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I. RECENT CONCERNS WITH NEW TOWNS IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES

The recent new towns development in both France and the United States can best be understood within the context of concerns facing both countries. First is the concern with what course urban growth should take in both countries and the formulation of national urban growth policy. Second, and more specifically, is the planning for housing needs and the types of human settlement patterns most appropriate for urban regions in both countries. New town developments have emerged as components of planning in both cases.

A. Concern with National Urban Growth Policy

France now has an explicit national growth policy. This policy formulated in 1965 is a result of a long-term concern with the growth of the Paris region and its economic and political dominance over that of the rest of the country.¹ In the United States, the question of the need of a national urban growth policy is only now being widely debated, and there is not yet unanimity that the federal government should adopt such a policy. Advocates of such a policy are in the main those concerned with reducing economic inequities within and between different regions of the country and those concerned with environmental preservation. While no one metropolitan area dominates in the United States as does Paris in France, there is still increasing pressure upon the federal government to provide guidelines for orderly metropolitan growth. There is, however, little evidence that there is support for such a far reaching national policy as has been officially formulated in France.
1. Urban Growth Policy in France

From the middle of the 19th century to the time of the entry of France into World War II the population of France remained roughly stationary. During this period, however, the urban population nearly doubled and that of the Paris region grew by threefold. Since World War II, France's total population has increased both as a result of a rise in the birth rate and from immigration, and the proportion living in urban areas has continued to rise. In terms of population, the Paris region continues to maintain its dominance, although it is not at the present increasing in population as much as certain other regional centers in the country. Recent population projections indicate growth in population throughout the rest of this century, with the Paris region adding six millions during this period.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population of France (millions)</th>
<th>Urban Population of France</th>
<th>Paris District Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected:</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "Schema Directeur". Table 2, page 24.
The economic and political dominance of Paris has been a long-standing controversy in France and became a topic of intense political discussion in the period immediately following World War II.² Whereas formerly the debate had centered on the disadvantages to other regions of the country--loss of manpower, political strength and obsolescence of economic vitality--the postwar controversy focused as well on the ability of the Paris region to absorb increasing population. The question was also raised as to the wisdom of a modern economy, increasingly dependent upon tertiary industries, to concentrate economic activities in one location.

Prior to this period, the growth of the Paris region had occupied local officials. The expansion of Paris was dramatized by the collapse in 1927 of Thier's fortifications, the wall separating Paris and its growing suburbs. At that time, Raymond Poincaire, President of the Council, created a committee to consider the organization of the Paris District. At this time, the District was defined as a circle with a radius of 35 km around Notre Dame in Paris. This area was extended in 1941 to the Paris Region and included the three districts of the Seine, and in 1943 a Comité d'aménagement de la Region Parisienne was created with the responsibility of planning for the Paris Region.

Planning for the Paris region was interrupted by World War II but was resumed in the post-war period. By 1958 a general organization plan, Plan d'aménagement et d'organisation générale de la Region Parisienne (P.A.G.O.D.) had been developed and was formally approved in 1960. At the same time the Planning Institute (I.A.U.R.P.)
for the Paris region was also established. Thus, there had evolved over some three or four decades plans and administrative arrangements for a comprehensive town and country scheme for the Paris region. These have subsequently been incorporated as a part of the national urban planning scheme in France.

The formulation of a national urban growth policy began with the Schema Directeur in 1965. This plan designated certain "metropoles d'équilibre"* from among the metropolitan regions of France as urban areas as alternate growth centers to the Paris Region. Included among these were Lyon-Saint Etienne, Marseille-Aix, Lille-Robaix-Tourcoing, Nancy, Metz-Thionville, Strasbourg-Mantes, Saint Nazaire-Bordeaux and Toulouse. The French government has accordingly taken action to place certain controls over industrial building in the Paris area, but is at the same time providing inducements to industries and providing certain additional services to the selected "metropoles d'équilibre". The aim is to stimulate their growth and to restrict the growth of the Paris region.

In addition to the plans for the "metropoles d'équilibre", a corollary part of the Schema Directeur is the plan for the Growth of the Paris Region. Under this plan new urban centers are being created with the hope of channeling future urban growth within the region away from the present radial concentric pattern to one along a double axis--one north and one south--from Paris towards Rouen, Le Havre and Caen.

*See Appendix, Map I
Accordingly, new town development has become an integral part of the plan for the Paris region. Hopefully, also, the creation of new towns would limit the growth of shapeless dormitory suburbs such as have developed in the suburbs in the post-war period. Up to now, plans have been developed for five new towns in the Paris region: Cergy-Pointoise; Marne-La Vallee; St. Quentin en Yvelines; Melun-Senart-Evry; and some others in suburbs of large other cities, as Fos. Etang De Berre near Marseille, L'Isle D'Abeau near Lyon, Le Vaudrieu near Rouen, Lille-Est near Lille. *

2. The Debate Concerning a National Urban Growth Policy in the United States

Recently, several official and semi-official groups in the United States have concerned themselves with the question of whether there should be a national policy to guide urban growth. These include the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1968), the Douglas Commission on Urban Problems (1969), the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy (1969), the National Goals Staff (1970), and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972). All have made recommendations for the development of national goal objectives and criteria for shaping the pattern of national growth. All point to the need for federal guidelines to serve as a framework for regional, state, and local planning.

Advocates of a national urban growth policy come from several sources. They include those concerned with the economically

*See Appendix Map IIa, Iib.
depressed areas of the country, both rural and urban. Those favoring a "growth center" strategy have been concerned primarily with the lagging rural regions of the country and would favor governmental support to regional metropolitan centers with the potential to provide employment to those left behind in economically depressed rural areas. Those concerned with the problems of the depressed central cities have favored extensive rebuilding and rehabilitation of central city areas with federal government support and governmental incentives to provide poor central city residents with access to jobs and housing in the suburbs of metropolitan areas.

Other advocates of a national urban policy are not so much concerned with the problems of particular "places", depressed rural areas and central cities, but believe that patterns of metropolitan growth that have prevailed in the United States are self-limiting with respect to an improved quality of life for a national population which is now heavily concentrated in metropolitan areas. They emphasize, in particular, the desecration of the environment, the inequities between different segments of the population, and the inability of local governments to handle problems for which they have been vested with responsibility. They emphasize the need of strong federal government action in providing guidelines to state and local governments.

As yet, new town development has not received much support as a component of national urban growth policy, for reasons which will be apparent in the next chapter. However, the role which
new towns might play in future metropolitan growth is being considered with increasing frequency. Though not generally regarded as feasible on a large scale, support is often recommended for governmental support for experimental efforts.

Political support for a national urban growth policy was never great but advocates surfaced when poverty was receiving national attention and with the racial confrontations in central cities. It seemed more urgent, also, when the rate of population growth was high. What interest existed in the topic was countered by those opposed to direct measures for helping particular areas in distinction to programs for particular individuals. A national urban growth policy has now encountered political oblivion. Whatever interest develops in new towns will most likely not develop as a part of national policy but obtain support primarily as an innovation in housing arrangements.

B. Housing and Settlement Patterns

Housing shortages were acute in both France and in the United States following World War II. This shortage was particularly acute in France immediately following the war due to war destruction. It was acute in both countries because little new housing had been built in the 1930's and during the period of World War II. The situation was aggravated by population increase in the metropolitan areas of both countries, and increase beyond that anticipated and one which assured population growth in metropolitan areas for several decades to come. New housing
had to be built rapidly and the decade of the 1950's was one of unprecedented mass housing construction in the suburban sections of metropolitan areas in both countries. Owing to the "emergency" housing demand, most of the construction was done without planning with respect to land use and to the provision of needed services.

Economic prosperity in the 1960's in both countries and higher family incomes assured the continuation of a large volume of new housing construction. Since the end of World War II, and more exactly since 1953, 750,000 new dwelling units have been built in France. In fact, in 1965, in the Paris Region more than 2.5 million people, or roughly 25 percent of the total population of the Region were living in housing less than 10 years old. 8 In the United States, in 1970, over half of the population living in metropolitan areas were living in dwelling units built since 1950. 9

The pattern of suburban development and housing construction has been the subject of intense criticism in both countries since the early 1960's, but in both of these countries the initiatives taken for planning to avoid "suburban sprawl" has been slower than in certain European countries, notably Britain, Sweden and the Netherlands. 9 However, the Schema Directeur, aimed at the development of the Paris Region, represents a comprehensive attempt to guide the pattern of residential settlement in the Region as a whole. Under this plan it is hoped to divert much of the new residential construction in suburbs to the new towns being planned for the Paris Region.
In the United States, with the exception of the New York State Urban Development Corporation* organized to plan for the development of urban growth in the New York region, there are no comprehensive governmental or quasi-governmental plans for the residential settlement patterns of entire metropolitan regions as in the case of the Paris Region. Regional planning organizations, created under the auspices of state governments, have limited objectives in most cases and are without the political power and financial resources to forge plans for residential growth patterns. New town development, as will be seen in the next chapter, has been primarily the initiative of private developers. Under the New Communities Act of 1970, the federal government is giving some support in the initial phases of planning to developers of new communities, and it hopes to enlist the states in more of these ventures. New towns-in-town are more recent ventures than the new town development, and are primarily the successors to older and often limited experiments with various forms of urban renewal in the central cities.

*The New York Urban Development Corporation was created in 1968 with the mandate to combine the efforts of the public and private sectors to help in the renewal of the cities of the State and to insure the orderly growth of urban areas. Its powers enable it to override municipal boundaries and authorities; furthermore it has the power to expropriate land, to act as a developer, to raise loans and to establish subsidiaries. Its program for 1972 includes the construction of 15,000 new dwelling units in urban areas of the state, numerous other types of facilities, and continuing work on three new towns: Welfare Island, Lysander, and Amhurst. Welfare Island, in East River in New York City, has been leased to the Corporation for 99 years by the city, and is expected to eventually have 20,000 residents. Lysander, outside of Buffalo, will cover 2,700 and is slated to accommodate 18,000 persons. Amhurst, near Buffalo, is still in the planning stage. In these new towns the Corporation plans to recover infrastructure costs by land sales.
II. PRIVATE VS. PUBLIC SECTOR'S ROLE IN NEW TOWN DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE

A. The United States

In the United States the federal government has made no large scale commitment to the building of new communities. This is primarily the province of private developers. Yet, there are a number of historical examples to illustrate the interest of federal government in new community development. Recently the legislation has been passed to stimulate and assist the private sector in new town building. There exist, however, strains and ambiguities in relationships between the public and private sectors.

1. Some Historical Precedents for Governmental Participation

Perhaps the first involvement of the federal government in new community development was during World War I when the nation was faced with a severe housing shortage in areas with war industries. In October 1917, the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense recommended federal assistance for comprehensively planned residential communities. In March 1918 the Congress appropriated $175 million to create permanent homes in new communities but the war ended before the communities were built.

When interest in the new town movement, stemming from the Garden City movement in England, surfaced in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's, the federal government became involved.
Under the leadership of Clarence Stein, a planner for the New York Commission on Housing and Regional Planning Association of America, four new garden communities were established with mortgage money provided by the Federal Housing Administration insurance guarantees: Sunnyside Garden Apartments in New York (1924-28), Radburn (now called Fairlawn), New Jersey (1928), Hillside, New York and Baldwin Hills Village in Los Angeles County (1941). During the depression the federal government itself financed and built three new Greenbelt towns: Greenbelt, Maryland (near Washington, D.C.), Greenhills, Ohio (near Cincinnati), and Greendale, Wisconsin (near Milwaukee). Built by the Resettlement Administration in 1935, control of the management of these towns was gradually relinquished. By 1953 all governmental holdings had been liquidated, and the Public Housing Administration sold all undeveloped land to non-profit veteran's associations.

The large scale power and reclamation projects sponsored by the federal government in the 1930's also entailed the creation of some new communities. Two examples of such communities are Boulder City, Nevada and Norris, Tennessee.

In the period following World War II, the large developers of new towns were indirectly assisted by the Federal Housing Administration of the federal government through its backing of FHA mortgages of buyers. The post-war communities such as Park Forest, Illinois and the Levittowns in New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania might not have been built without this assistance.
2. **Private Developments**

The earliest new towns were company towns, built to accommodate the needs of industry and generally without the features of experimental planning. These are widely scattered throughout the country, examples of which include Pullman, Illinois and Kingsport, Tennessee.

The real estate communities built by private developers were, however, intended to demonstrate that comprehensively planned new communities could be profitable business ventures. Riverside, Illinois, built in 1869 was the first of such affluent suburban communities. Among those subsequently built were Roland Park in Baltimore established in 1891, the Country Club district of Kansas City, and Forest Hills Gardens on Long Island, New York.

In the recent new communities development the investors and developers may be classified into the following categories: (1) the traditional developer-builder, such as Phillip Kentrick who built Park Forest, Illinois through the American Communities Ventures, the Rossmoor Corporation, one of the nation's largest home-building corporations, and James Rouse, the developer of Columbia, Maryland; (2) large national corporations with available capital, such as Westinghouse and General Electric Corporation; (3) corporate groups within the oil industry, such as the Sunset International Petroleum which has built three new communities in California; (4) large land owners who have decided to develop rather than sell their properties, such as Goodyear which built
Litchfield Park, Arizona or the Newhall Land Company which developed "Valencia" on 4,300 acres of its 40,000 acre holdings; and, finally (4) mortgage lenders, including banks and insurance companies, such as the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, one of the large lenders both for Coral Ridge, Florida, and for Columbia, Maryland.

With the exception of the new communities development in New York State, all new communities outside of central cities are being built as private ventures. The New York State case is a special and unique one in the sense that it is the only instance in which a state has established a policy and plan for urban development in both rural and urban areas and one which includes a long-term strategy for new community development.

New community development requires vast organizational effort and financial risk for the private sector. In such efforts, the speed of development is a crucial factor. New communities require huge front end investments to acquire large land sites, to build houses and to install facilities and improvements before people begin moving into the community. In the early stages of the building of Columbia, Maryland, the Rouse Company was paying interest at the rate of $5,000 a day on money borrowed to buy the land only, and even before there was assurance that a new town would or could be built on the land site. The large financial risks involved limit, therefore, the initiative which private investors may be willing to take with respect to large scale land assembly, provision of low-income housing, long-term planning, and innovations of various sorts.
3. **Entry of Governmental Participation**

As a result of the limits to new community development which can be anticipated under the auspices of the private sector, the federal government has become increasingly involved in the hopes of increasing the scope of long-term planning of housing and other facilities in the satellite new towns being built by private investors and developers. Through legislation and administrative arrangements, the federal government hopes that by facilitating the efforts of the private sector to wed some of its own interests and responsibilities in planning with that of the private sector.

The federal government had, through the Urban Growth and New Community Act of 1970, provided support for private developers for feasibility planning of some new towns—for example: Johnathan, Minnesota; St. Charles, Maryland; Park Forest South, Illinois; Maumell, Arkansas; Flower Mound, Texas; Riverton, New York; and recently there have been others.

This effort is the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Urban Development where there have been strong advocates for new town development. It is not clear, however, that elsewhere in the federal government there is strong support for government support of new towns or agreement that this should occupy a central concern in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The participation of government in assisting in the initial planning of new towns has called to attention the importance of comprehensive planning in the building of new
towns and the limits to which this can be achieved when it is in the sphere of the private sector only. In the process, the federal government is developing guidelines for new town development which may be broadly applied. The specific role of the federal government and the intent of legislation is more fully considered in a subsequent section.


The new towns-in-town are a recent development which have to be considered apart from the new towns being built as satellite communities. They have essentially been considered as successors to the earlier urban renewal programs in the deteriorating residential areas of central cities. The program first launched by the Johnson administration in 1967, as a reaction to the city riots in the 1960's, was to construct rapidly quantities of housing for the poor. This was to be done on federally owned sites not involving demolition of existing homes or displacement of slum dwellers. The first such site selected was Fort Lincoln in Washington, D.C. Under guidelines drawn up by the planners of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the new towns-in-town program was converted into a kind of model community development program with stress of economic and racial balance, comprehensive urban services, innovative architecture. Fort Lincoln, in the nation's capitol, would provide the prototype for the new town-in-town development in other cities.
Initially, seven cities were enlisted in the program, but three years later plans for new towns-in-town had been abandoned in three cities (San Antonio, New Bedford and San Francisco), and was stalled in Louisville. Cedar Riverside in Minneapolis was being built, and plans were still under consideration for Fort Lincoln and for the new town-in-towns in Clinton Township adjacent to Detroit, and in Atlanta. Conceived of as governmentally supported efforts, the new town-in-towns have met the obstacles of intragovernmental politics at almost every juncture. More recently plans are also underway for Coldspring in Baltimore and the federal government has provided support for the acquisition of land for its site. This new town-in-town, at this writing, appears to have some likelihood of being built as is presently being planned if local government can float the necessary bond issues. However, unlike its predecessors, Coldspring is not intended to serve primarily that portion of the population originally considered for new towns-in-town in the federal government's early program. Moreover, the plans call for facilitating arrangements which will more actively involve the private sector.

5. Legislation

Several recent legislative acts have established the involvement of the federal government in new town development. Title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and Title VII of the Urban Growth and New Development Act of 1970 have broadly defined the framework within which the federal government
will work in relationship to other levels of government.

The earliest legislation gave formal recognition to the basic desirability of new town development for the nation. It has also spelled out the working relationship between the federal government and the private sector in the planning and development of new towns. The legislation establishes criteria which private developers must satisfy in order to obtain financial assistance from the federal government.

Developers must present strong evidence that the building of the new town will contribute to the economic welfare of the general geographic area in which it would be situated. They must show that the principles of comprehensive planning will be applied in land use, and in the provision of housing and other facilities and services as well. They must also demonstrate the use of advances in design and technology. Low income housing units must constitute a portion of the residential units built.

If private developers satisfy these requirements, financial assistance of various forms are available to them at different stages. Upwards to two-thirds of all planning costs to the private developer may be covered by federal planning grants. The federal government is prepared to guarantee backing of debt obligations incurred by developers in acquiring land for the new town site, for developing the land and for installing utilities. It will also cover interest payments on money borrowed by developers for these purposes and will require no
repayments on these amounts during the first years of the new town's construction.

On April 20, 1972 a set of draft regulations supplementing the original Title VII and covering various aspects of assistance to new communities was issued by Secretary Romney. Included was a statement covering the human needs of new communities and an expanded section on health and social services to be included. Details were specified on the provision of services and facilities for portions of the projected population, including low income persons and the elderly. Also added was a new section spelling out the environmental factors to be considered. General criteria for new towns were also to include innovations not only in physical planning but in other aspects of new community development as well.

Finally, a section was added concerning new towns-in-town which has been published in another set of draft resolutions in August 1972. This provides for the use of urban renewal funds in areas with land or space that is vacant or inappropriately used. Under this section, new community programs and urban renewal programs can be coordinated to develop new community projects, especially in central city areas.

6. Problems

The federal legislation regarding new towns in intended to provide the framework for federal participation in the development of new communities and to specify the coordination between
the public and private sectors in this effort. Despite the beginning legislative efforts, there are a number of problems in this respect.

First, there is not yet agreement on the goals for which new towns are to be established even within the federal government. Within several governmental agencies new town development has been advocated primarily for providing higher quality of housing or for demonstrating that comprehensive planning be implemented. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, on the other hand, has tended to view the new community as a model for testing a great range of technological innovations. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has been primarily responsible for setting the guidelines for new towns which have followed the broad legislative efforts of the Congress, and within the federal government there is considerable objection to the broad initiatives taken by this Department.

Second, the role and responsibility at different governmental levels is not yet well defined by the legislation or specified in the guidelines which are being developed. A crucial point is the role which the state government will have in new town development. States clearly have the responsibility on matters relating to land use control and will need to be involved in the decision-making process in new town planning with the federal government and the private developers. The level of responsibility at the state level is not adequately defined in the present legislation, and the role of the state
government in new town development is in fact very weak. The legislation deals more specifically with relationships between the federal government, local officials and the private developers.

Third, inherent in the new town development is a conflict of basic interests of the public and private sectors which is not likely to be overcome by legislation. Even if the private sector is compelled to demonstrate some degree of altruism in order to do business profitably, its main objective is profit making. Government, on the other hand, will need to push those objectives believed to be in the public interest, such as comprehensive planning, the provision of low income housing, social integration of communities—matters which may impede profit making. The question remains as to whether the federal government can offer incentives sufficient to the private sector to enlist their interest in some of the altruistic goals to which government must address itself.

Fourth, a new kind of opposition is emerging on the American scene with increasing frequency to impede the efforts of both government and the private sector in large scale efforts, of which new town development is only one. This is the organized effort of public groups which get constituted to oppose a given project, or special interest groups, such as those concerned with environmental matters, who are already constituted to be vigilant when various new projects are being considered. In either case, the groups are concerned with the broad consequences which the new projects would bring to the people and the natural
environment of new developments. In short, a third sector has emerged and with which both the public and private sector must reckon. This sector has already been vocal with respect to urban renewal programs and is no doubt a factor in the decision of government to consider new towns-in-town as an alternative to earlier urban renewal plans, since the new towns-in-town would keep dislocation of the existing population at a minimum. Presently, also, there are instances where public groups are mobilizing to oppose the development of new towns because of environmental consequences, and perhaps for less altruistic reasons as well.

B. **France**

New town development in France is a recent venture. Unlike in the United States and in most of the Western European countries, there is no historical precedent for either public or private building of new towns. New towns are, however, a part of a larger comprehensive plan for stemming the growth of the city of Paris and for rationalizing the type of growth which takes place within the Paris Region. Although the private sector is being encouraged to participate in the building of some of the housing in the new towns, the planning and building of new towns is primarily the responsibility of government. The initial concern has been with evolving an organizational structure and the necessary administrative arrangements at different levels of government in order to accomplish the task.
1. **Governmental Structure for Planning of New Towns**

When the Schema Directeur was first set forth in 1965, the decision was made that the planning and building of the new towns in the Paris Region would have to be done within the existing organizational and administrative structure of government. This decision meant that the aim of the government would be to incorporate a structure for planning within the already existing framework of government. Involved would be certain ministeries of the central government, already responsible for certain services, and the local government at the commune level, with other responsibilities and prerogatives for decision making.

The Schema Directeur was a part national program promulgated within the ministries of Public Works and Construction, in existence as separate ministries from 1945 and combined in 1966 as the Ministry of Public Works and Housing. The purpose of the 1966 reorganization was to coordinate the efforts of two ministries in urban planning on a comprehensive basis. Under the one new ministry two separate units were established:

1. Direction de l'aménagement Fonciers et de l'Urbanisme (D.A.F.U.)
2. Direction de la Construction. The former was to have the responsibility for urban development and included special divisions for planning research, programs, organization, finance, and administrative and legal affairs. The latter's responsibility was with housing, primarily with the planning for low and moderate income housing (H.L.M.) but also with control and supervision of the private sector in matters of building regulations, rent, etc.
At the commune level, the government has traditionally had the responsibility for all building operations and for the provision of local services, even when the monies were supplied by the French central government. Because the commune zealously guards these perogatives from infringement by the central government, it was recognized that arrangements with local government was crucial to the success of new town developments. The question was not then whether the commune government should be involved in the enterprise, but whether some sort of administrative and financial extra-territoriality could be evolved as well. New towns would be large scale enterprises and administratively unwieldy and impossible if in the case of each new town it was necessary to deal with the various administrative units within each of the communes separately.

The organizational structure which has evolved was intended to overcome the massive proliferation of administrative details which would ensue without some change in traditional bureaucratic relationships between government at different levels.

A major step in this direction was the creation of an inter-ministerial working party at the central level of government to oversee new town development in France. Since most new towns are as yet confined to the Paris region, this group was to be headed by the delegate of the Paris region, but was to include as well representatives from various ministries and the prefects of districts adjoining the Paris region which might be affected by any new town
development. The group would have the responsibility for seeing that new town developments were consistent with national policy. It was also the agency within the central government which would function to work with other bodies and local government involved with new towns.

The same legislation which established the inter-ministerial working party for new towns at the central level, also prescribed that a Research and Planning Commission should be established in each case when a new town was designated by central government. The Director of the Commission in each new town was to be designated by the Prime Minister. This Commission is in effect for a given period only, and is first under the direct authority of the regional Prefect. As soon as possible, however, the Commission is supposed to locate in the area where the new town is to be built in order to facilitate the closest contact possible with local conditions and with local officials. Local officials--administrative and sales personnel, technical personnel, and town planning staff--are then recruited for development of plans for the new town. It has become increasingly evident with experience that the central government would be unable to supply the needed personnel for the planning efforts, nor does it feel that it would be advisable to do so.

After considerable deliberation, the public development corporation has evolved as the most acceptable model for undertaking the building of new towns, replacing the Research and Planning Commission as soon as the development is underway. Three
of the five new towns in the Paris region have already reached that stage in which the public development corporation has been created.

The New Town Act of 1970 spells out in detail how a new governmental structure for the new town is achieved. The proposed urbanization limits of the new town is first submitted by the central government to the local officials in those communes where the new town would be situated. If the boundaries are approved, the new town is granted official status by decree in the Conseil d'Etat. Following this, once the geographic limits of the new towns are approved by the various communes, there is then the need to create a governmental structure which transcends that of the individual communes. The usual municipal council is replaced by a council of nine members, including representatives of the relevant communes. New inhabitants as soon as possible elect representatives to municipal council and no later than three years from this election, the new town acquires the status of a fully operative municipality.

Provision for the financing of new towns was included in the Fifth Plan in 1965, and the Budget of the Ministry of Economic Affairs for 1966 earmarked a grant of Frs. 150 million in a "reserve" chapter designated as "aid for new towns". However, since large scale developments such as new towns require enormous financial outlays, it was recognized that capital available for new towns must be kept in circulation to meet the costs of land acquisition and community infrastructures in the new towns. It was important,
also, to control insofar as possible land speculation and prevent price escalation of land values in the areas selected for new town sites. Accordingly, a number of actions have been taken to build up land reserves and to implement a land development policy, under a chapter created within the Ministry of Public Works and Housing.

Under the land use control program, it is also possible for public authorities to acquire control over land and for preemption over land transactions in the so-called "Deferred Development Zones.

As it has worked out, it is often the public development corporation which acquires the land and undertakes the building of the community infrastructure. Loans for these purposes for new towns in the Paris region are obtained from L'Agence Fonciere et Technique de la region Parisienne, and are backed by the Paris District.

The residential sections of new towns are generally built by private developers, or by the public sector in the case of public housing, but under plans agreed upon in advance between the government and the developers. In the "concerted development zones" of new towns, both the private and public developers are constrained to conform to plans established in advance.

These restraints do not, however, discourage the participation of private developers in new towns, since other advantages, including the presence of an already existing community infrastructure, minimizes both their financial obligations and their financial risks.
2. Problems Connected with New Town Developments in France

As would be expected, governmental direction in the building of new towns in France has met with considerable conflict at the central level, between different levels of government and between the public and private sectors. There are also problems associated with launching such a large scale experiment in a country such as France which tends to be resistant to large scale change.

1. Conflicts and reactions against new towns

The new town program in France was initiated at the central level of government as a part of the national urban growth policy, and a "theoretical battle" has been in evidence from the very beginning among government authorities, both with respect to the national policy and the new town program as well. The main arguments used against the building of new towns center on the great risks being assumed by the central government, the scale of the development being undertaken, and the length of time which development and construction of new towns will take.

The achievement of continuity in the new town development depends very much on continued support by highly placed governmental officials in the central government. Since 1965 when the Schema Directeur was first presented, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Works and Housing, and the Prefect of the Paris Region, all key persons, have been succeeded by others. It remains to be seen whether support for the new town venture will continue. The new Minister of Public Works and Housing has raised the question of
whether the Schema Directeur should continue to be pursued. Up until now the majority of officials have responded in the positive, but theoretical debates are emerging on such issues as the size and scope of new town development which should be undertaken. There seems to be little reason to suspect that original objectives will not be altered as new officials gain political ascendancy and as experience with new towns create new controversies.

Strong opposition to the new town development is most apparent among certain local officials, frequently the mayors. This opposition derives generally not so much over the theoretical issues of how problems of urban growth are to be met, but over administrative arrangements. For example, in the Etang de Berre area in the south region, where new town projects had been decided upon, the mayors have refused to form themselves into one intercommunal body and have decided instead to create five intercommunal syndicates.3

On the other hand, many of the mayors are of the opinion that local officials have an insignificant role in the planning for new towns in their areas. It is true that while local officials are represented, about half of the members of the public development corporation are from governmental agencies, and the District representative is elected by government. The dominance of the central government, they maintain, has possible adverse consequences on the budget of the communes. While the communes do obtain loans for public works in new towns and have liberal repayment options, the central government is responsible for costly
items such as highways, subways, and other costly expenditures. Should the central government fail to live up to its obligations, the communes may be faced with repayment of loans before their returns from housing and taxes are proportional to their expenditures.

The land use policy adopted in connection with the new town development, entailing as it does control of land speculation, has not resulted in the amount of conflict with the private sector that might have been expected. Neither have the constraints placed upon the developers who build in new towns. Presumably, private developers have seen advantages in working in concert with government in the new towns.

Certain difficulties have, however, arisen in connection with developers who build in areas near the new towns. This arises because while the government has created tools to control what is happening within the defined limits of the new towns, it has less control over developments in adjacent surroundings. Many developers see it to their advantage to build houses in proximity to the new town limits in order that residents may have access to the facilities and services which are being offered in the new towns. This relieves the private developers of certain costs and responsibilities, but puts an overload on the new towns.

The new towns are also in competition with other new residential developments for attracting residents. Private developers, as has been indicated, may provide housing at less cost because
they do not provide the community infrastructure and the facilities and services which are part and parcel of new town development. Also, at least in the short run, some of the innovations being attempted in the new town experiments may as yet not be acceptable to the public. The public sector, on the other hand, can cater to conventional tastes, which may bring residents more readily. This problem is in fact one aspect of a broader one.

2. New experiments in a conservative and traditional country

Paris is an old historic city with many advocates for maintaining its "old" traditional atmosphere. Much opposition has been voiced in regard to government's public projects in housing and commercial development involving "skyscrapers" and high rise construction in general. In urban renewal programs, the government has been compelled by the force of public opinion, to restrict innovations in order that the character of areas will not be drastically changed.

Even among those who accept the reasons why the new town ventures are being undertaken and support this activity, many would not choose to be "victims" of the experiment. A survey concerning the public's attitudes towards new towns is significant in this connection. Among those surveyed who agreed that the new town experiments were a good thing, only 50 percent would themselves choose to live in a new town.

Such a reaction is probably not special with regard to the
new town developments, but would apply to most experiments, especially if the experiment was initiated by government. There is probably a rather general consensus that whatever government undertakes will be tasteless and to some extent unsatisfactory for those who would be able to exercise choice in the matter. Attempts to enlist the interest of citizens in new ventures is not yet common practice in France. Yet the general skepticism which prevails among the public with regard to new towns in France does raise the question of whether citizen involvement may not be desirable and even necessary in gaining interest and acceptance for new towns.

Another point applies to government in both countries. The structure of government is such that the various levels of government are unable to function in concert for the solution of important problems. It has evolved over a considerable period and simply is inadequate to the scale of problems which present themselves. Metropolitan problems, for example, cut across governmental jurisdictions. Regional government has been more completely achieved in the Paris region than in any large metropolitan area in the United States, but in France efforts to coordinate the efforts of local government outside of the Paris Region have not met with much success.

The new town development is, therefore, a kind of experiment in modification of the present archiac structure of government. This is more so the case in France than in the United States, since
the scale of new towns being built is larger and transverse more governmental jurisdictions, and since the role of government in building new towns is greater. However, even in the United States, new towns represent an experiment requiring considerable modification in government structure. A case in point is the practical necessity of making land acquisitions sufficiently large for the site of a new town. Clearly, in the United States this will require some initiative on the part of the state governments, or on the part of a quasi public-private body (as in the case of the New York Development Corporation) created for this purpose and with legislative sanction to actually determine land use. Clearly, also, if new towns are to be built on any scale and to provide housing that competes with other housing being built, local governments will have to submit to some standardization in building regulations to attract developers who will want to take advantage of technological innovations in the building industry. This will, of course, require initiative beyond the local governmental level. So, also, will the provision for a great range of services, important among which is transportation.
III. SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ROLE OF NEW TOWN DEVELOPMENT ON THE SOLUTION OF NATIONAL PROBLEMS

The previous discussion conveys the notion of large differences in the new town development in the United States and France. In the United States, support for new towns has surfaced from time to time, some new towns have been built, and there is obviously considerable ideological support for new towns among certain segments of the public at the present time. In France new towns are being planned without historical precedents and without much interest or ideological support from the public as a whole. In France, new towns are part of an explicit national urban growth policy which now has governmental sanction. In the United States, no such policy has as yet been made explicit, although advocates of new town development have emerged as such a policy is being debated on the national scene. In France, it is the government which has initiated the new town development, while in the United States the stimulus has currently been provided chiefly by the public sector.

These differences are sufficient to indicate that there are wide differences in the context within which new town development is taking place within the two countries. Emphasis on the differences, however, may have shortcomings in terms of the analysis of new town development and the questions which should be addressed in connection with that development. To concentrate on differences is likely to raise primarily polemical questions as to whether the route which France is proceeding with regard to new town
development is better than in the United States, or vice versa? It will tend to focus the concerns on such questions as whether government should initiate new town development, seek to facilitate its development, or remain aloof altogether?

Questions of this order, and polemical for the most part, are probably not the crucial ones. In both countries, there are the constraints presented by the economic, political and social structures, which to a large extent will shape specific courses taken at the beginning. But a major point is that the kinds of new towns that are now being built are experiments on a considerable scale in both countries, and that much "social learning" is needed to assess their possible significance from a number of points of view.

A. Similarities in the Type of Problems to Which New Towns Have Been Addressed

Viewed from this perspective, it is useful to consider the similarities in the objectives to which new town development has been addressed in both countries. There are similarities in the objectives, explicit or implicit, set forth in the literature, and these may be classified in certain broad categories. First, there is the interest in effecting changes in the pattern of the distribution of population and economic activities. Second, there is concern with increasing the supply and quality of housing and other amenities of the environment. Third, there is need to balance the role of different levels of government in meeting problems in the public interest. Fourth, there is the need to devise a
modus operandi for the cooperation of the public and private sectors in the solution of problems.

All of these problems are persistent problems of a broad scale and not amenable to easy solution. One accustomed to awareness of the types of solutions which emerge from time to time as a means for solution of these problems will probably view the "new towns movement" as an additional attempt to solve complicated problems with relatively limited means. Enduring problems are complex in their origins and incremental programs emerge as solutions, generally to be replaced by other programs at a later time which either seem more relevant or generate more public support.

The above is mentioned only as a caution. Too much is probably expected from new town development, and from this point of view, whatever its achievements are, the assessments are likely to fall short of success. This much can be expected with considerable certainty. However, with this caution in mind, it may still be profitable to examine the new town development in both countries from the point of view of the broad national problems to which it is quite obviously viewed as at least one means of solution.

B. Distribution of Population and Economic Activities

In both the United States and France, the present distribution of population and economic activities have been viewed by many as a significant national problem. On a national scale, the
concern has been that the people in one area are at some advantage or disadvantage relative to those in other areas. On a local scale, the concern has been with the seeming disorder of the location of settlements and new construction, the mismatch between residences and jobs, the diseconomies associated with providing facilities and services, environmental deterioration—all variously characterized as the results of "urban sprawl".

There is, however, considerable controversy as to the magnitude of this problem and the extent to which it may be altered by governmental intervention. Many would argue that the present patterns of distribution of population and economic activities merely reflect the balance of "benefits" over "costs". Therefore, any attempts to alter present distributional patterns are likely to have cost consequences which are in excess of benefit consequences, or will be attempts to alter the hierarchy of choice which has been operating in the present distributional patterns. In the main, they would argue that attempts to effect a different distribution of population and economic activities is, if not risky, likely to meet with only limited success. Such is the position taken by those concerned primarily with the "efficiency" of the economic system.

Others, however, would argue that other criteria need to be applied in assessing the desirability of the present distribution of population and economic activities and whether or not governmental intervention is desirable. Their arguments hinge on consideration of social equity for different segments of the population,
obligations of the government to maintain public and limited resources and to provide services and facilities, and the need to provide a greater range of living and working environment than is now available.

The positions taken with respect to new town development as a solution to problems of distribution of population and economic activities reflect the criteria used in assessing the present distribution patterns. They also reflect the extent to which it is believed that intervention would effect change in these patterns. Those who adhere to "efficiency" as the important determinant tend to be skeptical of the accomplishments which may be achieved by new towns. They point to the difficulties which can be expected in providing an economic base for employment of the new town population, the enormous costs involved in providing not only all new housing but a new community infrastructure as well. Generally, they are of the opinion that economic forces are far more important in determining how distribution patterns will evolve, and that that intervention is extremely unlikely to counteract these forces. And, finally, they are of the opinion that given the choice of vast expenditures of the scope that would be required to change distribution patterns that the money would be better spent in increasing the options of those with limited choice in the economic system. This is essentially the point of view that has prevailed in the United States and has kept government from developing a national urban growth policy which would focus attention on particular "places". In France, "efficiency"
considerations probably predominate to a lesser extent. France is more of a welfare state than the United States, and there is a longer and more accepted tradition for government intervention in the interests of social equity.

In both countries, however, there is an ascendancy of groups with an ideology for planning in the public interest. The interest of professional planners, social scientists, and other groups in new types of environments have undoubtedly forged the interest of new town development as alternatives to present types of settlement patterns. So also has the economic affluence which has prevailed in both countries and has given rise to the notion that alternative choices in living environments is in the public interest. This is a relevant point in connection with concern with housing in both countries.

C. The Problem of the Supply and Quality of Housing

Housing tends to be defined as a persistent problem in both France and the United States, and in most countries as well. It is perhaps worthwhile to explore to what extent it has been and is a problem in order to throw some light on how the new towns are expected to serve as solutions to this problem.

The focus tends often to be upon the supply of housing. Whether or not a housing supply is adequate or inadequate is often difficult to determine. In certain periods, such as the post World War II period in both countries, there was clearly a housing shortage, since there had been little housing
construction during the period of the war and the population was increasing. Housing shortages are also more likely to prevail at most times for the poorer segments of the population, since particular types of housing are needed: cheap housing and rental dwellings. A shortage of low income housing is therefore likely to be a persistent problem. Even here the problem is likely to be one of a supply of housing which meets certain standards. In neither country are the poor expected to live in substandard housing, and in both countries the quality of low income housing has been upgraded consistently.

Since government in both countries must be concerned with housing for low income groups, some interest in new towns attaches to the possibilities seen for providing low income housing in the new towns. This is clearly the case in the United States where the Department of Housing and Urban Development has attempted, but not very successfully, to make the provision of low income housing a condition for public support of private developers of new towns. In addition, low income groups have problems in addition to housing, and governments ordinarily have been unsuccessful in demonstrating that they can materially improve conditions for the poor, as evidenced by the limited success of urban renewal programs and a host of other public programs. The opportunities of removing the poor from their usual environments in a new town environment has obviously been of considerable appeal to many concerned with the plight of the disadvantaged sections of the population.
There is little to demonstrate, however, that in either France or the United States that low income housing will be a major achievement of new town development within the near future. New housing is more expensive than old housing, and the poor would have to be heavily subsidized in their housing if they lived in new towns. It is unlikely that in either the case of France or the United States will such heavy government support be given.

Improvements in the quality of housing and the housing environment for the non-poor have, however, been advanced as strong points in favor of new towns. Here, as in the case of other arguments in support of new towns, the evidence is not yet available to show that new towns will attract residents to the extent the proponents of new towns argue, or that residents of new towns will perceive of their housing and housing environment as superior to that which they might have commanded elsewhere. For example, some resistance is likely at the initial stages of the building of new towns when residents are needed but before all amenities are provided, and before the character of the new town can be known.

Certainly considerable "social learning" is needed about the importance of housing and the housing environment in comparison with other requirements of families. To what extent are those seeking housing willing or able to forego other things in order to achieve a certain level of housing and environmental amenity.
Will people choose to live in a new town rather than in an unplanned suburban development if they have to pay more for the house? To what extent are the amenities other than housing crucial in their decisions as to where they choose to live? Is housing less important than other things? What types of people are most likely to be attracted to new towns and what types are not? Does the newness of the community act as a deterrent for those already situated in stable environments?

These and other questions are relevant to the attractions which new towns may have for potential residents. The answers are, of course, not known for the most part. It is likely, however, that one of the strong points for the new towns is that it provides yet another type of alternative in living environment. Whether or not, the new town environment can satisfy the claims of its advocates remains another question. For example, in the United States new towns are generally advanced as providing the opportunity for more diversity with respect to residents and a greater sense of commitment than is presently the case in suburban developments and within cities. The evidence for these contentions is generally lacking and sometimes contrary.
D. Balancing the Role of Government at Different Levels in Problems of Public Interest

It is generally recognized that government in France is more centralized than in the U.S. In both countries, however, there is the problem of allocating the functions of government at the various levels and working out the relationships which must be obtained between different sectors of the government in the solution of problems. As France has discovered in its new town program, the central government is not prepared to undertake the actual building of new towns nor does it consider it desirable that the central government should assume full responsibility for this enterprise. Furthermore, the extent to which the solution of a national problem is assumed to be the domain of the central government will depend upon the extent of public concern with the particular matter. In the United States, many problems have become the concern of the federal government, because state and local governments have either been unwilling or unable to assume responsibility for these problems. A case in point is the entry of the federal government in the provision of public housing. Increasingly, in both countries the central governments have assumed responsibility for problems national in scope. But in both countries, there are limits to which the central government is willing to diminish the role of other levels of government.

Increasingly, it appears that local governments in the United States must relinquish some control if new towns are to be built, and that initiatives will need to be taken at higher
levels of government as is the case in France. This does not mean, however, that the federal government in the United States will necessarily ever be sanctioned to build new towns on a large scale, or that it will find it possible to increase greatly the resources which it makes available to private developers who do so. There is in the United States, and in France, also, a widespread interest on the part of the public to take positions with regard to public projects being planned in the areas in which they live. Up to now, this has chiefly taken the form of resistance activity in regard to highway construction, urban renewal programs and other governmental activities. Such groups are likely to become both protagonists and antagonists in regard to governmental ventures in their own communities, and government at all levels will be required to be responsive to their concerns. Earlier these constituencies operated primarily to achieve intervention at the federal level; increasingly they are attempting to achieve their objectives at the local level of government. To the extent that this is the case, local governments may gain leverage with respect to the federal government. The new town development becomes then only another type of development in which the responsibility of different levels of government is under test.

E. Private and Public Sector Cooperation in the Solution of National Programs

As in the case of cooperation of different levels of government, the cooperation of public and private sectors in matters
of the public interest is always a problem. In France, the range of activities assumed by government has been greater than in the United States. Yet, in the United States there has been increasing pressure for government to assume the role once considered the domain of private enterprise. Again, housing, particularly for low income groups, is a case in point. In both countries, there are limits to which government can mobilize the financial resources and the talents to provide goods and services. In some cases, also, the private sector may be able to render the goods and services more efficiently. The private sector, however, cannot be expected to operate altruistically in respect to those problems of concern of government. It must find incentives if it is to cooperate with the government in finding solutions to national problems.

Again, the new towns development is a kind of experiment to determine the extent of cooperation which may be achieved between the two sectors. Here it is of interest to point out examples which demonstrate how this cooperation can be maximized.

In France where the government has assumed the initiative in new town development, the incentives to the private sector are obvious. The private sector takes relatively little financial risk for new town development. Government assumes the responsibility for land acquisition and planning and the front-end costs in the initial stages of new town development. In building residences, it incurs no financial responsibility for the community infrastructure. In sum, the private sector has little risk and
good prospects for at least limited profits for cooperation with the government in new town ventures. It must, in return, however, comply with government plans for the new town development.

In the United States, the incentives for the private sector in new town ventures involve more financial risk but may involve greater financial gains in the long run for developers. The risk-taking, however, is great and is impossible without large amounts of capital which are difficult to obtain for the extended period required. Where this risk is assumed by the private sector, the developers may be unable or unwilling to invest sufficiently in a community infrastructure, to plan adequately in matters of long term consequence of the new community, and to provide for matters such as low income housing.

One of the functions of the recent new towns legislation is therefore to minimize some of the risk-taking of private developers in the building of new towns and in return to attach some requirements to their responsibilities.

The planning grants available to private developers are a case in point. These grants provide front end money for feasibility planning. In return, the federal government is assured, for example, that sufficient planning has been undertaken to assure that the new town has some likelihood of economic viability if built.

Similarly, the risks and costs to developers of new towns would be considerably reduced if the means can be found by government to exercise some control over land acquisition for new town
development. As the situation now exists, developers run the risk of large escalations in land values when it becomes known that they wish to acquire the land. They also run the risk that they may not be able to acquire the necessary land for the new town site, even after they have already made large capital outlays for land acquisition and planning.

New towns have also been cited as providing unusual opportunities for racial and socio-economic integration, for achieving social goals which are not possible in already established communities. In general, however, private developers may be unwilling to undertake innovations of this type unless they can be assured that they have something to gain and unless special incentives are provided.

Private developers may see some advantages in accepting members of minority groups in that they will also attract residents who are favorable to having minority groups as residents. If, on the other hand, the presence of minority group members limits their prospects for attracting new residents to the new town, they will undoubtedly be less hospitable in the acceptance of minority families. In matters such as racial integration, private developers will be more favorable to the social goals of government if they feel that they do not carry undue burden as compared with those developers outside of new towns. Government is therefore more likely to achieve the cooperation of new town developers in this area if it enforces housing desegregation outside of new towns as well as within them.
Socio-economic integration is a social goal in many ways more difficult for the private developer to assume than racial integration. Outside of new towns racial integration has been achieved to some extent in many localities; socio-economic integration only infrequently. Private developers in new towns seem to show no great amount of reluctance to accept a certain proportion of low income residents (albeit it small perhaps), but only if the housing is subsidized by government. As outside of new towns, low income housing is not a profitable venture for the public sector. It will be built in new towns only if reliable subsidies are available from government, or if non-profit organizations take the initiative for obtaining government or other support for such ventures. Low-income housing is likely to be more expensive in the context of new towns, because it will be new housing and because the added amenities are greater in the new town than in the areas which low income families now occupy. For this reason, the government has either not seen fit, or has not mobilized sufficient support, to provide the necessary subsidization for low-income housing on any scale in new towns in the United States. Exceptions are in the new towns-in-town such as Fort Lincoln where the new community is essentially being planned for low income people. Some new towns-in-town have, however, abandoned plans for providing low-income housing because the subsidies cannot be obtained. A case in point is Coldspring in Baltimore, where the present plans are for housing for middle income and lower middle income people, but not for that portion of the population who cannot afford to purchase or rent their housing at market prices.
APPENDIX

A Brief Description of New Towns in the Paris Region

The following is a brief description of the new towns under construction in the Paris Region.
Cergy-Pointoise is located about 25 km northwest of Paris around two loops of the Seine River on a rolling hill terrain. The center of the new town will comprise the interior of the loops and will be landscaped to the waterfront.

The total area of the new town will cover sixteen existing communes and is expected to include 70,000 inhabitants by 1968, 170,000 by 1975, and 330,000 by 1985. In order to achieve these goals, a housing program of 30,000 new dwelling units is planned for the period of the VIᵉ Plan, 90,000 by 1985, and 120,000 by 2000. Construction of dwelling units are already underway, as are schools and other facilities. An urban park and recreational and leisure facilities will be available using the Seine loops. Two cinemas are already open, and a cultural center covering 20,000 m² and including a museum, theater and library will be completed soon.

Part of the shopping center, under construction since 1971, is already open and an additional 50,000 m² will be completed this year with a 2,000 parking facility for cars. The parking facilities will eventually be doubled. Other smaller shopping centers will also be opened later.

It is planned that jobs in the new town will be provided for 15,000 persons by 1975, 45,000 by 1985, and 49,000 by 2000. New office construction is expected to bring jobs. It is planned that 12,000 offices will be available by 1975, 28,000 by 1980, and 60,000 by the end of the century.
Finally, a new kind of transportation system, the Aerotrain, will provide the link between Paris and the new community, along with six thoroughfares and a new highway to be opened in 1975-76.

Evry

Located about 30 km from Paris and 12 km from Orly, the population of Evry is expected to be eventually 450,000 inhabitants, and the area included to cover 14 existing communes with an area of 9,300 hectares.

The plans call for considerable effort in the integration of community facilities. Playgrounds used by school children during the day will be available for public use at other times. Cultural and commercial facilities in the center of the city will also be combined.

Neighborhoods are being constructed both to have access to major urban boulevards and to have the advantages of quiet areas as well. The access to urban boulevards is to facilitate access to services, shopping facilities, and to the "street" with the advantage of "life" and human exchange. Included in the quiet areas are facilities for sports, parks, public squares, and walking alleys. The "Agore", a multipurpose center with shopping and cultural facilities, is as the name implies, a center for social exchanges and the lively areas in the heart of the new town.

The central zone has the shape of a star, and each branch of buildings is separated by an urban park. The zone has been designed by landscape architects and includes hills, much relief, a lake and a leisure park.
Marne la Vallee

Located 10 km from Paris, Marne la Vallee will cover an area of 20 km and will eventually include a population of around 500,000 inhabitants. Included in the area are 33 existing communes with an area of 148,000 hectares. Special features of this new town are castles and their parks which will be retained.

On the Marne side will be built "The City of Television". Here the O.R.T.F., the French radio and television organization plans to create its center for professional training. Here the plans are for employment of some 1,000 persons. The city is also expected to be the site for various movie firms and studies.

Melun-Senart

Melun-Senart is located about 35 km from Paris near the town of Melun. The population is projected to reach about 350,000 inhabitants and to include the area now occupied by 19 communes, an area of around 12,000 hectares.

This community is conceived of as a regional center for the Melun region and represents an extension of the existing town of Melun, rather than a completely new town.

Saint Quentin En Yvelines

Located near Versailles, Saint Quentin En Yvelines had a
population of 65,000 in 1968 and is projected to increase to 190,000 by 1975. During the VI\textsuperscript{e} Plan, construction on 45,000 dwelling units will be completed. By 1975 a commercial area covering 480 hectares will be completed, including 600,000 m\textsuperscript{2} of office space. Within the new town limits, an historical site from the 12th century will be used as the location for a cultural and artistic center.

The above mentioned new towns comprise those which have been developed around the Paris area. Some additional new towns are also being built in the areas adjacent to other large cities with many points in common with the new towns in the Paris area. Included are Fos. Etang De Berre near Marseille, L'Isle D'Abeau near Lyon, Le Vaudrieu near Rouen, Lille-Est near Lille.
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PERESPECTIVES DE DEVELOPPEMENT DES METROPLOLES D'EQUILIBRE ET LEUR INSERTION DANS LA TRAME DES GRANDES LIASONS PRIMAIRES.

"Schème établi sur la base des études poursuivies par le ministère des Travaux publics et des Transports."
LES VILLES NOUVELLES de la REGION PARISIENNE

"NEW TOWNS IN THE PARIS REGION"