

# Area-Based Urban Policies French Perspectives and International Insights<sup>[1]</sup>

Since the beginning of the 2000s, policies deployed in France to deal with spatial concentration of poverty have mainly consisted in transforming the urban environment in order to promote social diversity in areas referred to as “deprived”. This was the approach behind the national programme for urban renewal (*Programme national de rénovation urbaine / PNRU*), which was launched in 2003, mobilising hitherto unequalled resources for area-based policies.

Although numerous countries have pursued such policies, others chose different options: in Germany, for example, where the “Social City” programme aimed to develop the neighbourhoods concerned, from an urban, economic and social point of view, on the basis of their endogenous potential, rather than attempting to change their sociological composition; or in the United States, where the Obama Administration sought to transform these areas into neighbourhoods of choice and opportunity by combining multiple means – development of neighbour-

hoods through community development, social diversity through urban renewal and residential mobility.

At a time when the government is discussing the next stage of the French area-based policy, and while major inequalities remain between areas, this policy brief stresses the need to replace the current approach, focused on buildings, by one focusing on the inhabitants, and insists on the promotion of their backgrounds and directions, both social and residential. Facing renewed calls for the mobilization of mainstream policies and territorial equality, this *Note d'analyse* also proposes to structure the sectorial policies at city scale, on the basis of the analysis of the mechanisms causing exclusion, segregation and inequalities. Several instruments are necessary to make such an approach possible: tools that enable decision makers to objectify the social and residential mobility of households, as well as a geolocalization system for public resources. ■

[1] This *Note d'analyse* is based on reports and documents produced by the Centre d'analyse stratégique (CAS) as well as studies commissioned by the CAS and the “General Secretariat of the French Inter-ministerial Committee on Cities”. It completes the *Notes d'analyse* no. 178 on French “ghettos”, no. 249 on “neighbourhood effects”, and no. 278 on the participation of inhabitants.

**THE STAKES** In the United States and in many countries of Western Europe, public policies targeting “deprived” neighbourhoods have been conducted, in order to fight against the problems linked to urban segregation. In broad outline, since the end of the 1990s these policies have fallen within the scope of three non-mutually exclusive options, implemented according to various combinations, in different countries and at different periods: seeking social diversity through urban renovation, developing the neighbourhoods through collective actions (community development) improving the residents’ living conditions thanks to their own resources, or promoting the inhabitants’ social and residential mobility.<sup>(2)</sup> <sup>(3)</sup>

Since the launching of the *national urban renewal programme* (PNRU) in 2003, the French area-based policy has mostly focused on the first option. This programme aimed to change the appearance of “sensitive” neighbourhoods through the demolition of social housing and the diversification of the housing environment, hoping that these developments would increase the social diversity in these neighbourhoods, thus narrowing the gap between them and surrounding areas. However, although the living environment has indeed been vastly improved, high levels of poverty still remain, in a situation made worse by the economic crisis, as the French Court of Auditors (Cour des Comptes) emphasised in a recent report. In this respect, numerous studies dedicated to French area-based policy show uneven results, and call for its reorientation and a greater use of common-law.<sup>(4)</sup>

As the *national urban renewal programme* is ending and the discussions on “territorial equality<sup>(5)</sup>” are beginning, this note identifies the main stakes of the next stage of area-based policy.<sup>(6)</sup>

## ➤ FACING SPATIAL CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY, WHICH POLICIES SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED IN FRANCE AND ABROAD?

Since the end of the 1990s, Western European countries have mostly privileged options such as community development and social diversity through urban renewal in deprived neighbourhoods. These two directions have also been followed in the United States, where the Federal Administration chose to include the promotion of the inhabitants’ mobility as well.

### ( In Western Europe: Community Development and Urban Renewal

#### ■ Community Development

This approach, which considers neighbourhoods as resources to be developed, is based on the idea that when individual inhabitants turn into a collective body, bound together by territorial anchoring and common interests in a neighbourhood, they are able to participate in local planning. Inspired by the United States, France was one of the first European countries to try this approach in the 1980s (through the so-called “social development of neighbourhoods”). At the end of the 1990s, similar approaches were also undertaken in Germany, with the *Soziale Stadt* programme launched in 1999, in the Netherlands from 1994 to 2009, through the “Big Cities” Policy, and in the United Kingdom from 1998 to 2010, with the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (NSNR) (the flagship programme “New Deal for Communities”) which, despite some implementation difficulties, delivered favourable results.<sup>(7)</sup>

[2] Also referred to as community development; in Anglo-Saxon countries, the notion of “community” is commonly used and broadly positive, and refers to collective initiatives, for example by the inhabitants of a neighbourhood, disabled people, associations of patients suffering from the same pathology etc.

[3] Typology borrowed from Bruce Katz, vice president of the Brookings Institution, in Katz B. [2004], *Neighbourhoods of Choice and Connection. The Evolution of American Neighbourhood Policy and what it Means for the United Kingdom*, Paper for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s Centenary Event.

[4] ONZUS [2011], *Synthèse du rapport 2011*, Les Éditions du CIV; Cour des Comptes [2012], *op. cit.*; Goulard F. and Pupponi F. [2010], *Rapport d’information fait au nom du comité d’évaluation et de contrôle des politiques publiques sur l’évaluation des aides aux quartiers défavorisés* [“Information report on behalf of the committee for the assessment and control of public policy on the evaluation of aid to deprived neighbourhoods”], report handed over to the French National Assembly, volume 1, no. 2853.

[5] Objective declared by François Hollande during the Presidential election campaign, taken up again in the title of the Ministerial post entrusted to Cécile Duflot (Ministry for “Equality of Territories and Housing”).

[6] A government consultation on area-based policy was launched at Roubaix in October 2012.

[7] In the CAS report, see Tunstall R. [2012], “La stratégie nationale de renouvellement urbain au Royaume-Uni [1998-2010]”; Bolt G. and van Kempen R. [2012], “Les politiques urbaines aux Pays-Bas”; Zimmer-Hegmann R. [2012], “Le programme “Ville sociale” en Allemagne”.

### ▼ The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in the United Kingdom (1998-2010)<sup>[8]</sup>

The NSNR targeted 88 cities concentrating poor neighbourhoods identified through the Index of Multiple Deprivation. In order to reduce territorial inequalities, it conducted both specific policies and mainstream policies, through local strategic partnerships bringing local authorities and the principal public services together (schools, police, employment agencies, social housing providers etc.). Within this framework, local action strategies, priorities and quantified objectives for the reduction of inequalities, and the partners' commitments, were jointly defined. Local authorities played an important role, inhabitants were involved in decision-making and programmes were planned with a long-term perspective. Major financial issues include stimulation of joint public and private financing and reorientation of mainstream policies resources according to the needs of neighbourhoods and their inhabitants. Apart from additional resources made available thanks to the NSNR, the budget allocated to the New Deal for Communities amounted to almost 75 million euros for each of the 39 targeted neighbourhoods, with an average of around 9,900 inhabitants.

The German, British and Dutch programmes are similar in several respects:

- ▶ firstly, all of them are based on a “bottom-up” approach to decision-making, allocating a central role in the elaboration of projects to local bodies including inhabitants and representatives of the school, health and economic sectors, as well as housing providers and local authorities;
- ▶ secondly, they all chose an integrated approach to public action towards neighbourhoods, which aimed to

transform physical infrastructures as well as address social and economic factors;

- ▶ finally, they expect a redeployment of mainstream policies resources, according to the needs of the targeted neighbourhoods and their inhabitants.

### ▼ The Soziale Stadt programme in Germany (1999-)<sup>[9]</sup>

In the German *Soziale Stadt* programme, responsibility for implementation falls to municipalities, who have many skills, especially in urban planning. If they do receive grants from the *Länder*, responsibility for working out the strategic orientations actually belongs to them. The Projects are elaborated at monthly “neighbourhood forums” where all stakeholders are represented (elected representatives, social housing providers, inhabitants, shopkeepers, etc.) – including a group in charge of mobilising and coordinating the various local administrations. The link between these two levels of decision-making is established through “neighbourhood management teams” which play a role of mediation and coordination within and between the administrations and the neighbourhoods. Besides, in order to encourage the neighbourhoods' inhabitants to express themselves and become involved, residents' committees have been created, to which specific funds are allocated (Empowerment Funds). The total cost of the programme amounted to almost 3 billion euros between 1999 and 2010, divided between 600 local neighbourhoods in 400 cities. But because it stimulated mainstream policies, the programme also generated almost 15 billion euros in investments.

However, at the end of the 1990s, many European countries witnessed a shift to urban redevelopment operations conducted in the name of social mix.



[8] Tunstall R. (2012), *op. cit.*; Communities and Local Government (2010), *The New Deal for Communities Experience: A Final Assessment. The New Deal for Communities Evaluation: Final Report*; Epstein R. and Mboumoua I. (2012), *Les indicateurs de la politique de la ville : comparaison entre trois pays, la France, la Grande-Bretagne, les Pays-Bas*, Centre d'analyse stratégique / General Secretariat of the French Inter-ministerial Committee on Cities.

[9] Zimmer-Hegmann R. (2012), *op. cit.*; please see Donzelot J. (2008), *Quand la ville se défait. Quelle politique face à la crise des banlieues ?*, Paris, Seuil, coll. “Points”, p. 158; Böhme C. et al. (2008), *The Program “Social City” (Soziale Stadt)*. Status Report, Centre for Knowledge Transfer “Social City”, German Institute of Urban Affairs, Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, July.

### ▼ The “Big Cities Policy” in the Netherlands (*Grotestedenbeleid*) (1994-2009)<sup>[10]</sup>

Launched in 1994, The *Big Cities Policy* devoted most of its action to districts located in 31 cities. Over its 3 phases (1994-1998, 1999-2004, 2005-2009), it retained a transverse, participative and integrated decision-making process. It was based upon three pillars (social, economic and physical) and aimed to transform the physical appearance of neighbourhoods, as well as address social and economic parameters. As for the explicitly targeted objective, it always remained the same: “developing safe urban centres together, while also meeting the increasing demands of residents, businesses, institutes, visitors and tourists [...]; developing economically vital cities with high-quality areas to promote business and social cohesion.”

In terms of governance, major orientations and policies, as well as the five-year budgets allocated to municipalities, were elaborated by the State. However, the town councils had great autonomy in the definition of projects and objectives that were set out in contracts agreed with the State. They organized their implementation, in association with the economic actors, social bodies and inhabitants of the neighbourhoods concerned.

In financial terms, the distribution of the resources allocated to the three pillars varied from one phase to the next: 1.2 billion euros for the economic part of the programme, 0.2 for the physical part and 0.1 for the social part from 1994 to 1999 (5.7, 1.8, and 3.7 from 1999 to 2004 and 0.16, 1.3 and 3.7 from 2004 to 2009 respectively).

#### ■ Urban Renewal

Apart from the German *Soziale Stadt* programme, which never explicitly sought to change the sociological composition of the targeted neighbourhoods<sup>[11]</sup>, social diversity began to be considered as a reference for urban policies during the 2000s, especially in France and the Netherlands.<sup>[12]</sup> This approach, based on the assumed existence of negative dynamics linked to concentrated poverty, focused on social diversity, usually in the form of urban transformation operations (demolition, renovation, diver-

sification of habitat) and aimed to change the image of these neighbourhoods.

In France, this was indeed the approach chosen at the end of the 1990s, in particular through the PNRU launched in 2003. In the name of social diversity, this programme allocated most of the resources made available –over 42 billion euros<sup>[13]</sup>– to urban development initiatives in sensitive urban areas (*ZUS-Zones Urbaines Sensibles*), as evidenced by the quantitative objectives established by the law of 1<sup>st</sup> August 2003: to build 200,000 rentable social accommodations; to renovate another 200,000; and to demolish 200,000 others between 2004-2008<sup>[14]</sup>.

Similarly, in the Netherlands, the objective of social mix, or even ethnic mix, became particularly crucial in the *Big Cities Policy*. Although it was always aimed to improve the living environment for inhabitants, in 1997 the government called for the reduction of the concentration of poor inhabitants through the demolition of social housing, while concomitantly building accommodations for more well-off households. It should however be noted that, unlike France, the resources allocated to the social and economic aspects of the programme remained dominant as compared with those allocated to physical infrastructure.

The United Kingdom also opted for social diversity and urban redevelopment, but at a later time and, above all, to a lesser extent than in France and the Netherlands: social mix only became a central objective of the NSNR in 2006, through the *Mixed Communities Demonstration Programme*. However, and despite the official discourse, the government's implication in the project appeared to be rather moderate considering the allocated means, as the programme did not received any additional funding. Much more than social mix, the NSNR insisted on the improvement of the original inhabitants' situation by providing more services and supporting community development. Moreover, social mobility, defined as intergenerational improvement in incomes and social class, became an important goal of the British public policy at the end of the 2000s.

[10] Bolt G. and van Kempen R. (2012), *op. cit.* ; Epstein R. and Mboumoua I. (2012), *op. cit.*

[11] Zimmer-Hegmann R. (2012), *op. cit.*

[12] Bolt G. and van Kempen R. (2012), *op. cit.*

[13] The State's budgetary programme dedicated to area-based policy represented 534.3 million euros in 2012 to which must be added other actors' financial contributions. Thus, the total amount cannot be ascertained at present. As for the PNRU, over 42 billion euros were planned for the 2004-2013 period.

[14] Following the riots of autumn 2005, these objectives were changed to the construction of 250,000 rentable social accommodations, the renovation of 400,000 and the demolition of 250,000 over the 2004-2013 period.

## ■ What Results?

- ▶ Firstly, concerning **Community Development**, available evaluations of the German “Soziale Stadt” and the British NSNR programmes –in particular those of the *New Deal for Communities*– are, on the whole, positive: “neighbourhood boards” have enable actors networking, the integration and the territorial anchoring of initiatives implemented; local authorities have taken the deprived neighbourhood in hand again; and innovations have been introduced in public management.<sup>(15)</sup> These results show just how much this bottom-up and participative political process encourages the involvement of citizens, improves relations between residents and local actors, and concomitantly leads to positive effects on mental health, feelings of insecurity, the satisfaction of living in such neighbourhoods and of living in communities. However, a number of vigilance points are revealed by these assessments: the orientations defined by local bodies should be taken into account, at all levels of public decision-making of the agglomeration; schedules should be set; deadlines and allocated budgets should be specified; as much human resource as possible (including academics, businesses, NGOs etc.) should be involved in neighbourhood boards; finally, consequential budgets should be allocated.<sup>(16)</sup>
- ▶ Secondly, about **urban renewal** policies, the results are subtle and, above all, reveal considerable local differences.

In the Netherlands, where social mix is very much put forward, assessments indicate a certain form of social desegregation, but changes are much less clear on the ethnic composition of neighbourhoods. Regarding the improvement of housing conditions for the original inhabitants, urban renewal has so far not succeeded in enabling the

poorest to access new housing supply (either for rent or for sale), under conditions as satisfactory as before.<sup>(17)</sup>

As for France, an evaluation of the PNRU’s results is being conducted by the *National Observatory for Sensitive Urban Areas* (ONZUS<sup>(18)</sup>). In the meantime, studies have already provided some results. First of all, positive effects are noted concerning the improvement of living conditions in deprived neighbourhoods (housing, equipment). For this reason, local elected representatives are almost unanimously celebrating the PNRU’s success.<sup>(19)</sup> A survey conducted by the CSA institute in 2011 even highlighted the support of recipient inhabitants and their neighbours.<sup>(20)</sup> However, this improvement has not led, as was hoped, to a change in the socio-economic composition of the neighbourhoods, by attracting more well-off inhabitants<sup>(21)</sup> (referred to as an “exogenous” social mix). But, in some cases it is said to have promoted the “endogenous”<sup>(22)</sup> social mix by anchoring local residents, especially young couples with both partners in employment who could have left those neighbourhoods to buy their own homes<sup>(23)</sup>. Apart from these results, the programme has received some criticisms on the modalities of public action: poor coordination between urban and social initiatives; lack of resident involvement in projects; low mobilisation of mainstream policies and unsatisfactory distribution of specific resources; but also excessive municipalisation of urban renewal projects within neighbourhoods and insufficient integration of city scale strategies<sup>(24)</sup>. Given those mixed results and the remaining local differences, most of the actors want the policy to be improved, or even reoriented, in spite of progress made on the constructed environment.

These various options analysed separately all have both advantages and limits. Besides, in spite of the positive evaluations that some of them have received, financial



[15] In the CAS report, see Kirszbaum T. [2012], “La politique de la ville ici et ailleurs : la tentation d'en finir avec une question interminable”.

[16] Carrel M. and Houard N. [2012], “La participation des habitants : trois pistes pour rénover la politique de la ville”, *La Note d'analyse*, no. 278, Centre d'analyse stratégique, September.

[17] In the CAS report, see Houard N. and Lelévrier C. [2012], “Mobilité et choix résidentiels: quels enjeux pour les politiques publiques?”.

[18] On 13<sup>th</sup> September 2012 the ONZUS was appointed by François Lamy, Minister Delegate for Cities. It is due to hand over its conclusions at the beginning of 2013.

[19] Epstein R. [2012a], “ANRU : mission accomplie ?”, in Donzelot J. [dir.], *À quoi sert la rénovation urbaine ?*, Paris, PUF.

[20] CSA/ANRU [2011], *La satisfaction à l'égard des programmes de rénovation urbaine*, rapport d'étude, June.

[21] Comité d'évaluation et de suivi de l'Agence nationale de la rénovation urbaine [2011], *Les Quartiers en mouvement. Pour un acte 2 de la rénovation urbaine*, Paris, La Documentation française ; Conseil économique, social et environnemental [2011], *Bilan et perspectives du Programme national de renouvellement urbain*; AMGVF [2012], *Recommandations de l'Association des maires de grandes villes de France pour un PNRU 2*; Goulard F. and Pupponi F. [2010], *op. cit.*

[22] Categories borrowed from Thomas Kirszbaum. See Kirszbaum T., “Le logement social dans l'impensé de la ville multiethnique”, in Houard N. [2011] [dir.], *Loger l'Europe. Le logement social dans tous ses États*, Paris, DIHAL, La Documentation française.

[23] See the works of Christine Lelévrier, in particular Lelévrier C. and Noyé C. [2012], “La fin des grands ensembles ?”, in Donzelot J. [dir.], *À quoi sert la rénovation urbaine ?*, Paris, PUF.

[24] Comité d'évaluation et de suivi de l'Agence nationale de la rénovation urbaine [2011], *op. cit.* ; Conseil économique, social et environnemental [2011], *op. cit.* ; AMGVF [2012], *op. cit.* ; Goulard F. and Pupponi F. [2010], *op. cit.*

resources for these policies have been greatly reduced in Germany, and were even cancelled at the end of 2010 in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, in response to the economic and financial crisis and changes of government. On the contrary, in the United States, in an equally constrained budgetary situation, the Obama administration chose to maintain and even consolidate the Federal policy aiming to fight against the effects of urban segregation, as part of a new strategy, consisting in combining three approaches: community development, social mix in neighbourhoods and promotion of the inhabitants' mobility, considering that the common limit of these options would be a lack of coordination between them.<sup>(25)</sup>

### In the United States: a combined approach

Announced in 2009, the Neighbourhood Revitalisation Initiative launched by the Obama administration aims to transform “deprived” neighbourhoods into “neighbourhoods of choice and opportunity”, enabling their residents to develop their potential, both individual and collective, and to have access to all the necessary resources for the improvement of their social trajectories (high quality schools, decent and affordable housing; shops; cultural activities, etc.).<sup>(26)</sup> Above all, to reach this goal, the Federal Administration wishes to concentrate as many resources as possible in the same neighbourhoods, while simultaneously promoting three orientations:

- ▶ promoting social mix through urban renewal;
- ▶ community development by involving residents in the elaboration and implementation of urban transformation projects;
- ▶ inhabitants' mobility, not only residential but also social, by supporting people moving to more well-off areas and by providing services (education, employment, health etc.) likely to help the promotion of individuals.<sup>(27)</sup>

This plural approach already constituted a part of the Hope VI (Housing Opportunity for People Everywhere) programme in 1992<sup>(28)</sup>, which did however receive criticism

for focusing on the first option, at the expense of the other two<sup>(29)</sup>; the current initiative is more balanced between the three aspects of the programme. Moreover, it is intended to be transverse, locally-based and guided by indicators –to facilitate monitoring and assessment– as well as flexible to adapt to changing conditions. Finally, if they are specially targeted, the idea is to connect those neighbourhoods to their environment, in order to optimize the opportunities offered to the inhabitants.<sup>(30)</sup>

If it is too early to draw any conclusion from the *Neighbourhood Revitalisation Initiative*, and although many parameters are very different between the United States and France (the social welfare system, the federal organisation; the major role played by the private and philanthropic sectors), the American example stresses the importance of combining multiple approaches and insists on the importance of the inhabitants' mobility. In this perspective, urban renewal is evaluated according to the opportunities accessible to resident households, unlike in France where, for the moment, the urban policy is above all focused on the objective of social mix and the role of urban renewal.

## ◊ STRUCTURING POLITICAL OPTIONS BY PLACING GREATER EMPHASIS ON THE PROMOTION OF INDIVIDUAL TRAJECTORIES

During the 2000s, French area-based policies greatly emphasized urban transformation. Since, by the end of the PNRU, the living environment in French neighbourhoods had greatly improved, we must now tackle certain issues that remain unresolved especially concerning residents' opportunities (professional, educational, evolution of income, etc.).<sup>(31)</sup> The stake would then become the social and residential trajectories of the residents instead of the neighbourhood socio-economic composition. On the one hand mainstream policies will be structured according to a locally-based diagnosis, starting with the structural factors behind the exclusion process, inequalities and discri-



[25] Kirszbaum T. (forthcoming), *La Rénovation urbaine entre performance et équité : le programme Choice Neighbourhoods aux États-Unis*, Centre d'analyse stratégique / General Secretariat of the French Inter-ministerial Committee on Cities

[26] See the description of the strategy on the Whitehouse website: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/nri\\_description.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/nri_description.pdf); see also chapter 11 of the CAS report: Theodos B. and Popkin S. (2012), *Les politiques de développement territorialisées aux États-Unis*.

[27] Kirszbaum T. (forthcoming), *op. cit.*

[28] Cosme C. (2012), *La Politique de la ville américaine*, Paris, La Documentation française, Centre d'analyse stratégique.

[29] The results of Hope VI are subtle. Although the programme managed to improve the image of neighbourhoods, attract higher-income residents to certain areas, and reduce poverty and criminality, it still received some critics about its too central focus on this aspect at the expense of community development and the promotion of social mobility for the original residents. See Theodos B. and Popkin S. (2012), *op. cit.*

[30] Kirszbaum T. (forthcoming), *op. cit.*

[31] Donzelot J. (dir.) (2012), *op. cit.*

minations; on the other hand, instruments will be made available to better understand these mechanisms.<sup>(32)</sup>

### Promoting individual trajectories by adapting mainstream policies according to a systematic diagnosis

Without relying on a systemic local diagnosis, many mechanisms have been experimented through the French urban policy. In this respect, “place-based” policies were clearly favoured over “people-based” policies<sup>(33)</sup>, not in the aim of promoting the mobility of residents but rather of reducing the gaps between the targeted neighbourhoods and their environments:

- ▶ through the strengthening of the human resources (additional teachers, teaching assistants, nurses, etc.) available to priority schools (located in sensitive urban areas (ZUS) or priority education areas (ZEP) or part of the ÉCLAIR network [*Écoles, collèges et lycées pour l'ambition, l'innovation et la réussite* (Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and High Schools for Ambition, Innovation and Success)] or RSS networks [*Réseaux de réussite éducative* (Educational Success Networks)]);
- ▶ through tax relief for companies settling in urban free zones (ZFU—*zones franches urbaines*) or urban redynamisation areas (ZRU—*zones de redynamisation urbaine*), in return for which, they must recruit at least a fifth of their new workforce amongst the residents of the free zone (a third since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2003);
- ▶ finally, through the urban transformations of the PNRU.

In addition to the PNRU assessment described before, there are a few lessons to learn from surveys on these “place-based” policies, including the following:

- ▶ urban free zones (ZFU) and urban redynamisation areas (ZRU) have failed to have any ripple effects on the neighbourhoods due to the poor level of training provided for residents and the enclosure of these areas<sup>(34)</sup>;
- ▶ children schooled in priority education areas (ZEP) have

neither achievement better levels nor a more successful education than their counterparts schooled outside of priority education areas, all other things being equal.<sup>(35)</sup> As for the effects of the most recent priority education policies, it is still too soon to draw final conclusions.<sup>(36)</sup>

The “people-based” option has not been really explored in France, with the exception of policies such as “busing”<sup>(37)</sup> and the *Plan Espoir Banlieues* [Suburban Hope] launched in 2008 (“internships of excellence” and the so-called *Cordées de la réussite* [Ropes to success] tutorial system<sup>(38)</sup>). In this “people-based” approach, the Monitoring and Evaluation Committee of the National Agency for Urban Renovation (ANRU) proposed some options in its last report to promote residential mobility at town scale and increase the choice in new social areas for households affected by urban renewal and demolitions.

### ANRU Monitoring and Evaluation Committee's proposals for the promotion of residential paths at town level<sup>(39)</sup>

- Include an objective of residential mobility in urban renewal projects;
- Reserve at least 25% of annual social housing allocations for residents affected by urban renewal;
- Ensure that public housing bodies systematically offer households three accommodation options (one of which should be outside the neighbourhood and outside a sensitive urban area);
- Make collaborations between social landlords compulsory to mutualize the housing offer.

In the United States, on the contrary, some programmes have stressed direct support for individuals, such as local and federal residential mobility programmes (*Section 8, Gautreaux, Moving to Opportunity, Thompson, etc.*) developed over more than thirty years<sup>(40)</sup>, or the “education

[32] In the CAS report, see Davezies L. and Estèbe P. (2012), “Quelle solidarité pour les quartiers populaires”; Epstein R. (2012b), “Politique de la ville, rénovation urbaine, égalité territoriale : quelle est la nature du problème ?”.

[33] Typology taken from Jacques Donzelot, described in chapter 1 of the CAS report: Donzelot J. (2012), “Les lieux et les gens”.

[34] ONZUS (2011), Synthèse du rapport 2011, Les Éditions du CIV, p.9; Kirsbaum T. and Epstein R. (2010), *Synthèse de travaux universitaires et d'évaluation de la politique de la ville*, report submitted to the National Assembly.

[35] Meuret D. (2000), “Les politiques de discrimination positive en France et à l'étranger”, in Van Zanten A. (dir.), *L'école : l'état des savoirs*, Paris, La Découverte, p.112-120; Rochex J.-Y. and Kherroubi M. (2004), “La recherche en éducation et les ZEP en France”, *Revue française de pédagogie*, no. 146, Paris, p.115-190.

[36] In the CAS report, see Van Zanten A. (2012), “Les politiques de choix de l'école et leurs effets”.

[37] This involves relocating classes from a school where there is little social diversity amongst pupils to another school in the same town, provided that the mayor, teachers accompanying the “relocated” class and children's parents agree.

[38] The internships of excellence (26 in 2011-2012) endeavour to provide “motivated” pupils with favourable conditions for secondary and further education in order to promote social diversity and equal opportunities. The “*Cordées de la réussite*” system, which has been experimented since early 2008 (312 in 2011-2012), aims to create ties between secondary schools located in priority education areas or sensitive urban areas, further education establishments (*grandes écoles* and universities) and secondary schools offering a *grande école* preparatory course.

[39] Monitoring and Evaluation Committee attached to the Agence Nationale de la Rénovation Urbaine (2011), *op. cit.*

voucher” programs implemented during the 1990s.<sup>(41)</sup> Considering that segregation goes hand in hand with unequal access to mobility and creates difficulties in both the educational and professional spheres, these programmes aim to distribute vouchers to families living in deprived neighbourhoods to give them immediate access to the town opportunities. A similar approach has been adopted:

- ▶ in the field of housing, the vouchers help households to relocate to more well-off neighbourhoods by covering part of their rental expenses;
- ▶ in the field of education, the vouchers enable families to educate their children in a private establishment by covering part of their school fees and even the cost of transportation between home and school.<sup>(42)</sup>

Some experts insist on the benefits of such “voucher” programmes to help those residents who wish to leave their neighbourhood, to go and live or study in a more privileged environment. Others, however, point out the risk of seeing the most privileged residents leave their neighbourhood, so that the living conditions worsen, and criticize the limited effects that these vouchers might have on the social mobility of the targeted population<sup>(43)</sup>:

- ▶ regarding “education vouchers”, assessments reveal significant, but limited, effects for Afro-American pupils<sup>(44)</sup>, although on the whole, pupils seem to have made relatively little progress, and only in certain subjects or at certain levels of education<sup>(45)</sup>;
- ▶ about residential mobility programmes, surveys reveal positive impacts only on the state of health of children and adult women, and on criminality rates among young women<sup>(46)</sup>; but the surveys also outline that integrating into the new neighbourhood might be difficult since families might experience discrimination with children’s access to quality schools and to certain public services in the new neighbourhood.<sup>(47)</sup>

Whilst the results of these mechanisms might appear

limited, one of them, namely the Thompson Residential Mobility Program recently experimented in Baltimore, does, however, look more promising. Learning from the limits of previous experiences, this program places greater emphasis on giving households a choice (the choice of relocating or staying, the choice of which neighbourhood to move to and the choice of the most appropriate accommodation for them in this new neighbourhood) and it also insists on the services offered in addition to the housing benefit (individual support both prior to and following the rehousing itself). Under certain conditions outlined in the policy brief of the Centre d’analyse stratégique, this type of experience might be a source of inspiration for France.<sup>(48)</sup>

### Le Thompson program experimented in Baltimore<sup>(49)</sup>

The Thompson program was launched in 2003 and, just like the previous ones, involves the allocation of 2,000 vouchers to volunteer families to help fund the rent on their chosen accommodation in better off neighbourhoods.

Individual support is offered to households prior to their relocation and continues for at least two years afterwards:

- families receive help to choose their accommodation, manage any potential costs implied by changing from public housing to the private sector, to integrate into their new neighbourhood (access to services, good schools and jobs) and to diversify their social connections (sports clubs, extra-curricular activities, etc.);
- a range of special activities are offered (summer internships, jobs at local establishments outside of school time, etc.) in an attempt to curb delinquency among young boys;
- families receive financial aid that enables them to cover 75% of the cost of learning to drive and to buy a second-hand car to help prevent them from losing their job as a result of transport problems.

Provided that the tools required to draw up a systemic

[40] For an overview of these works, see Bacqué M.-H. and Fol S. [2007], “Effets de quartier : enjeux scientifiques et politiques de l’importation d’une controverse”, in Authier J.-Y. et al., (dir.), *Le Quartier. Enjeux scientifiques, actions politiques et pratiques sociales*, Paris, La Découverte.

[41] Van Zanten A. [2012], *op. cit.*

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] Houard N. [2011], *op. cit.*; Van Zanten A. [2012], *op. cit.*

[44] Miron G., Urschel J. [2008], “The impact of school choice reforms on student achievement”, Western Michigan University, The Evaluation Center.

[45] Rouse C. E. [1998], “Private school vouchers and student achievement: An evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 113, p. 553-602.

[46] Kling J. R., Ludwig J. and Katz L.-F. [2005], “Neighbourhood effects on crime for female and male youth: Evidence from a randomized housing voucher experiment”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(1), p. 87-130; Sanbonmatsu L. et al. [2006], “Neighbourhoods and academic achievement: Results from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment”, *Journal of Human Resources*.

[47] Varady D. P. and Walker C. C. [2003], “Using housing vouchers to move to the suburbs: How do families fare?”, *Housing Policy Debate*, 14(3), p. 347-382.

[48] For further information on the Thompson program, see Engdahl L. [2009], *New Homes, New Neighbourhoods, New Schools: A Progress Report on the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program*, Poverty and Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) and The Baltimore Regional Housing Campaign; DeLuca S. and Rosenblatt P. [2010], “Does moving to better neighbourhoods lead to better schooling opportunities? Parental school choice in an experimental housing voucher choice”, *Teachers College Record*, 112(5); Tegeler P. [2007], “Connecting families to opportunity: The next generation of housing mobility policy”, in Smedley B. and Jenkins A. (éd.), *All Things Being Equal: Instigating Opportunity in an Inequitable Time*, New Press; Houard N. [2011], *op. cit.*

[49] *Ibid.*



diagnosis are available, starting with local manifestations of exclusion and extending to causes that affect the town or suburban area as a whole, sometimes covering an even wider range, area-based policies might serve as an incentive to structure mainstream policies in accordance with the needs of neighbourhoods and their residents. Strategic guidelines and a correct balance between “people” and “place”-based initiatives would then follow. A recent policy brief by the Centre d’analyse stratégique on the involvement of residents suggested three options for establishing such a bottom-up decision-making framework:

- ▶ introduce “neighbourhood participatory budgets<sup>(50)</sup>” integrated at town level, involving residents in urban planning;
- ▶ guarantee the quality of public consultation; and
- ▶ enable residents to be empowered and to take action<sup>(51)</sup>.

With this in mind, urban policies might not only serve as a platform for observation and experimentation but also as a lever for influencing mainstream policies. At the same time, residents’ abilities to take action at both individual and collective levels would be strengthened<sup>(52)</sup> which would boost the social mobility of residents.

### Tools required to structure mainstream policies

The very rich work carried out by the ONZUS has enabled us to describe accurately the situations and even the trajectories of certain territories, in this case sensitive urban areas. Nevertheless, with the exception of a few occasional surveys, the monitoring and observation system does not allow to objectify the households’ trajectories, or identify the public expenditure allocated to neighbourhoods. All the more, no comparison of such developments can be made with other territories.<sup>(53)</sup>

#### ■ Objectifying the households’ trajectories



[50] “Participatory pyramid” consisting of several levels (local neighbourhood forums and political orientation groups at local government and town level) and linked to significant resources, explaining the link to the decision. This financial and organisational structure is outlined in the CAS report. See Carrel M. and Houard N. [2012], *op. cit.*

[51] Carrel M. and Houard N. [2012], *op. cit.*

[52] According to the definition provided by Marie-Hélène Bacqué, this is a process by which an individual or group acquires the means to strengthen their ability to act and to emancipate themselves. See Bacqué M.-H. [2005], “L’intraduisible notion d’empowerment vue au fil des politiques urbaines américaines”, *Territoires*, no. 460, p.32-35.

[53] Davezies L. and Estèbe P. [2012], *op. cit.*; Epstein R. [2012b], *op. cit.*

[54] See chapter 7 of the CAS report: L’Horty Y. and Petit P. [2012], “Ouvrir l’accès à l’emploi dans les quartiers par des politiques publiques mieux ciblées”.

[55] *Observatoire national des zones urbaines sensibles* [National Observatory of Sensitive Urban Areas] [2010], Rapport 2010, Paris, Les Éditions du CIV, p.129.

[56] L’Horty Y. and Petit P. [2012], *op. cit.*

[57] Van Zanten A. [2012], *op. cit.*

[58] Goux D. and Maurin E. [2005], “Composition sociale du voisinage et échec scolaire. Une évaluation sur données françaises”, *Revue économique*, vol. 56, no. 2, March, p.349-362; Sari F. and Issehnane S. [2009], “Effets contextuels et effets de pairs : quelles conséquences sur la réussite scolaire ?”, in *Emploi et protection sociale, Acts of the 29<sup>th</sup> days of the Association d’économie sociale* [Association of Social Economy], Paris, L’Harmattan.

[59] Duru-Bellat M. [2009], *Accès à l’éducation : quelles inégalités dans la France d’aujourd’hui ?*, reference document prepared for the global follow-up report on education for everyone 2010 – Reaching those on the fringes, p.16 et seq.

We do not currently have any information that will enable us to systematically understand the paths taken by residents, whether or not they have left the neighbourhood, in terms of educational or professional performance, evolution of income, etc. Of course, surveys have highlighted correlations between living in a priority neighbourhood and individual trajectories, that have already been highlighted in the report on “neighbourhood effects” compiled by the Center for Strategic Analysis, but none of them have enabled us to resolutely establish the causes behind the effects observed:

- ▶ on the professional front<sup>(54)</sup>, studies show that, all other things being equal, a resident of an area-based policy neighbourhood would have less chance than a resident of another neighbourhood to find a job within 18 months, an unemployment period that is 9.2% above average, and between 1.1 and 1.9 times less chance of being employed<sup>(55)</sup>; recent surveys have shed light on discriminatory practices when it comes to access to employment, with discrimination more likely to be linked to the origin for those with a foreign-sounding name, and linked to the address for other residents<sup>(56)</sup>;
- ▶ on the educational front<sup>(57)</sup>, the effects of segregation on career guidance have been proven. Indeed, the INSEE’s<sup>(58)</sup> employment survey shows that living in a deprived neighbourhood increases the likelihood that an individual will give up his studies, fail to obtain a diploma (BEP vocational diploma or higher education diploma) or be lagging behind at school by the age of 18. Other research shows that, at a comparable school level, a young person from a working class family, educated at a secondary school with a deprived social undertone, develops a lower level of educational aspiration than a counterpart educated in a less working-class establishment; the change of context has a lesser effect on young people from a higher social class<sup>(59)</sup>;
- ▶ in terms of residential mobility, it is believed to be generally more significant in priority neighbourhoods: bet-

ween the 1990 and 1999 censuses, 61% of residents of sensitive urban areas are said to have moved, as opposed to 53% in other towns of over 2,000 residents and 48% in metropolitan France outside of sensitive urban areas.<sup>[60]</sup>

In order to ensure that public initiatives can contribute effectively to the upward progression of individual trajectories, it is necessary to understand the factors that cause or protect against the inequalities observed, particularly those outside the neighbourhood (effects of stigmatisation and discrimination, spatial and institutional isolation, etc.). To clarify these aspects and measure the impact of the duration of exposure to the neighbourhood, it might prove useful to gather longitudinal information. In this respect, two approaches might be considered:

- ▶ a series of pluri-annual follow-up surveys to monitor groups of households living in certain neighbourhoods, such as the “*Panel politique de la ville*” survey launched in 2011 by the General secretary of the Interministerial Committee for Cities<sup>[61]</sup>, enabling us to track the paths taken by individuals who have, at some point, lived in a priority neighbourhood. Such information might be of interest, but it is nevertheless limited, particularly as a result of the attrition of samples over the years;
- ▶ the other approach involves the panelisation of administrative data from social organisations, such as the “*Paname*” panel orchestrated by the National Family Allowance Fund, which enables us to monitor the allocated benefits, the family circumstances of beneficiaries and their income over a period of several years.

The limit of this exercise is of course the sector-specific nature of the gathered information. In the Swedish model, a general overview of the residents’ social situations is compiled and updated on an annual basis through the *Statistics Sweden LISA Files* database (see box below).

### The Swedish *Statistics Sweden LISA Files* database<sup>[62]</sup>



[60] *Observatoire national des zones urbaines sensibles* [National Observatory of Sensitive Urban Areas] (2005), 2005 report, p. 121.

[61] Panel survey carried out at the request of the Observatoire national des ZUS [ONZUS] on a sample of households living in sensitive urban areas, presented in the 2011 ONZUS report and the initial results of which are presented in the 2012 report.

[62] Visit the Statistics Sweden website: [http://www.scb.se/Pages/List\\_\\_257743.aspx](http://www.scb.se/Pages/List__257743.aspx).

Resulting from a partnership between Statistics Sweden, the Social Insurance Agency and the Swedish Agency for Innovative Systems, the LISA database contains information on all individuals over 16 listed in Swedish censuses and crosses information related to employment, education and social situations. LISA has been updated on an annual basis since 1990 and enables longitudinal statistical surveys to be carried out across the entire population whilst distinguishing between different groups or different areas, highlighting both residential and social trajectories. The database has to be used in respect with personal data protection laws (anonymisation, use for scientific purposes, etc.).

The following two types of data are recorded:

- information on the individual: profession, salary, other income, professional status (employee or employer), place of birth of the individual and their parents, year of immigration, place of residence, place of work and highest level of qualification.
- information on the employer: address, field of activity, entrepreneurial status, number of employees listed by gender and level of qualification, number of individuals recruited over the course of the year, distribution of salaries over the course of the year and ‘key’/‘basic’ economic data (since 1997).

### Identifying the Public Resources Allocated to Regions

In addition to the individual social mobility indicators, it would be useful to locate information, whether related to households (obtained from surveys such as the INSEE’s employment surveys or administrative statistics) or to the resources allocated to certain regions. It is now, in fact, impossible to quantify and therefore to put into perspective the funds allocated to different regions, and only isolated localised studies can shed any light. Whilst some of these might reveal that priority neighbourhoods have received preferential treatment with regards to sports and cultural facilities<sup>[63]</sup>, surveys that have attempted to

record the means granted to different regions, show the extent to which specific area-based policy credits fail to compensate for the poor implementation of mainstream policies on these territories.<sup>(64)</sup> Since the available budgetary information only enables us to assess specific urban policy credits from the State and excludes mainstream credits given by the State and other stakeholders, a number of experts, such as the members of the French Court of Auditors<sup>(65)</sup>, are calling for better identification and better regionalisation of public expenditure. Some even refer to a geolocalization system that would enable all resources granted to different areas, beyond only priority neighbourhoods, to be put into perspective.<sup>(66)</sup>

It is possible, of course, to identify several obstacles to the introduction of such instruments into public statistics, such as laws and case law rulings protecting personal data required to measure social mobility, the aggregation and homogenisation of considerable amount of information, and, especially, the support of all financing providers for the regionalisation of public expenditure.<sup>(67)</sup> This information is nevertheless fundamental if we are to adapt mainstream policies to social and regional situations.

**CONCLUSION** During the 2000s, French area-based policies greatly emphasized urban transformation. Since, by the end of the PNRU, the living environment in French neighbourhoods had greatly improved, we must now tackle certain issues that remain unresolved especially concerning residents' opportunities (professional, educational, evolution of income, etc.). The stake would then become the social and residential trajectories of the residents instead of the neighbourhood socio-economic composition. On the one hand mainstream policies will be structured according to a locally-based diagnosis, starting with the structural factors behind the exclusion process, inequalities and discriminations; on the other hand, instruments will be made available to better understand these mechanisms.

► **Key words** : area-based urban policy, urban renovation, sensitive urban areas, *New Deal for Communities*, *Soziale Stadt*, deprived neighborhoods.



Noémie Houard,  
Social Affairs Department



[63] For example: Martin-Houssart G. and Tabard N. [2002], "Les équipements publics mieux répartis sur le territoire que les services marchands", *France, Portrait Social*, 2002-2003, Paris, INSEE.

[64] Epstein R. and Mboumoua I. [2012], *op. cit.*

[65] Cour des Comptes [2012], *op. cit.*

[66] In the CAS report, see Epstein R. [2012b], *op. cit.*

[67] In the CAS report, see Damon J. [2012], "Variations autour de la politique de la ville".

THE CENTRE'S  
PUBLICATIONS

[www.strategie.gouv.fr](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr), rubrique publications

**Note d'analyse :**

N° 278 ■ **La participation des habitants :  
trois pistes pour rénover la politique de la ville**  
(septembre 2012)

**Rapport :**

**Politique de la ville**  
Perspectives françaises et ouvertures internationales (décembre 2012)




**Études :**

**Politique de la ville**  
L'expérience américaine (décembre 2012)

**Les indicateurs de la politique de la ville**

Comparaison entre trois pays, la France, la Grande-Bretagne, les Pays-Bas  
(décembre 2012)

Get the latest news from the strategic Analysis Centre from:

-  [www.strategie.gouv.fr](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr)
-  [centredanalysestrategique](https://www.facebook.com/centredanalysestrategique)
-  [@Strategie\\_Gouv](https://twitter.com/Strategie_Gouv)



Note d'analyse No. 309 -  
December 2012 is a publication  
of the Centre d'analyse stratégique

Director of Publication:  
Vincent Chriqui, Director General

Chief Editor:  
Hervé Monange,  
Deputy Director general

Copy Editors:  
Delphine Gorges,  
Valérie Senné

Copyright: December 2012  
N° ISSN: 1760 -5733

Press office:  
Jean-Michel Roullé,  
Communication manager  
+33 [0]1 42 75 61 37 / 06 46 55 38 38  
[jean-michel.roulle@strategie.gouv.fr](mailto:jean-michel.roulle@strategie.gouv.fr)

The Centre d'analyse stratégique is a research and advisory institution under the authority of the Prime Minister. The Centre's mission is to advise the Government on economic, social, environmental and technologic policy issues. The Centre provides the Prime Minister with briefs and forecasts concerning major national reforms. It also conducts independent research initiatives as a part of its annual working program. The Centre draws upon an 11 member Steering Committee that includes two Members of the Parliament, two Senators and a member of the Economic, Social and Environmental Council. It works in coordination with the main Councils of experts reporting to the Prime Minister.



[www.strategie.gouv.fr](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr)