).” In particular, the government used a sequential test approach to guide and deter suburban development. However, this change to the city’s industrial structure increased unemployment in the 1980s. The government had attempted to solve the unemployment issue by instituting enterprise zones to support urban regeneration and encouraged the development of large-scale shopping malls and the maintenance of industrial parks through deregulation. This type of regeneration plan also led to the revitalisation of the city centre, including redevelopment and town management. With this as the backdrop, BID took over the area of town management.

BID as a policy was pioneered in 1970 in a shopping area in Toronto, Canada. The shopping district established a Bloor West Village Business Improvement Association (BIA) in the management area for cleanup activities and beautification of the city. It was a project that had received certification from the city. BIA was first founded in 1970 at Bloor West Village in Toronto⁵⁾. Its main purpose was to create a self-help programme to promote and stimulate local businesses. The concept was simple and straightforward: have the city collect an annual levy from businesses; give control of the funds to an elected board of volunteers; and devote the money to improving and marketing the area. Soon after, BID’s system of mechanisms spread to the United States, before spreading all over the world, mainly in Europe.

The introduction of BID was considered in 1997 in England, and a pilot project was conducted in 22 cities in 2001. Thereafter, the BID system was stated in the Local Government Act, and the BID law was enacted in England (2004), Wales (2005), Scotland (2007), and Northern Ireland (2014). The mechanism of any BID is to prepare and publish a plan (mainly a business plan) within 5 years and decide acceptance or rejection by the vote (businesses) within the area. The vote is based on the wishes of 50% or more of the total number of business establishments. Levy is collected from all participants by adding an

5) The Business Improvement Area (BIA) legislation was enacted and became Section 217 of the Municipal Act. BIA is a non-profit association within a specified area, who join with the official approval of the city. Its main purpose is to create a self-help programme to promote and stimulate local business. Browsed in 2021; <https://www.bloorwestvillagebia.com/AboutUs>

additional 1-2% to the business rate. The majority of BIDs were installed in the city/town centre. At the same time, the emphasis shifted from Town Centre Management (TCM) and CCM to area management by BID, representing a more holistic and integrated approach. We, therefore, focus our attention on UK's policy for the inner city.

Over time, many cities began to use TCM and/or CCM methods not only for development activities, such as landmark maintenance and the renewal of large-scale commercial facilities, but also in cooperation with the city council urban development and regeneration department in maintenance and management work, such as cleaning, crime prevention, and tourism initiatives. There was also a characteristic that the diverse operations were carried out according to the area (Otsuka and Reeve 2007). However, such methods became more difficult because of the administration's financial crisis that led to drastic reductions in financial support from the central government (Adachi 2012). In 2011, an increasing number of municipalities began moving to BID organisations, including 26 of London's 75 districts (Minakata 2013). It is highly likely that this transition will continue in the future.

BIDs and TCM/CCM both resemble administrative services and have many similarities. For example, Cook (2010) analysed the roles of BIDs, TCM, and administration in security activities and pointed out that although their exact role varies according to region, both TCM/CCM and BID organisations often play an auxiliary police role, such as monitoring using CCTVs.

Table 2: The situation of TCM members and nonmembers in Borlänge

	All	Members in the TCM organisation	Not members in the TCM organisation
Retailers	69	48	21
Bank/building soc.	10	5	5
Restaurants, cafes	38	13	25
Pubs and nightclubs	4	0	4
Hotels	5	4	1
Gasoline station	1	0	1
Haircare/hairdresser	19	6	13
Health and beauty	19	10	9
Culture	5	3	2
Travel and leisure	7	5	2
Sport and training	3	1	2
Total	180	95	85

Source: Johan Håkansson · Madelen Lagin (2015)

Although BIDs and TCM/CCM share some similarities, there are also major differences between them, especially in members' participation and contribution. In BIDs, all offices share the burden even if they opposed the scheme and there are no free riders. In TCM/CCM, however, member participation is not mandatory. Table 2, according to Håkansson and Lagin (2015), examines TCM/CCM in Sweden's Borlänge; the participation rate varied depending on the industry: the participation rate of retailers was high but that of restaurants, cafes, pub, night clubs, beauty salons, and barber shops was low, which was about 50%. Such a TCM system is similar to that of Japanese shopping streets, where business management is assumed to result in burdens and free riders.

2.2 Types of BIDs in the UK

In 2018, there were about 300 BIDs throughout the UK: 248 districts in England, 39 in Scotland, 12 in Wales, 6 in Northern Ireland. There were also 4 in the Republic of Ireland. Each district decides whether to perform a BID based on the voting results. To perform a BID, it is necessary to have 50% or more of the total votes in favour and 50% or more of the rateable value. According to a report (insert reference) on British BIDs, in 2015–2016, 33 districts had BIDs in their third term, 89 in the second term, and 161 in the first term (Table 3). A BID is considered successful if it continues after its second term. The voting rate was 84.5%.

Of the existing BIDs, the majority (261) are of the town centre type and 27 are of the industrial park type. In other words, the majority of BIDs aim for city centre regeneration and redevelopment. The popularity of these two types of BIDs is most likely because of the trend of establishing a BID to take over TCM/CCM activities, as described above. Many industrial BIDs are aimed at maintenance and management expenses for infrastructure development, maintaining an aesthetic appearance, building a network between business establishments, and so on and are based on cooperation between the local government and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. However, a few BIDs are geared toward other purposes depending on the region: in the UK, five are located in commercial business districts, five are of the tourism type, and two are the resort type (included in the "others" category).

BID sizes vary depending on the region: members range from 100 to 1,000 district businesses, with the median being 400–600. In London and other metropolitan areas, for example, BIDs have a relatively large number of member establishments. The operation cost of BIDs is high and raised mostly through levies, which account for 76.1% of the total income for all 261 town centre BIDs. Levy surcharges the City Council by adding it to the

business rate of 0.25-5%. Approximately 62% of all BIDs levy funds of 1-2%, and about 32% require less than 1%. Levy income ranges from £22,000 to £3,800,000, whereas BIDs' total income ranges from £76,500 to £11,008,000.

In addition, BIDs vary depending on the city. For example, there are 62 city centre BIDs in London and 11 in Birmingham, including BIDs currently under development. However, The BIDs of cities such as Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester, Liverpool and Nottingham cover the entire city centre as one district. The same is true for many other cities such as Cambridge and Norwich. However, Plymouth has one district in the city centre and one district in the waterfront area. Such cities are exceptions and it remains unclear how the BIDs interact with TCM/CCM and government initiatives. Besides, some cities have BIDs outside the city centre, including the industrial parks on the outskirts of Runcorn and Fareham and Morecombe's resort areas. Finally, as described in more depth in the following section, the suburbs of Sheffield have established BIDs as a disaster prevention measure.

Table 3: Types of BIDs across the British Isles as of August 4, 2017

	First	Second	Third	Developing	Total
Town centre	141	68	26	26	261
Industrial	7	17	3	–	27
Commercial	1	3	1		5
Tourism	4	1	–	–	5
Others	8	0	3	–	11

Source: British BIDs (2017), National BID Survey, 2017

Table 4: City type as seen from BID establishment number and location

	Multiple	Single
Centre	London, Birmingham, Bristol, Edinburgh, Belfast	Sheffield, Manchester, Liverpool, Nottingham, Leeds, Cambridge, Norwich, Plymouth, Reading, Letchworth, Glasgow, Swansea
Non-centre	London, Birmingham, Bristol, Glasgow	Sheffield, Plymouth, Runcorn, Morecombe, Fareham

Source: Institute of Place Management "BIDs Map"⁶⁾

2.3 A history of BIDs in Japan

For BIDs in Japan, the pilot project was implemented in 2014, and in 2018, the Local Revitalisation Act was revised to create the 'area management contribution system', which

6) Browsed in 2017; <http://www.placemanagement.org/news/uk-ireland-bids-map-launched/>

will eventually become the Japanese version of a BID. A mechanism has been created for the administrative charge of BID levy on behalf of the organisation. The main reason is that the area management group intended to secure a stable financial resource because of the shortages of manpower (42.7%) and resources (33.5%). BIDs can prevent beneficiaries in the area from becoming free riders. Consisting of the beneficiary from the municipality, the municipality collects the necessary expenses for the activity with the consent of 2/3rds of business operators in the area as the requirement (both the total beneficiary business operator and the total amount of the contribution) in the Japanese version of BIDs, which is a mechanism to deliver to the management organisation. Although it is possible to collect the contribution limited to the benefit the beneficiary receives, the system does not indicate the specific method of determining that amount. Beneficiaries include retailers, service providers, and real estate lenders that lease to tenants.

Local governments need to prepare local revitalisation plans and be certified by the Prime Minister. The planning period is obliged to conclude within 5 years. Local administrations receive an application from the area management organisation, approves it after approval by the parliament, and establishes a regulation concerning the contribution. This certification can be cancelled by agreement of more than 1/3rd of the beneficiary companies. Area management organisations are limited to non-profit corporations, such as Specified Nonprofit Organisations, General Incorporated Association, General Incorporated Foundation, and Town Management Company.

The Local Revitalisation Act took effect in 2005. The objective of this act is to develop a community in preparation for a declining population, create job opportunities, and enhance local sustainability. It is a mechanism that supports subsidies, tax cuts, etc., for various initiatives such as local Community Boards, social infrastructure development, popularisation of renewable energy, activation of shopping streets, the sixth industrialisation of rural areas, and enhancement of medical and welfare services.

The Cabinet Office set up a committee in 2016 and revised the Local Revitalisation Act to consider introducing BIDs. The Cabinet Office has investigated advanced cases in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany have been used for reference examination of pilot projects in Japan. In 2017, the Cabinet decided to revise the Japanese government's Long-term Vision and Comprehensive Strategy (Machi Hito Shigoto Sousei-Strategy), and the BID legislation was enforced into law on securing the resources of the area management organisation and promoting policies. In February 2018, the Cabinet decision on the revision bill of the Local Revitalisation Act, "Local Revitalisation Area Management Levy System (Japan version of BID)," was decided, promulgated, and enforced in June the same year.

A pilot project of the Japanese version of a BID was born from the Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction (enforced in 2002). This law aims to promote the disposal of nonperforming loans and the securitisation of real estate and to reinvest in cities. Targeted metropolitan areas, mainly Tokyo and Osaka metropolitan areas, promoted the large-scale redevelopment of cities by deregulation. Among them, incorporating the Urban Reconstruction Promotion Corporation (revised 2007), Urban Reconstruction development plan, special case of road occupancy permission, pedestrian route agreement, etc. (revised in 2011) were adopted to use the area management method. As a result, the pilot project (GRAND FRONT OSAKA TMO General Incorporated Association) gained a chance to be established.

The Act on Vitalisation in City Centre came into effect in 1998 and the revitalisation mechanism of the city centre (City Centre/Town Centre) was arranged. "The vitalisation in City Centre Basic Plan" was formulated by the local government and approved by the government. It develops business plans, such as the redevelopment of aged buildings, public transportation improvement, event implementation, crime prevention measures, etc., in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and private companies (NPOs and residents). TMO, which was founded by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the town development company (funded by the city), operated the business.

By the end of 2005, about 400 TMOs had been certified. The breakdown of the 399 TMOs established was as follows, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (or the Society of Commerce and Industry) 281, the Public Corporation (Public-private mixed investment) 115, the Incorporated Foundation 2, the Incorporated Non-Profit Organisation 1. The Chamber of Commerce was the largest among them, the Public Corporation is the second largest, and most organisations have been established either. The Public Corporation is characterized by the investment of local governments, chambers of commerce, private companies, merchants and residents. Therefore, there are many investors and the investment ratio of local governments tends to be low.

TMO has no choice but to rely on the revenue business as a voluntary financial source, or to receive subsidy from the city hall or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. However, there was concern that the financial resources were insufficient. In addition, TMO operates under strict budget constraints in many cases, and there are many areas where staff cannot be arranged and town managers had to be relied upon. For example, more than half of the Public Corporation had less than three full-time employees, of which 18.2% had no one. In this way, TMO often had many problems in operation, across multiple areas. Therefore, in many TMOs, the staff of the local government and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry

also serve as TMO staff and in some cases serve as town managers. In this way, the BID system is also a mechanism for sustainable activities for town development companies, such as TMO.

We interviewed Kenichi Hirono (director of Grand Front Osaka TMO General Incorporated association) at a case study in Osaka, Japan. We also conducted document research in parallel.

2.4. BID pilot project in Osaka City, Japan

During the redevelopment in Japan, the barriers leading to implementation, such as a lack of consensus long after the establishment of the district plan, were by no means insignificant. The Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction came into effect to promptly advance the redevelopment plan. In particular, if one designates an Urban Reconstruction emergency development area using the same law, one can receive deregulation benefits such as height limit and volume rate, financial support such as an interest-free loan, and tax incentives of national tax and local tax. Hence, Tokyo and Osaka have been used for redevelopment in which business offices, commercial tenants, and accommodation facilities in large cities are mixed, centring around the city. As a result, even if there is a shortage of funds on hand, the floor-area ratio will be relaxed, and the development cost can be covered by raising the height of the building and selling the reserved floor. To improve international competitiveness through the amendment of the law (2011), more support measures than before were incorporated. As a result, within Osaka city, we have renewed openings of high-rise buildings around Osaka Station, Nakanoshima, Midosuji area, and Cosmo Square station area around the department store as the core after designation.

Osaka City will introduce the BID pilot project in the area around Osaka Station. To implement BID, Osaka City established and enforced the 'Osaka City Area Management Promotion Ordinance' in 2014. This ordinance was the first project to incorporate the mechanism of the Japanese version of a BID. This ordinance was granted as the first general issue of GRAND FRONT OSAKA TMO General Incorporated association (Urban Reconstruction Promotion Corporation). The Osaka City Council signed an agreement with TMO, collected a contribution (28 million yen) as operation and maintenance expenses from 12 development companies (asset owners), and creating a mechanism to subsidize the consignment fee (28 million yen) to TMO. TMO conducts security and beautification activities by subsidizing appropriation, but event management needs to be conducted with voluntary financial resources.

The following is the process leading up to the development of the Grand Front

Osaka. Osaka City was planned in 2004 (Osaka Station North Town Management Town Management Basic Plan) and planning area management was conducted to integrate the district holistically. In 2006, the Osaka City Hall solicited developers and selected 12 developing companies. A preparatory committee was set up to establish the TMO in 2009, and in 2011, the Osaka City Council and developers conducted 'the Umekita area management review meeting'. In 2012, the TMO was founded. In 2013, Osaka city council established a BID review committee. Within the existing legislation, there was a problem in that the levy's surrogate collection was limited to only a part of the project. Events and promotions are to be covered by the BID's voluntary financial resources. To solve this problem, there was a need for the Japanese version of BID law to be maintained. However, the following four buildings were completed earlier than BID. Four high-rise buildings (38 floors above the southwest building, 38 floors in north building B, 33 floors in building C, 48 floors of the Grand Front Osaka Owner's Tower) were set up in 2013. The Grand Front is a huge collective, with offices (236,800 m²) directly connected to Osaka Station, a vast open space for events, commercial facilities (80,700 m²), accommodation facilities (38,900 m²), and condominiums (525 units: 65,400 m²).

Returning to the BID pilot programme, TMO was certified as an urban reconstruction promotion corporation by Osaka City in 2014. TMO has been given a public position as a town planner and has the power to propose the Urban Reconstruction plan to the city hall. It was possible to conclude an urban convenience promotion agreement, which concerns the day-to-day management and management of facilities, such as open cafes and advertisement towers to be concluded with landowners and others.

TMO has become able to substitute the management of the sidewalk space, which the administration has done so far by using contributions collected by Osaka city. Osaka City Council does not support subsidies, but it supports area management through deregulation, for example, by amending outdoor advertising objective ordinance and removing advertisement prohibited area. In addition, the city of Osaka encourages TMOs to engage in businesses such as traveling buses, bicycle rentals, event promotions, and providing places for festivals and events. As a result, Grand Front Osaka had 53 million visitors and commercial sales of 43.6 billion yen for the first year. Compared to the initial plan, the number of visitors reached 145% and commercial sales reached 109%.

3. Case Study: City of Sheffield, UK

The survey method was a semi-structured interview, informing subjects of the questions in advance and asking additional questions according to their answers. The interviewees

were officials of Sheffield City Council, Richard Eyre (head of City Centre Management and Major Events)⁷⁾, and Simon Ogden (head of City Regeneration)⁸⁾. We conducted document research in parallel. These were recorded as of 2017.

3.1 Attracting Shopping Malls at Urban Regeneration

The city of Sheffield is a major city based at the centre of the South Yorkshire County in the middle of the UK, and its population is the fourth highest in England (based on data from June 2018). Sheffield is a famous industrial city; handicrafts such as knives and kitchen knives were popular in the birthplace of stainless steel. In the 1890s, it became the world's largest factory group in the steel industry, after which the steel industry became a symbol of the city. However, the steel industry in the UK declined gradually as the world market expanded and the manufacturing base moved overseas. In the 1980s, the biggest company in the Sheffield went bankrupt and the factory was closed. The unemployment rate increased across the UK, but the unemployment rate in Sheffield city reached nearly 10%, which was the worst among all major cities in the UK.

Therefore, the City Council and the wider area municipal government started urban regeneration from the latter half of the 1980s to increase the investment in the city by using public works and to change the industrial structure. The urban regeneration aims for economic revitalisation, such as improving urban functions, attracting private enterprises, and increasing the number of employees. According to the City Council's plan, private enterprises that establish public corporations that manage urban regenerators and partnerships, maintain and improve commercial functions such as retailing and service industries, and develop information and advanced technologies to rebuild industrial areas it also included the attraction of private companies. The administration matches the research and development department of the local university with companies, based on the collaboration between industry, government, and academia. It promotes enterprises to redevelop building and vacant lots in the city. Turning back to the story in the 1980s, specific project plans included the improvement of stadiums, etc. by attracting the Universiade, improvement of wharfs and airports, reconstruction of industrial estates, and

7) Richard Eyre doubles as the City Center Manager. He was a director (nonexecutive officer) of the Sheffield BID from January to September 2017.

8) Simon Ogden participated in regeneration from the beginning and improved the interchange of the M1 highway and the road around Meadowhall. In the Heart of the City, Millennium Project, he worked on the concept and design of Peace Gardens. He also participated in the BID of Sheffield Lower Don Valley Flood Defense Project. He was Programme Director, Castlegate Kickstart from 2018 to 2021.

construction of large shopping malls in factory sites. Along with giving permission, at the same time, we have developed bypasses, etc., connecting peripheral roads to expressways. The implementing entity was the Urban Development Corporations⁹⁾, in which the government and regional municipalities cooperated with the City of Sheffield.

It was also part of the urban revitalisation plan that Sheffield City attracted shopping malls to the factory site. The main feature of the development of the factory site is the “Meadowhall”¹⁰⁾ shopping mall, which is the largest in all of Britain, where private enterprises have developed with more than 230 million pounds in input. Meadowhall was opened in 1990. In addition to shopping, eating, and drinking services, it includes three core department stores (Marks & Spencer, Debenhams, House of Fraser) and large supermarkets, more than 220 specialty shops, as well as sales floor space of approximately 116,000 m² (about 1.25 million square feet). It also has leisure facilities such as resting places and a cinema. The parking lot is large, with space for 12,000 cars and 300 buses to park. There are 15,000 trees planted, park maintenance, and a hotel located on an adjacent site. In addition, the function of a new transportation hub was granted such that a bus stop, a train station, a tram, a parking lot for the park and ride are adjoining so that citizens can access the shopping mall. Meadowhall Centre Limited (1988, 1989) widely mentioned that the situation at that time was to create new employment for 5,000 or more employees. From the beginning of the plan, it was predicted that the annual sales of 30 million people will significantly exceed the sales in the central urban areas.

3.2 Development and maintenance of the city centre

Richard Eyre reports that in the 1960s and 1970s, Sheffield’s city centre was the main shopping district, but the quality of the stores began to decline in the 1980s. When Meadowhall was completed in 1990, many apparel stores left the central urban area for this new location (Neda 2008).¹¹⁾

9) Sheffield Development Corporations (1988-), Sheffield One (2000-), and Creative Sheffield (2007-). In addition, it has established the Yorkshire Forward (1999-2012) as a wide-area municipality in the metropolitan area. For cooperation within the area, Sheffield City Region LEP (2012-) was established.

10) Meadowhall had been forecasting sales of 3.5 million pounds before opening. Currently, Meadowhall is the eighth largest SC (Super Regional Shopping Center) and has an area of approximately 140,000 m² (1.5 million sq ft.). It was renovated in 2018 and planned to increase to 30,000 m² in 2021. It has a car parking lot of 12,000 vehicles, 280 tenants (including department stores such as M & S, Debenhams, and Fraser), and has attracted approximately 24 million people/year (Source: British Land HP and Annual Report).

11) In particular, the number of apparel specialty shops decreased, from 105 in 1989 to 55 in 2003, and food retailers also decreased from 55 in 1989 to 28 in 2003 (Neda 2008). Since then, it has been

In 1994, the City Council formulated a revitalisation plan for the central urban area as part of the city's master plan. This was followed in 1996 by the "Millennium Project" to revitalize the city centre and the 1997 implementation plan "Remaking the Heart of the City," promoting large-scale redevelopment of the city centre. This plan integrated plazas, cultural facilities, commercial facilities, high-rise residences, and accommodation facilities. In 1998, the Peace Gardens were built as the core of this project. Originally an English garden on the site of the Town Hall Church (a lawn-based park), it was renewed by the addition of stones, ironworks, waterways, and a hydrophilic fountain that reflected the city's urban identity. Simon Ogden says, "In the early 1990s the Peace Gardens was almost a no-go area. It was quite a dangerous area at night – a lot of street drinking and anti-social behaviour. And now almost any time you feel safe¹²⁾."

Simon Ogden says that Sheffield began the revitalisation with the development of the Peace Gardens to boost morale. The unemployment rate was high, and the movie *The Full Monty* had just been released; citizens were feeling disillusioned with their city. The local government, therefore, made it a priority to build a space where people could gather and children could play, a place to celebrate. Richard Eyre, however, attributes the decision to begin revitalisation with an open space to economics: he argues that opening empty stores and deficient industries first to leverage economic activities would have been a mistake. Instead, the maintenance of the Peace Gardens proves that the consciousness to differentiate is stronger than the competitive consciousness of suburban commercial facilities, such as the central commercial area and Meadowhall.

After Peace Gardens was completed, the Winter Garden, Millennium Galleries, St. Paul's Tower (Town Mansion 300 rental housing), St. Paul's Place (three buildings: a business office, a cafe, and a restaurant on the first floor), New Town Hall, a casino, and a hotel were developed. The maintenance of the Sheffield Retail Quarter, which is said to be the last piece of the regeneration plan of the city centre, is currently underway. The Sheffield Retail Quarter is a redevelopment project (Heart of the City II) that continuously develops eight blocks from 2016 to 2024. In the first phase of development, the government assisted with expenses equivalent to about one-fifth of the government expenses (LEP: 1 million pound) and the City Development Fund (about 1.5 million pounds) were subsidized for the maintenance fee of the redevelopment building. The building will be completed in 2019 in a commercial building, with 14,864 m² of office space and 5,341 m² of retail banks as a nuclear

decreasing until 2017 (Richard Eyre).

12) The Newsroom (2017) Interview: The art of regenerating Sheffield;

<https://www.thestar.co.uk/news/interview-art-regenerating-sheffield-446844>

tenant. Originally planned as a large-scale commercial facility, it seems that the elements of the office building have been strengthened as the plan has been revised after the suspension of construction.

The next step was the establishment of an active CCM to administrate the city centre. The CCM was managed by city officials and was responsible for overseeing the four markets, attracting events, planning, administration, and public relations as well as maintaining the Peace Gardens. According to Richard Eyre, the CCM began with the maintenance of flower beds in the garden by five staff members, who also oversaw the space's use as an event venue. The city council hosts about 800 events throughout the city that may serve in 2017. Peace Gardens probably has about 15 events a year. 'Sheffield by the Seaside' is an event for about a month that one of the 15 events. Although Sheffield was responsible for these expenses, eventually, its financial situation did not allow the city to support the CCM's operation. To continue managing and hosting events in the central urban area, it was therefore necessary to create new financial resources. It was this financial consideration that inspired Eyre to establish a BID in Sheffield.

In the next section, we introduce the Sheffield City Centre BID Limited (Sheffield BID) works. In developing the business plan, we have four objectives, and in the implementation plan, events are being conducted to stimulate tourism attraction and revitalize the night economy in the central urban area to increase the number of customers in the area.

3.3 Sheffield City Centre BID Limited

In 2015, local stakeholders approved the creation of the Sheffield BID. The business plan laid out four objectives, and implementation focused on conducting events to stimulate tourism and revitalize the late-night economy in the central urban area. The project officially started in October 2015, and the BID included the entire city centre, including shopping streets and 511 participating businesses, including private companies, administrative facilities, universities, etc., but excluding elementary schools and welfare facilities.

The BID's business plan included the following five projects: (1) "Busier," which aimed to plan and sponsor events that would attract customers, including Sheffield's Herd (180,000 people), Cliffhanger (a mountain biking and bouldering event that attracts 40,000 people/year), Feature Walls, Alive After Five (450,000 people), etc. These events and campaigns have brought in about 880,000 visitors and increased revenue by 10.87 million pounds.¹³⁾ (2) "Safer" supports the city's safety and security, specifically by installing and maintaining

13) Sheffield BID (2018).

security cameras and CCTVs, sponsoring security training, etc. (3) “Cleaner” involves cleaning graffiti, local streets (6–9 a.m. daily), etc. (4) “Easier” improves visitors’ comfort, including by placing ambassadors around town, increasing access and mobility, providing a map with toilet information, installing free high-speed Wi-Fi and AEDs, etc. (5) Finally, “Together” creates connections between local business for the purposes of cost reduction (i.e., facilities, distribution, waste transactions, insurance) and to provide a help centre (i.e., information provision and dissemination).

These initiatives have had a marked effect on the area. For example, about 4,500 m² of graffiti was erased in 1,224 hours. Clean-up activities saved local businesses £370,000. There was also a decline in the incidence of begging, and the investment effect per £1 since the start of the project is £5.44.

As shown in Table 5, event-related expenses are the largest expenditure for the BID, which suggests that the organisation’s greatest purpose is to implement events. Personnel expenses are the second highest, the majority of which can be attributed to secretarial staff. Employees are hired for a term of 5 years, which is the plan implementation period. The board of directors is unpaid and is made up of elected members from local offices and city employees.

Levies account for almost all BID income: the BID has collected £4.2 million (£847,000/year) from all establishments over its 5 years. The City Council collects BID levy funds of 1%. In Sheffield, landowners are not required to contribute to the BID, but this applies

Table 5: Sheffield BID’s budget (£)

		Oct. 2015–Jun. 2016	Jul. 2016–Jun. 2017
Income		849,085	841,530
	BID levy	847,263	840,587
	Bunk interest received	1,822	943
Outcome		468,563	667,513
	BUSIER	215,947	320,188
	SAFER	49,506	68,104
	CLEANER	25,558	57,708
	TOGETHER	4,986	8,253
	EASIER	–	30,522
	Levy collection fee	17,843	17,951
	Administrative expenditure	154,538	164,423
	Taxation	185	364
Carryover		380,522	174,017

Source: Website of Sheffield City Centre BID Ltd.

only to a small number of city offices and universities. The percentage of contributions by business classification is as follows: leisure and culture = 11%, City Hall = 5%, two universities = 8%, retail = 39%, and offices = 37%. About £120,000/year is contributed by City Hall and two universities, and retailers have the greatest number of establishments and the highest burden rate.

3.4 CCM vs. BID

Today, Sheffield has increased retail sales in the city centre because of increased commercial shopping centres, entertainment facilities, specialty shops, etc.; better commercial functions; and improved public transportation. This increase in the city centre's commercial functions began in the 1990s with the aforementioned regeneration plan, which invested in the city centre, attracted businesses (including offices, hotels, houses, and restaurants), and enhanced the city centre's charm by renewing the gardens. The City Council forbid the expansion of Meadowhall in the hope of prioritizing development downtown. Initially, these changes seemed to be working; in 2013, retail sales amounted to 830 million pounds in the city centre and 670 million pounds at Meadowhall¹⁴⁾. However, despite the best intentions of the regeneration plan to maintain this commercial growth, the balance of retail sales shifted, and in 2016, there were sales of 732 million pounds in the city centre and 813 million pounds in Meadowhall¹⁵⁾. As a result, the government decided that the central urban area required differentiation as a commercial accumulation, and the Sheffield BID began to manage the area in 2015 and started providing administrative services, such as event support, tourism guides, cleaning work, and security.

When Sheffield's city centre was run by a CCM, the organisation was managed by the city council. They were responsible for operations to plan, facilitate management, and sponsor events at the four city markets, including Moor Market where the CCM head office was located. The city redevelopment utilised the city budget and government and EU subsidies, and the local government was strongly involved. The events hosted by CCM using parks, public transportation, streets, etc. were developed by the administration.

In 2013, Moor Market was redeveloped. Today, it includes about 90 stores and hosts the BID's office. The BID has a geographic area similar to that designated in the regeneration plan and, in many ways, it duplicates the role that CCM played in central city events: BIDs plan similar events in the city centre, thereby allowing the city budget to be reduced. However, despite these similarities and other overlaps in terms of responsibilities, there are

14) Sheffield City Council (2013).

15) Sheffield City Council & Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2017).

also some crucial differences. For example, although the BID's purview includes only the central urban area, the CCM oversaw marketing and event management in municipal areas outside the central urban area.

Today, the Sheffield BID involves a collaboration between industry, government, and academia. Projects include public relations, tourism, and the installation of digital signage. City Council officials can utilise the existing network through nurtured relationships with the university and company stakeholders in event planning and committees. For example, teachers at the University of Sheffield are willing to exchange ideas in committees because their priorities align with those of the BID in their cultural and evening events. Richard Eyre gives another example of this relationship building: approach by the Sheffield City Council to the chair of the Board of Directors. Prior to the establishment of the BID, when the Board of Directors elected the Independent (first) chair of the Board, James Prince (the managing director of Sheffield in John Lewis) took office. Before the BID began, Richard and James are deepened their friendship through CCM activities. And above all, Richard regarded James as someone who was willing to act as an area manager with leadership. Going back, it was Richard and CCM who had the idea of setting up a BID in the city centre. So Richard entrusted the idea of BID to James and led him to take office as a chair. In this way, the city of Sheffield constantly makes connections to secure promising staff and volunteers who have the motivation and ability to place talented people in the BID. That is, the city of Sheffield is positively affected by the establishment of the BID.

The city of Sheffield was familiar with the BID mechanism before the Sheffield BID was established. That is because the administration and the Chamber of Commerce set up a BID in the Sheffield Lower Don Valley Flood Defence Project (2014-) in the year before the Sheffield BID was established and entrusted it to a nonprofit corporation of river management. This project was a momentum for the City of Sheffield to introduce BIDs. The target area was the Lower Don Valley in the industrial area, and from the flood that occurred in 2007, commercial facilities such as Meadowhall suffered serious damage with flooding of more than 1 m depth. The city of Sheffield has received government subsidies for disaster prevention projects, but not enough. Therefore, it was necessary to pay the beneficiary's expense to cover disaster prevention measures and river maintenance costs. Therefore, the business rate was set to between 0.75% and 2.25% so that the burden increases as the influence is greater. Business contents range from flood prevention, risk management, support for volunteer activities, exclusion of foreign plants, cleaning, and so on. The development of such activities differs from Sheffield City Centre BID Limited in that it introduced the BID under the initiative of the City of Sheffield, but there are similarities in

terms of reducing the burden on municipal finance.

4. Discussion

4.1 Policy-Implementation Process at the Sheffield BID

Initially, the Sheffield City Council independently carried out urban regeneration, established a CCM and the Regeneration Department for revitalisation, and established the Peace Gardens in 1998 at the city centre. Since then, the maintenance of Peace Gardens and the cost of events have been borne by the city finances. However, when the city's finances were tight, the budget for CCM was also reduced, making it difficult to operate. For example, the number of ambassadors has decreased from 26 to 13. Therefore, the Sheffield City Council had to use a BID.

The first chair of the Sheffield BID was James Prince, then John Lewis's manager of Sheffield. Richard Eyre was the result of coordinating James Prince with Sheffield BID. Richard Eyre introduced the BID system in the city centre to make up for the lack of financial resources for the CCM and City Council.

Simon Ogden was involved in the design and philosophy of the Peace Gardens' master plan in 1994, and in the subsequent 2008 master plan, planned to develop a street that would lead to Peace Gardens. In particular, the two streets connect the east-west streets that connect universities and the Sheffield station, and Castlegate and the Moor Market from north to south. The Sheffield City Council has attracted businesses with commercial and cultural facilities and a new garden on these two axes. In addition, the Sheffield City Council used BIDs in the Sheffield Lower Don Valley Flood Defence Project before the establishment of the Sheffield BID for beneficiary disaster preparedness. In this way, Simon Ogden has placed Peace Gardens at the core of the City Centre and has complemented it in subsequent plans. Furthermore, it can be said that it provided an incentive to use the BID, although not directly.

Table 6: Coordination with concept, design, and management at Peace Gardens

	Discretion	Intention
Richard Eyre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Head of City Centre Management and Event (and City Centre Manager) · Board of the Sheffield BID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Place management · BID-CCM alignment
Simon Ogden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Head of Regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Place-making · Flood protection scheme

4.2 Policy-making for BID

There was no difference in the BID policy among political parties. First, Tony Blair made policies as Labor when he was Prime Minister but continued to expand BID policy even during Conservative rule in UK. The background includes the transfers of resources by decentralisation. Second, Liberal Democratic at the time of Prime Minister Abe made a policy, but at the time of Democratic, it did not oppose the BID policy in Japan. Democratic made deregulation in the Urban Regeneration Special Measures Law for pilot projects. The background for Japan to legislate BIDs was the same as that in the UK. We explain the policy process for BIDs in the UK and Japan in Tables 7 and 8.

BIDs are expected to play a role similar to TCM/CCM in the city centre. BIDs are often founded in the city centre, and the pilot project was operated by the Association of Town and City Centre Management (ATCM)¹⁶⁾ for this reason. As Osaka City set up a contribution as compensation for administrative services, the contribution cannot be used for events and promotion. Therefore, Osaka City council supports BIDs by deregulation rather than subsidies.

Table 7: Policy Process for BID and City Centre in the UK

Year	Prime minister, Party	Policy by central government
1980	Margaret Thatcher, Conservative	Local Government Planning and Land Act
1981		Urban Development Corporation: UDC
1988		Planning Policy Guidance 6 (Major Retail Development)
1990	John Major	Town and Country Planning Act (revised)
1991		Association of Town and City Centre Management (ATCM)
1993		PPG 6 (Town Centre and Retail Management)
1994		Single Regeneration Budget (-2007)
1996		PPG 6 (Sequential Approach)
1997	Tony Blair, Labor	BID: Visit Bryant Park BID in New York
1998		Regional Development Agencies Act: URD
1999		Regional Development Agencies : RDA
2000		Urban Regeneration Companies
2001		BID: "Strong Local Leadership-Quality Public Services"
2002		BID: Pilot Project at 22 BIDs (-2005)

16) ATCM is established a not-for-profit membership organisation in 1991, one of the largest dedicated to promoting the vitality and viability of urban centres across the UK and the Republic of Ireland. This includes nearly 500 practitioners and partnerships.

Year	Prime minister, Party	Policy by central government
2003		BID: Local Government Act (BID Levy: Non-Domestic Rate)
2004		BID: The Business Improvement Districts (England) Regulations Planning Policy Statements 4 (-2012)
2005		BID: The Business Improvement Districts (Wales) Regulations PPS 6 (retail building over 2,500 m ² to city centre)
2006		City Development Company
2007	Gordon Brown	BID: The Business Improvement Districts (Scotland) Regulations
2009		BID: Business Rate Supplements Act
2010	David Cameron, Conservative	Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Enterprise Zones 24
2012		National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
2013		BID: The Loan Fund scheme
2014		BID: The Business Improvement Districts (General) Regulations (Northern Ireland) BID: Property owner BIDs were permitted
2015		BID: The Community Right to Challenge Regulations
2016	Theresa May	Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016

Table 8: Policy Process for BID and City Centre in Japan

Year	Prime minister, party	Policy by central government
1998	Keizo Obuchi, Liberal Democratic	Act on Vitalisation in City Centre Town Management Organisation (TMO)
2000	Yoshiro Mori	Large-Scale Retail Store Law (Abolition) Act on the Measures by Large-Scale Retail Stores for Preservation of Living Environment
2002	Junichiro Koizumi	Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction
2005		Local Revitalisation Act
2006	Shinzo Abe (-Sep. 2007)	"Compact City," Act on Vitalisation in City Centre (revised) Strengthening the regulations of stores with over 10,000m ² (City Planning Act revised, Building Standards Act revised)
2007	Yasuo Fukuda (-Sep. 2008)	Urban Reconstruction Promotion Corporation (Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction revised)
2011	Yoshihiko Noda (-Dec. 2011), Democratic	Urban Reconstruction development plan, special case of road occupancy permission, pedestrian route agreement, etc. (Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction revised)
2014	Shinzo Abe, Liberal Democratic	Urban Facility Location Plan (Act on Special Measures concerning Urban Reconstruction revised) BID: pilot project (in Osaka)
2016		BID: Establishment of revision committee for The Local Revitalisation Act
2018		BID: Local Revitalisation Act for Area Management Levy

5. Conclusion

This paper clarified two points. The similarities and differences between BIDs and CCM/TCM were clarified. The coordination model is effective at analysing the policy-implementation process.

The first point is that BIDs have been thought to provide area management that adds new value, and CCM/TCM provide public services that are close to government. However, it was revealed that the services of BID and CCM/TCM in the city centre are similar. BIDs are often founded in the city centre, and the pilot project was operated by ATCM for this reason. The government had to change policies for austerity finance. In addition, it had to switch policies as a result of the financial crisis in 2007–2008, and austerity finance since 2010. The activities of the BIDs, TCM, and CCM are highly similar to public services. However, the difference between BIDs and TCM/CCM is that BIDs do not create free riders, because all the businesses share the burden (levy), including individual businesses in the area that are opposed to the programme.

The second point is that the coordination model was used to reveal the involvement of the Sheffield City Council. The Sheffield City Council has developed large shopping malls in the suburbs and then embarked on the development of the city centre. It was Simon Ogden who brought history and culture to the redevelopment of the city centre. Simon Ogden is the Head of Regeneration, with the maintenance of Peace Gardens at the core and the subsequent street axis design. Richard Eyre is the Head of CCM and Events, involved in the establishment of Sheffield BID, allowing the austerity City Council to hold park maintenance and events. The Peace Gardens, etc., developed by urban regeneration, targets not only citizens but also consumers (night economy, tourists) differently from previous regeneration efforts. The result was that the Sheffield BID conducted an event, increased the number of visitors by 880,000, and increased consumption by £10.07 million. This analysis of “discretion” and “will” in the coordination model revealed how the Sheffield City Council tried to use a BID in urban regeneration.

Future tasks are to increase the number of analyses using the coordination model and to clarify the causal relationship of coordination by statistical methods.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the interviewees in city of Sheffield and city of Cambridge, thank Prof. Peter Tyler, thank Matthew Hayman. This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP 20K01980 and by a designated research project of the Research Institute, Momoyama Gakuin University, (2020).

References

- Adachi Motohiro (2012) A Study of the Regeneration System in the U.K with Special Reference to Funding and Subsidies, *The Wakayama Economic Review*, 367.
- Architectural Association of Japan (2014) Architecture and Society, vol.96, January.
- Aoki Masahiko (2008) *Information, Corporate Governance, and Institutional Diversity: Competitiveness in Japan, the USA, and the Transitional Economies*, Kodansha Ltd.
- Aoki Masahiko (2001) *Towards a Comparative institutional analysis*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Burt, Ronald S. (2001) Structural holes versus network closure as social capital, in Lin, N., Cook, K. S. and Burt, R. S. (Ed.), *Social Capital Theory and Research*, Aldine De Gruyter, pp.31-56.
- Chavance, Bernard (2007) *L'Economie Institutionnelle*, La Decouverte.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., Olsen, J.P. (1972) A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice, 'Administrative Science Quarterly', Vol.17, No.1.
- Cook Ian R. (2010) Policing, Partnerships, and Profits: The Operations of Business Improvement Districts and Town Centre Management Schemes in England, *Urban Geography*, 31:4, pp.453-478.
- Enta Yushi (1994) A Revised "Garbage Can Model", *The Hosei Journal of Business*, 30 (4), pp.63-72.
- Government, *The Business Improvement Districts (England) Regulations 2004*, Office for National statistics.
- Hayase Noboru, Tsutsui Noriko (2009) *Volunteer Coordination and Creation of Civil Society*, Tutuishobo.
- Inamizu Nobuyuki (2010) Problem-solving and decision-making in unsegmented organisation structure: an analysis of garbage-can simulation model, *Organisational science*43 (3), pp.72-85.
- Japan Local Government Centre (2011) *Clair Report*, No.366.
- Johan Håkansson, Madelen Lagin (2015) Strategic alliances in a town centre stakeholders' perceived importance of the property owners, *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 25.2, pp.145-161.
- Joshua Fraley, Daniel Baker, David Batker, Christopher Koliba, Richard Matteson, Russell Mills, James Pittman (2007) Opening the policy window for ecological economics: Katrina as focusing event, *Ecological Economics* 63, pp.344-354.
- Karin Guldbarandsson, Bjoorn Fossum (2009) An exploration of the theoretical concepts policy windows and policy entrepreneurs at the Swedish public health arena, *Health Promotion International*, Vol.24, No.4.
- Kingdon, John W. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Ron Newcomer & Associates.
- Lee Wonhyung (2016) Struggles to form business improvement districts (BIDs) in Los Angeles, *Urban Studies*, Vol.53 (16), pp.3423-3438.
- Magalhães De Claudio (2014) Business Improvement Districts in England and the (private?) governance of urban spaces, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 2014, volume 32, pp.916-933.
- Meadowhall Centre Limited (1988, 1989) *The Meadowhall Newsletter*, No.1, No.2.
- March, James G. and Olsen, Johan P. (1976) *Ambiguity and Choice in Organisational*, Universitetsforlaget.
- Milgrom, P., Roberts, J. (1992) *Economics, Organisation & Management*, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Minakata Tatsuaki (2013) *The Effects of the Japanese Public Policy towards the Retail Market Structure*, Chuokeizai-sha Holdings, Inc.

- Morçöl Göktuğ, Gautsch Douglas (2013) Institutionalisation of Business Improvement Districts: a Longitudinal Study of The State Laws in the United States, *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol.37, No.2.
- Neda Katsuhiko (2008) The Changes in the Central Shopping Area and District Centres in Sheffield after the Meadowhall Regional Shopping Centre Opened, *Japanese Journal of Human Geography*, 60(3), pp.217-237.
- Otsuka Noriko, Reeve Alan (2007) Town Centre Management and Regeneration: The Experience in Four English Cities, *Journal of Urban Design*, Vol.12, pp.435-459.
- Ron Martin, Ben Gardiner, Peter Tyler (2014) The Evolving economic performance of UK cities: city grows patterns 1981-2011, *Future of cities: working paper*, Foresight.
- Rydin Yvonne (2003) *Urban and Environmental Planning in the UK: Second edition*, Macmillan Distribution Ltd.
- Sato Ikuya (2002) *Method of Field Work*, Shinyosha.
- Sheffield City Centre BID Limited (2016, 2017) *Annual Report 2016, 2017*.
- Sheffield City Centre BID Limited (2018) *Compliance Letter*.
- Sheffield City Council (2013) *Sheffield City Centre Master Plan 2013*.
- Sheffield City Council & Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2017) *Sheffield & Rotherham Joint Retail & Leisure Study*.
- Sumiya Yoshinori (2019) The Effect of Area Management by BID: A Case Study of the City of Sheffield, UK, *St. Andrew's University Bulletin of the Research Institute*, Vol.44 (3), pp.11-30.
- (2016) Grant of Information from BÄR-GÄI in Hakodate to ITAMI MACHINAKA-BAR and The Course, *Journal of Marketing & Distribution*, Vol.19, No.1.
 - (2015) Analysis of Coordination in the Shopping Centre District -Increase in Restaurant and Change with "BAR-GAI", *Distribution Studies*, No.36.
 - (2011) The Role of Small and Medium Retail Merchants on Machizukuri-Analytical Frameworks of the Coordination-, *Distribution Studies*, No.29.
- Takamura Gakuto (2017) Legal Control on Business Improvement Districts in San Francisco: Observational Research on their Organizational Behavior, *Policy science*, 24 (3), pp.265-291., 24 (4), pp.181-236.
- Tanaka Masamitsu (1989) Organized Anarchy Model and Innovation, *Journal of Business Management*, 59 (0), pp.145-150.
- Tohma Katsuo (1994) The effectiveness of garbage can model in technological innovation : The case of synthetic leather material in TORAY, *THE KAGAWA UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW*, 67(1), pp.91-140.
- Watanabe Naoki (1991) On the Decision Making School in Management, *Mita business review*, Vol.34, No.5, pp.207-224.
- Yuri Muneyuki (1997) Financial system reform and the "Policy window", *The Business Review*, No.47-4.

