

THE PERCEPTION OF STREET SPACE BY CITIZENS

An analysis of Paris neighbourhood councils meetings

Laetitia Dablanc and Caroline Gallez

Université Paris-Est, City Mobility and Transport Research Unit (LVMT)

Over the past few decades, states as well as local public authorities have been committed to increasing the participation of citizens in public affairs. According to some authors, this general interest has been accompanied by a move from systems of government to governance (Rhodes, 1997). Many works have sought to analyze the participation process and resources (Neveu, 2007), focusing for instance on the links between increasing public participation, governance and democracy (Kübler and Wälti, 2002).

A smaller number of works have concentrated on the outputs of public participation, focusing their attention on the substantial changes brought about by such processes in terms of emerging issues or innovative solutions *inter alia* Gonzales, 2006, Louvet, 2005. In this article, we present the results of an analysis we have conducted of meetings¹ of Paris neighbourhood councils (*conseils de quartier*) - local, non-decision-making bodies bringing together randomly selected or appointed members two or three times a year. In our analysis of the minutes of these meetings, we focused on the discussions that took place in relation to the uses and functions of street space². Citizens' concerns address many different uses of street space, underscoring the fact that transport and mobility are but one component of public space. Our analysis aims at assessing whether, by formulating problems or expressing needs about street space in a global and transversal way, citizens make a valuable contribution to the more specialized approaches to transport developed by municipal technical services.

In the first section, we present neighbourhood councils in Paris and the methodology we used to study them. In the second section, we characterize the main issues arising from an analysis of current views on the uses and functions of street space; we focus in particular on freight transport and delivery issues which have become especially important in Parisian transport and planning policies in recent years. In section three, we assess the transversal aspect of debates concerning the uses and functions of street space and finally, in the fourth section, we analyze the fruits of this dialogue by stressing the factors that are likely to hamper a more global appreciation of public space.

1. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. Neighbourhood councils in Paris

In many countries, citizens' participation in the identification of municipal policies or projects is an established practice, as evidenced by the longstanding tradition of town meetings in New England (Bryan, 2004). In France, a number of neighbourhood committees were already in existence or had been experimented with in various cities (e.g., Paris, Marseilles or



Roubaix) before the Local Democracy Law (*Démocratie de Proximité*) of February 27, 2002 laid down general rules for this form of democratic participation in all cities with over 80,000 inhabitants.

Organization of local government in the City of Paris

Each of Paris' twenty *arrondissements* (districts – see figure 1) has a council presided over by a mayor chosen from the members of Paris City Council (*Conseil de Paris*). District councillors have a mainly consultative role.

Therefore, the City of Paris has most of the say regarding transport, street use and planning policy and delegates very little to the mayors of the *arrondissements*. However, we should note that, unlike the mayors of provincial cities, Paris City Council does not have complete control over street planning policy. Traffic and parking regulations for certain major streets are the preserve of the *Préfet de Police* (chief of police) and the *Préfecture* may veto certain street development initiatives in the name of road safety. Moreover, there is no metropolitan authority similar to that existing for Greater London and, with the exception of public transport, authority ceases at municipal boundaries.

The Law of February 27, 2002, strengthened the role of Paris district councils which have been tasked with creating new consultative bodies, i.e., neighbourhood councils. There are 121 such neighbourhood councils in Paris and their members are either appointed by local mayors or drawn from among volunteers. These councils discuss local housing, transport or planning issues, or any aspects of local policy. Neighbourhood councils formulate non-binding 'wishes' for consideration at local government level. In Paris, the City Council sets the terms of reference for neighbourhood councils upon the recommendation of the district councils. The organization and *modus operandi* of the neighbourhood councils is the responsibility of the mayor of each *arrondissement*.

Our research focuses on the debates of neighbourhood councils in the 15th *arrondissement* of Paris (figure 1), and, more specifically, on two councils in contrasting neighbourhoods. We examined and compared the minutes of meetings over a three-year period (2003, 2004, 2005). In the 15th *arrondissement*, each neighbourhood council meeting is presided over by an elected representative and comprises 24 permanent members – half of these are neighbourhood residents selected at random from electoral lists. The others are district councillors, representatives of associations or suitably qualified persons. All meetings are held in public and open to all residents. At least two meetings a year are organized in each neighbourhood.

1.2. Methodology

The object of our analysis - street space and its perception by citizens - is taken in its broadest sense to mean a space used collectively, comprising both the road network, footpaths and public spaces. The uses we identified are both dynamic (traffic, deliveries) and static (parking of vehicles, leisure, shops, etc.). The references identified in the minutes of neighbourhood council meetings were selected in accordance with their direct or indirect relation to this object.

In order to organize the content of debates, we first had to classify expressions of opinion by main theme addressed: speed, parking, conflict of use, etc. This is an empirical basis of classification: we did not seek to

optimize the classification or the number of categories obtained – we merely wished to describe content while avoiding any overt or definitive compartmentalization of the various themes studied.

The debates are made up of the successive contributions of the various participants. Each participation by an individual in the debate is referred to as 'a contribution'. For each contribution, one or several thematic expressions were identified. An expression consists of one or several sentences that we attach to a principal theme, e.g., parking, modal share or adverse environmental effects (tables 1 and 2).

2. THEMATIC CONTENT OF DEBATES

2.1 Street uses and functions

We identified eleven main themes in respect of street use and functions (table 1). A statistical analysis shows the percentage contribution of each theme to the total number of contributions identified (figure 2).

As several meetings were called to discuss a specific development project (e.g., a cycle or bus lane), a significant number of contributions (24%) relate to the reorganization of traffic lanes, footpaths or public spaces.

Moreover a large number of contributions (35%) concern mixed street use and the coexistence of such different uses: shared use of streets and footpaths (17%), speed and safety of pedestrians (6%), harm caused by noise and other pollution and cut-off effects (8%), need for local stores or desegregation of the organization of public space (4%).

Next come contributions on traffic-related issues (27%): organization of traffic (19%), performance of public transport (3%), modal share (5%).

Finally, 14% of contributions relate to streets' urban development functions: 10% to parking, 2% to protection of local heritage, and 2% to urban services and access to amenities.

2.2 The perception of freight in the public space

We have analyzed the importance accorded to freight and delivery issues at forty meetings (a higher number of meetings than for other themes). In particular, we focused on the relative importance of freight compared to other issues, as well as on the type of stakeholders involved. A lexical search was conducted for words such as delivery, truck, goods, transport of goods and freight. We found a total of 28 thematic contributions for freight and delivery, i.e., an average of 0.7 references for freight and deliveries at each meeting. This means that these problems account for very little of what is debated by neighbourhood councils, except when the transport of goods is central to the issue discussed (such as the reorganisation of truck access to the Porte de Versailles Exhibition Park). The specific themes discussed are the following (figure 3).

The impacts caused by delivery activities referred to by council members are congestion, safety and noise (in that order). There is only one reference to air quality problems. Local impacts are also discussed, such as the manoeuvres that trucks have to engage in to reach a supermarket in a narrow street. These local issues are surprisingly few. Many references are made to the difficulties of deliverymen in accessing shop premises, particularly when new cycle lanes are introduced.

Apart from a single discussion concerning the future of the *petite ceinture* railway and a debate on the future of river ports, the themes raised in relation to deliveries are local, short-term issues unconcerned with the challenges of innovation (clean vehicles, for example). Only a single reference to the transport of goods concerned a general consideration of the organization of deliveries in Paris.

Nearly half (46%) of the references denote opposition to, or a negative view of freight activities, presenting them as noisy, dangerous and cumbersome. However, the other half (54% of references) presents freight activities in a positive light, stressing the necessity for delivery bays and the need to facilitate truck drivers' working conditions. Most participants in the meetings agreed that the reorganisation of rue du Commerce (a very busy street with many businesses) had to provide more space for on-street delivery bays at the expense of car parking space. On the whole, the perception of freight issues by participants in neighbourhood councils is not as negative as we initially thought.

3. TRANSVERSAL ATTITUDES: FROM OBJECT TO DEBATES

In addition to these statistical analyses, which are highly dependent on the basis of classification used and the agenda of the various meetings, an in-depth analysis of speeches, and a breakdown of the components of the contributions give a clearer idea of the transversal nature of the debates.

3.1 The street: a transversal object

The overall statistical analysis conducted on street use shows that over one-third of contributions concern conflicts of use and the corresponding planning solutions envisaged, as well as the lack of, or need for, functional mixity in public spaces. The contributions relating to parking and urban accessibility relate, by definition, to the interface between network and territory and fall within the scope of traffic flows and networking of the urban street system. Moreover, we note that over one-third of contributions relating to traffic problems concern inter-modal conflicts, particularly in terms of safety, cut-off effects or inaccessibility. In brief, we may say that the transversal nature of street-related contributions resides in both the object and the manner in which it is referred to. The street is multifunctional by nature and the debates concerning it mainly revolve around balance, shared use, and conflicts between uses or between different uses.

3.2. Speed and parking: contradictory points of view?

Beyond the multidimensional nature of the street and the issues relating to its layout or the coexistence of its different uses, the degree of 'transversality' of the related debates also depends on comparing differing points of view.

The contribution of a participant is generally associated with the formulation of a defined problem that only covers a tiny portion of a street's typical uses. It is the reactions from other participants to this contribution that trigger a shared or opposing viewpoint related to different practices and experience of street use. Clearly, the experiences or everyday practices of residents to different street functions (traffic, local community, lifestyle, etc.) are only expressed in approximate terms via the preoccupations and expectations formulated by

each participant considered in isolation, and an overall approach may only be gauged from a comparison of the dialogue and exchanges of contributions between different inhabitants, district councillors, associations or other local actors.

The degree of contradiction varies widely depending on the specific theme and does not involve all categories of actors in the same way.

Let us take the example of speed and pedestrian safety. This issue of conflict between car-borne street users and residential street users reveals a majority viewpoint among the inhabitants, namely, the danger to the most vulnerable users faced with excessive speeds of vehicles or dense traffic on certain roads. Nevertheless, there is a minority viewpoint that stresses the “inherent nature” of traffic in Paris, equating heavy traffic flows with a certain urban vitality as opposed to traffic-free districts frequently presented as “dormitory” neighbourhoods. District councillors or technicians faced with such questions appear to evade the issue or ‘kick for touch’. Technicians tend to emphasise their partial responsibility for regulating the speed of traffic while district councillors, for political reasons, focus more on problems relating to the overall organisation of all modes of transport or parking.

In a nutshell, the issue of speed is mainly raised by inhabitants and is rarely taken up by technicians due to a large degree of fragmentation of competencies, or by politicians, because of opposition from the elected representatives of the district to the traffic regulation policies promoted by the Mayor of Paris.

Conversely, parking-related issues generate heated contradictory arguments among inhabitants and district councillors. The nature of such contradictions is different. On the one hand, there is a broad consensus among inhabitants, traders and councillors regarding the dearth of parking spaces in the two neighbourhoods under consideration. This shortage is expressed in different ways: inhabitants speak of their difficulties in finding parking spaces near their homes; others recount how it hinders their professional activities (e.g. a doctor who performs his visits by car and a trader who feels that the absence of parking facilities has hit his turnover); other people tell of the problems of illegal parking (e.g., pedestrians that cannot use footpaths because they are blocked by cars) and link these to the lack of parking facilities (street-based or specially organized facilities).

District councillors of the 15th *arrondissement* (who belong to the opposition) have used this issue to spearhead their attack on the politics promoted by Paris City Council: by reminding inhabitants that the Council uses this lever to limit car use in Paris, they seek to mobilise inhabitants against certain planning projects by stressing the number of parking spaces that will be lost. Whenever the inhabitants themselves seek a solution to a street planning issue or a given problem, they are generally more amenable to closing a traffic lane than to loosing parking spaces.

A minority point of view exists among those inhabitants who are clearly in favour of curtailing the use of cars in the city and who wish to place the general interest of all (improving the quality of life, combating pollution or simply putting an end to “car obsession”) over individual interests.

Thus, the question of parking is debated very differently to that of speed. It encompasses all street functions and uses, and constitutes a particularly

sensitive political topic: both as a policy instrument, as parking is recognised by experts as one of the most effective levers for limiting car use; and also as a political football as the issue of parking is used by the opposition to contest the relevance of such and such a planning initiative.

3.3 Transport of goods: the emergence of a structured approach

The 28 references to the transport of goods and businesses in the debates were equivalent to a total of 78 concrete contributions (figure 4 provides a breakdown of these contributions).

Over one-third of contributions come from residents and mainly concern perceived hindrances. A non-negligible number of contributions also concern the necessity for certain types (such as plumbers/tradesmen or businessmen) of having access to delivery bays.

Contributions from representatives of associations (parents of schoolchildren, associations of property owners, residents associations) are rare (approximately 10%). We should note that business people and their representative associations – including delivery companies – are rarely present at these meetings. The only meeting that attracted a business representative concerned the redevelopment of rue du Commerce. This representative participated mainly for the purpose of ‘explaining’ the project to the other participants (mostly residents): it would appear that business people were urged to participate in meetings concerning the redevelopment of rue du Commerce outside the context of neighbourhood council meetings.

District councillors made 29% of the contributions in respect of the transport of goods and deliveries. In general they make informed contributions: some use the problems of deliveries and access to stores to challenge an entire redevelopment project (e.g. the Bir Hakeim – Montparnasse cycling trail). They intervene in different ways depending on whether they are acting as representatives of the district (against the central City Council, for example), as sponsors of a local project (that they wish to defend), or as chairmen/coordinators of a neighbourhood council (in which case they attempt to launch certain debates).

Street engineers and external experts invited to attend accounted for a quarter of contributions. They attempt explain the constraints and realities of delivery activities in layman’s terms and promise technical solutions. Technical knowledge of the challenges and planning issues concerning deliveries which was previously in short supply now appears to have assumed greater importance in Paris administration.

4. TYPOLOGY OF STREET USES AND REPRESENTATIONS

A number of different analytical levels can be identified corresponding to approaches to public spaces based on function, use and various representations.

4.1. The technical viewpoint: network-based approach and separatist logic

The first level of argument is that of the technicians of the *Direction de la voirie et des déplacements* (DVD – streets and transport unit) of Paris City Council. Their approach is predominantly network-based linked to satisfying infrastructure traffic requirements. When confronted with modal share issues,

they opt for “segregative” planning of public space and seek to strictly delineate the lanes reserved for cars bikes, buses, taxis and deliveries. Green spaces are also developed on a ‘separatist’ basis as the basic principle consists in discouraging traffic in order to safeguard a residential quality of life. This recalls the functional separation of urban spaces close to the living/circulation dichotomy first posited by Cerdà (Wachter, 2003), the principle of isolating car traffic contained in the Charter of Athens which ranks lanes by the type and speed of the vehicles that use them and by their destination (Mangin, 2004), as well as the neighbourhood units isolated from traffic described in the Buchanan Report (1963).

Therefore, paradoxically, the political imperatives inherent to this approach - summarised by two underlying concerns: restoring a balance between different modes of transport and guaranteeing a better quality of city life - result in planning principles that are akin to those used to adapt cities for use by automobiles. These separatist principles that aim to renew the sharing of public space or mixity of uses, are underpinned by values - transversal by definition - such as urbanity, far removed from the primacy that modern city planners and traffic engineers accorded to the circulatory function in the 1950s and 60s.

The inertia of institutional structures and compartmentalization of the competencies comprising the domain of street planning, organisation of traffic and implementation of transport plans undoubtedly account in large part for the sluggish evolution of approaches and technical mentalities. Nevertheless, it would be simplistic to deny that changes in street planning methods and principles are taking place. The example of the solutions provided by a technician of the *Direction de la voirie et des déplacements* to problems concerning the choice of route for a cycling track are revealing in this regard: she explained that the choice does not merely depend on traffic flows or the capacities of the different axes concerned, but on the opportunities offered by the various itinerary in terms of accessibility to shops. We should also note a significant change in the perception of delivery-related problems by technicians. Whereas they previously regarded such issues purely from a technical perspective, municipal technicians would now appear - based on their contributions in neighbourhood councils - to be much more amenable to the need to incorporate a wide range of issues (planning, town planning, commercial development, working conditions of delivery people) into solutions to problems concerning traffic or the parking of delivery vehicles.

4.2. The residents’ viewpoint: urban approach and territorial mindset

Residents’ basis of argument is probably that most directly opposed to technicians’ network-based approach. By definition, residents are rooted in the neighbourhood and they approach street-related issues as a component of the urban landscape with a broad vision of collective uses. They can spot conflicts in uses and identify them in space and time (as borne out in contributions concerning parking or the risks inherent in temporarily or permanently narrowing footpaths). They challenge certain planning principles when such principles do not fit with their ideas of possible or desirable uses for a given initiative (e.g., a resident was astonished that a cycling trail was placed along a busy route rather than along an itinerary with much lighter traffic flow). They complain that boundaries between different spaces are

unclear due to cut-off impacts (via infrastructures or the weight of traffic or by the closure of certain neighbourhoods).

However, residents also raise numerous questions concerning the rerouting of traffic or the continuation of routes that extend beyond their own neighbourhood. Concertation in street planning matters reaches its limits due to the principle of territorialisation of neighbourhood councils: for example, when a cyclist is worried about preserving a cycling lane that straddles a particular neighbourhood they may be informed that the matter falls outside the scope of their neighbourhood council – if the cyclist belongs to an association, they may put forward their argument in several different neighbourhoods or contact the relevant technical services directly. However, if they are merely a resident, a problem that requires a network-based approach may be rejected for organisational reasons.

However, we would be wrong to perceive residents' arguments in a monolithic way: many different viewpoints exist depending on whether or not these residents own and use a car or have young children (issues of safety). Car users and business people usually advocate maintaining reasonable parking facilities. They feel that problems of illegal parking are directly related to an insufficient supply of parking spaces and need to be resolved by developing underground car parks. Indeed, residents who complain of the adverse effects of heavy traffic may agree with this position.

4.3. The viewpoint of district councillors

The 'pitch' of district councillors is directly related to their political allegiance. The 15th *arrondissement* of Paris is currently in the hands of right-wing parties opposed to the team of Mayor Bertrand Delanoë. Consequently, transport policy, which is one of Paris City Council's flagship policies, is one of the opposition's bugbears and they contest the validity of a strategy that is excessively hostile to privately-owned cars.

Moreover, in Paris, neighbourhood councils were set up in specific circumstances to reallocate technical and political competencies between the central City Council and the councils of the *arrondissements*. As the councillors of the 15th *arrondissement* point out, decision-making is concentrated in the City Council; the mayors of the *arrondissements* have a consultative role and they constitute a point of contact for inhabitants. As such, the organisation of a concertation process appears as a new component that is likely to modify and disrupt the local political landscape.

Consequently, district councillors' approach to street planning issues is characterised by two main types of argument.

The first consists of defending the car in the face of the regulations imposed by the City Council and constitutes a call to defend local community values (attractiveness of shops, economic vitality) and the living conditions of Parisians themselves (avoid reducing the number of parking spaces). District councillors attempt to mobilise the members of neighbourhood councils against such and such a planning initiative. They intervene as moderators in car-related debates that have become too heated by recalling that the rules of democratic debate permit the expression of all points of view. Certain debates reveal fairly clear attempts to instrumentalise the neighbourhood council

(particularly when the neighbourhood council makes recommendations within the scope of the local planning concertation process).

The second recurring argument is closely bound up with issues of redistributing competencies and decision-making power. When replying to problems raised by inhabitants, district councillors frequently stress their lack of clout due to the absence of real decision-making power at *arrondissement* level. We note that the argument varies depending on the topic: while requests to regulate speed or the need to sanction illegal parking meet with a muted response, problems concerning the removal of obstacles from footpaths may be held up as proof of the insufficiency of the central services tasked with their removal. Furthermore, district councillors defend their role of providing information to inhabitants and negotiating with representatives of the central City Council. Therefore, they seek both to limit the role of the neighbourhood council (e.g., by stressing that a particular information meeting or working group is not open to residents but that the district councillors are there to keep them informed) and to use opinions or petitions likely to emanate from the council in order to bolster their opposition to the central City Council.

CONCLUSION : WHAT PURPOSE IS SERVED BY THE LOCAL CONCERTATION PROCESS?

In France, where centralising tendencies are strong and there is a deep-rooted attachment to representative democracy, a cleavage clearly exists between the expectations expressed *vis-à-vis* the local concertation process and the actual experiences of the different participants in the related public debates. Associations or the general public are left wondering what purpose concertation serves if their requests are not heard, nothing changes and everything is decided beforehand. Technicians and district councillors ask themselves what is the good of public meetings if all they do is complicate their job and delay or block the decision-making process.

One aspect highlighted by an analysis of the content of debates is the gap between the “production” of concertation and the initial expectations of the stakeholders.

As regards local concertation on Parisian street planning projects, four points should be borne in mind.

The first concerns all of the concrete and practical benefits of local concertation: the contributions that lead participants to formulate their expectations and listen to contradictory viewpoints from other users; information given or requested for projects in progress, the choice of the agenda for other meetings; direct contact with the technical services or district councillors which, at a first glance, would appear to be more effective than postal correspondence – residents often complain that their petitions are simply never addressed. Many participants express satisfaction at their participation at these public meetings.

The second point relates to the effects highlighted by concertation, namely the emergence of new problems not addressed on a political level, exacerbated by a particularly high degree of fragmentation in technical and institutional responsibilities. The most telling example is probably that of speed. Without getting into the question of the representativeness of the contributions on this

subject, we would simply stress that the manner in which the problem is presented is an explicit challenge to the ‘segregative’ principles that continue to dominate Parisian street planning projects and methods. As one inhabitant explains, the issue of speed regulations is relevant everywhere and does not just concern through roads. 30 kilometre/hr zones need to be extended, according to another.

The third point concerns the influence of the neighbourhood council in the local political landscape. As we have seen, the strong implication of the elected representatives of the 15th *arrondissement* in street-related matters results from their political affiliation and the symbolic importance accorded to transport policies by the teams working alongside Mayor Bertrand Delanoë. This implication is probably also linked to the specific way in which competencies are split between the central City Council and the councils of the *arrondissements* (districts). What we are probably witnessing is a dual phenomenon: on the one hand, neighbourhood representatives wishing to reaffirm their lobbying role by attempting to directly contact the technical services concerned by a given planning initiative or conflict of use; on the other hand, district councillors are attempting to instrumentalise the local concertation process to bolster their negotiating power with the central City Council while striving to safeguard their own role of intermediaries between the local population and institutions.

Lastly, the fourth point is specific to the theme of deliveries and the transport of goods. We have felt the need – as expressed by municipal technicians and sometimes by district councillors – to develop a global and sometimes experimental approach to the transport of goods and urban logistics. As such, the need to establish partnerships and enlarge the concertation process to include hauliers and residents in order to promote cleaner delivery systems has been reaffirmed on a number of occasions by key actors. But at the same time, it is becoming more and more difficult to establish such partnerships as representatives of hauliers’ and especially their customers (who really decide how deliveries are organised), are not present in bodies such as neighbourhood councils. Residents’ representatives participating in neighbourhood council meetings do not display much interest in these issues. Consequently, on this specific point, local concertation and all its attendant benefits are a long way from being truly effective.

Notes

¹ 13 meetings were studied for the themes in table 1, in addition to 27 meetings (i.e., a total of 40 meetings analysed) for the themes in table 2.

² Issues concerning spatial regulation and modal share lie at the heart of Parisian transport policy. Unlike policies adopted in other cities such as London or Stockholm, measures regulating car use in Paris mainly depend on decreasing the space allotted to road traffic and parking, and not parking enforcement measures or toll gates.

Bibliography

- Amar G. (1993) Pour une écologie urbaine des transports, *Les annales de la recherche urbaine*, n°59-60, pp. 141-151.
- Bryan F. M. (2004) *Real Democracy. The New England Town Meeting and How It Works*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- Buchanan C. (1963) *Traffic in towns. A study of the long term problems of traffic in urban areas*, Majesty Stationary Office, London.
- Conseil National des Transports (2004) *Une voirie pour tous. Sécurité et cohabitation sur la voie publique au-delà des conflits d'usage*.
- Gonzalès A. (2006) *Mobilier et le PDU d'Ile-de-France. L'innovation dans les politiques de déplacements au risque de la concertation*, Thèse de doctorat de l'ENPC, sous la direction de J.-M. Offner.
- Kübler D., Wälti S. (2002) Metropolitan Governance and Democracy: How to Evaluate New Tendencies, *Public Participation and Innovations in Community Governannce*, McLaverty P. (ed), Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 99-121.
- Louvet N. (2005) *Les conditions d'une concertation productive dans l'action publique locale : le cas des plans de déplacements urbains*, Thèse de doctorat de l'ENPC, sous la direction de J.-M. Offner.
- Mangin D. (2004) *La ville franchisée. Formes et structures de la ville contemporaine*, Paris : Editions de la Villette.
- Neveu C. (ed) (2007) *Cultures et pratiques participatives, Perspectives comparatives*, L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Rhodes R.A.W. (1997) *Understanding Governance*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Roncayolo M., Paquot T. (dir) (1992), *Villes et civilisation urbaine. XVIIIè-XXè siècles*, Larousse, Paris.
- Wachter S. (2003) *La forme et le flux. Figures urbaines et architecturales de la mobilité*, Notes du Centre de Prospective et de Veille Scientifique (CPVS), n°18, MELT-DRAST.

Figure 1 – The 20 *arrondissements* of Paris




Image Copyright 2004, Mark Jaroski

Figure 2 – Distribution of street-related thematic expressions






Figure 3 - Distribution of freight-related thematic expressions in neighbourhood council meetings



100 % = 28 freight-related thematic expressions

Figure 4 – Origin of contributions during debates concerning deliveries



100% = 78 freight-related contributions

Table 1 – Classification of street-related thematic expressions

Thematic expression	Content
1. Protection of local heritage	Requests for protection of streets or places with specific heritage value
2. Supply and demand of parking spaces	Need for parking spaces, observations or worries over reduction in parking spaces, managing the supply (residential parking, short-term parking, delivery bays)
3. Accessibility of urban amenities	Problems with access to public spaces (stations, public gardens), especially for persons with restricted mobility, organisation of public transport service to centres of interest (extension of line, train times)
4. Organisation of traffic flows	Organisation of car traffic (congestion, rerouting of traffic due to development work, traffic routing maps), buses (continuity of bus lanes), bikes (continuity of cycle tracks), pedestrians (crossing busy streets).
5. Public transport performance	Requests/projects dealing with public transport performance (speed, regularity, frequency of buses, waiting times, timetable information)
6. Development of modal share	General considerations concerning the evolution of different modes of transport, car dependence, bicycle use, etc.
7. Characteristics of street development	Needs/projects to develop streets, footpaths, crossroads or public squares, cycling and bus lanes, problems with road signs
8. Speed, traffic intensity, pedestrian safety	Excessive speed of cars or motor cycles, traffic intensity likely to give rise to risks or cause accidents to pedestrians, or promote a feeling of insecurity
9. Street sharing, conflicts of street use	Organising the sharing of streets and adjacent public spaces (footpaths, pedestrian spaces) problems of coexistence between different modes of transport (including illegal parking), circulatory and

	commercial uses (e.g., deliveries and bus lanes)
10. Environmental problems	Pollution (including noise pollution) related to traffic and deliveries, removal of trees within the scope of a street redevelopment plan
11. Mixed functions and uses of public spaces	Problems with segmentation of public spaces, insufficient functional 'mixity' (e.g., demand for local stores), quest for 'mixity' of uses (e.g., development of a cycling track favouring access to shops)

Table 2 - Classification of thematic expressions relating to freight and delivery activities

Thematic expression	Content
1. Impacts and pollution caused by freight activities	Noise, air pollution, visual intrusion of trucks in city streets
2. Conflicts of street use generated by freight activities	Conflicts between trucks/vans and buses, trucks/vans and bicycles, trucks/vans and pedestrians...
3. Accessibility to loading/unloading facilities	Access to shops' premises, availability of parking spaces, delivery time windows, need for on-street or off-street delivery bays, inadequate location or design of delivery bays
4. Multimodality, clean or experimental delivery vehicles	Waterborne freight transport, rail freight transport, electric or natural gas propelled delivery vehicles