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First stages of the Greater Paris project

- 29 April 2009  Pdt Nicolas Sarkozy presented broad outlines of the Greater Paris Project
- 3 June 2010   Greater Paris Development Act was passed
- November 2010 The Council of State gave a negative opinion on the Ile-de-France master plan
- Oct 2011-Jan 2012 Parallel public debates on the Region’s and the State’s metro projects
- 26 January 2012 Agreement between the Region and the State on a common project
- May 2012      Overall scheme of the « Great Paris Express » was published
Great Paris Express’ overall scheme (May 2012)

Territorial Development Contracts (TDC)

Objective: setting the priorities for housing building, economic development and public facilities in areas around the stations of the Great Paris Express

Main contract holders:
- the regional State representative (the Prefect)
- the municipalities concerned by the stations

Other actors involved:
- Regional and local state departments as the Regional Direction of Infrastructure and Spatial Planning (DRIEA), the Société du Grand Paris (metro builder), Eparmarne (public developer of the new town)
- Intermunicipal authorities, Départements

In May 2012, 19 TDC were under preparation
Study areas and Marne-la-Vallée’s territory

Urbanization sectors of Marne-la-Vallée

- Porte de Paris
- Val Maubuée
- Val de Bussy
- Val d’Europe

TDC of ‘Boucles de la Marne’
TDC of ‘Noisy-Champs’
TDC of ‘Noisy-Champs’

Actors involved

State representatives:
- Ile-de-France Prefect
- Epamarne
- DRIEA Ile-de-France
- Société du Grand Paris

Local authorities:
- 2 municipalities (Champs-sur-Marne, Noisy-le-Grand)
- 1 intermunicipal authority (SAN Val Maubuée)
- 2 Départements (Val-de-Marne, Seine-et-Marne)

Noisy-le-Grand is no more included in the perimeter of the new town

TDC of ‘Boucles de la Marne’

Actors involved

State representatives:
- Ile-de-France Prefect
- Epamarne
- DRIEA Ile-de-France
- Société du Grand Paris

Local authorities:
- 4 municipalities (Bry-, Villiers-, Champigny- and Chennevières-sur-Marne)
- 1 intermunicipal authority (CA du Haut-Val-de-Marne)
- 1 Département (Val-de-Marne)

Chennevières joined the CDT in March 2012 (a few months after the start-up)

Questions

- How do local actors get involved in the implementation of the Greater Paris project?

- How do the different visions of local-based development and the general good are put in competition and what compromises are made?
Municipalities: the reasons to participate

- A legal obligation:
  - In the absence of a contractual agreement, the ‘Société du Grand Paris’ may act as a developer in areas around the stations

- A way to influence the decisions:
  - To regain control on urban planning and development
  - To ensure State’s engagement on the projects
  - To become eligible for funding of future projects

- An opportunity to build and defend a common project
Defining the TDC’s perimeters

- Formal provisions remain imprecise:
  - ‘each contract focuses on the development of a territory included in a group of touching municipalities without an enclosure’ (Greater Paris Development Act, 3 June 2010)
  - ‘a territorial development contract concerns all or part of the territory of at least two municipalities’ (Decree of 24 June 2011)

- In practice:
  - The existence of significant available land influences the location of the station and the choice of the perimeter
  - The perimeters finally included all the territory of the concerned municipalities
Issues at stake

- Housing building is a main concern for the State
  - The building objective for Ile-de-France is 70 000 units per year
  - This objective has been spatially distributed
  - An additional effort is required from the municipalities served by the Greater Paris Express

- For local authorities, the priority is economic development
  - Improving the jobs/housing balance
  - Rebalancing between the East and the West of the IdeF Region
  - But the means to achieve the objectives remain undefined

- Network’s financing appears as a (very) sensitive topic
  - The rule for calculating the land-value capture is not defined yet
Points of disagreement:
- The financing of public facilities
- The rate of social housing
- The price of the land owned by the State

Difficulties of implementation:
- Impossibility to meet the TDC deadlines (October 2012)
- Low level of participation of the Region and the STIF (Regional transport authority)
- Coexistence of strategic reflections (Territorial Development Schemes) and operational reflections (Territorial Development Contracts)
Concluding remarks and questions

- ‘The main issue of TDC is not to debate about the development of a railway station area, but to draw-up a territorial project (local State representative, April 2012)
- The metro project gives the public stakeholders the opportunity to discuss and to negotiate the rules
- What about the leverage effect of TDC?
  - May the arrival of the metro be sufficient to attract new jobs?
  - What about the ‘cluster’ effect?
  - To what extend the TDC could enhance inter-municipal cooperation and anticipate the creation of new intermunicipal authorities?