A NEW WAY TO RE-MAKE THE CITY OF PARIS

Some consider Paris to be a city fixed in time, with its citizens and city authorities resistant to new developments. As a case in point, a new 180m-tall commercial tower, Projet Triangle, has been vehemently opposed by critics because it challenges the ban on tall buildings in central Paris.

Contrary to this view, municipal authorities in Paris have been keen to find new ways of making the city, incorporating new ideas and catering to evolving needs. The key issue facing urban planners is how to plan for more optimised and flexible use of space in a city that is already very dense (close to 25,000 persons/sq km). Might better use be made of facilities that are underused at certain times: for example parking lots at night, or schools and offices on weekends? Can major arterial roads or expressways, instead of being large open gashes that cut the city up, be better integrated into the urban fabric?

The Reinventer Paris competition, launched in 2014, features 23 land sites seeking innovative proposals to address such challenges. Most of these sites are not iconic locations -- some might even be considered unattractive. The initiative for proposals focuses a spotlight on these sites, encouraging multidisciplinary teams to come up with savvy and viable new ideas.

FORERUNNER INITIATIVES

Jean-Louis Missika was one of the key drivers of Reinventer Paris. As the Deputy Mayor in charge of innovation and research under then-Mayor Bertrand Delanoë, he had previously experimented in 2010 with an open call for innovation in intelligent urban furniture, for which the city received about 40 submissions.

Parisian officials were also deeply inspired by New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who had called upon universities around the world to submit expressions of interest for an Innovation Institute, to be located on five hectares of land on Roosevelt Island. New York City received 18 submissions, eventually awarding the project to the Technion-Cornell partnership.

Based on early test beds and New York City’s approach, one of the first initiatives Missika undertook as Deputy Mayor in
“The City makes a building site available, and sells or rents it, not to the highest bidder, but to the best, most innovative project.”
— Jean-Louis Missika, Deputy Mayor of the City of Paris

Missika tried a different tack with these selected sites. As he explains, “the rules of the game are simple: people come up with a building development project, which must be financed by private funds or qualify for public funds, but not by funds from the City. The City then makes a building site available, and sells or rents it, not to the highest bidder, but to the best, most innovative project.”

KEY CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION
Projects proposed for Reinventer Paris had to contribute equally to the broader objectives set by the city, in terms of housing and environment and achieving a sustainable and intelligent city. Because this initiative was meant to inspire future projects, proposals still needed to comply with local urban codes, and demonstrate their replicability beyond the chosen sites.

Five key criteria guided the juries’ evaluation:

a. the innovation proposals made by each team and their relevance to the specific urban context of each site,
b. the architectural qualities and integration into its urban context,
c. the environmental performance of each proposal,
d. the offer price assessed against market prices,
e. the financial feasibility of the project and its economic viability over time, with the aim of rapid implementation.

BROAD DEFINITION OF “INNOVATION”
As a key criterion, the city officials had to define what they meant by “innovation”. They took a broad approach: innovation could potentially be present at every stage of a project, from initial design to commissioning.

According to Missika: “Choices in terms of innovation should be listed in order of priority according to the site, its configuration, methods of urban integration, environment and potential. The objective is not to innovate on all fronts, but to identify which is the most relevant innovation on each site. Innovation cannot be defined a priori or in the abstract; it is an alchemy of high standards, new technologies and a scrupulous understanding of the issues and needs it generates.”

The City decided not to prescribe what they expected as “innovation”, but instead to define areas and processes where it wanted innovation to occur, as seen in the diagram above.

TEST-BEDDING THE PROCESS ACROSS 23 DIVERSE SITES
To test the potential for possible innovation, the sites selected were deliberately diverse and rarely in iconic locations. Ranging in size from a few hundred square meters to almost two hectares, all 23 sites were immediately available for development. The Reinventer Paris process provided the opportunity to open up options for some sites that would have been unsaleable through the normal land sales process. Some examples are shown in the following picture.

For some of these sites, the City imposed specific conditions, or ‘program’s. For example, the condition for the site containing the former electric substation was: “Paris invites you to take up the challenge of inventing the cinema of tomorrow”. Such requirements did not
turn out to constrain innovative proposals, since the electric substation went on to receive about forty of them – the largest number out of the various sites. In the case of Pershing, another site above a ring road, proposers were asked to integrate an existing bus station within their submission. Other sites remained more unconditionally open to proposals.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Team Diversity
The Reinventer Paris website had a meet-up page; the City also organized meet-up events where young start-ups, universities, artists or resident associations could encounter established developers or architects to team up with. Each team had to include at least one architect and one sustainable development design office (not necessarily in the lead). Teams were encouraged to be multidisciplinary.

Technical Committee
Before each panel, a technical committee comprising members of the City authorities, a consulting company (Algoé) and a group of notaries, conducted an analysis of proposals and submitted it to the juries to help them in their choice.

Jury composition
The 23 juries, one for each site, comprised members from city authorities and external experts. Additionally, the second panel had juries chaired by an international expert. These experts were mostly from Europe and North America, with some from South Africa and Israel. They comprised not only architects but also mathematicians, ecologists, entrepreneurs, designers and anthropologists.

Committing on innovation
During their second round proposals, the teams had to commit to their innovation for the site. Whatever innovation proposals they made had to be in place for ten years.
In comparison, the normal process would only have required commitment on the price, land-use, number of offices or number of hotel rooms. A sound business model was also required: the city did not want a beauty contest and the financial and legal viability of the projects were important criteria of assessment.

THE RESULTS

Out of the 22 projects awarded, only 8 were awarded to the highest bidder. One of the sites was not awarded due to the lack of innovation. Through the Reinventer Paris initiative, the city stands to gain about Euro 565 million through the sale or lease of the sites. It could however have earned about Euro 1 billion by choosing the highest bidders over the most innovative.

Most of the projects proposed a high degree of mixed uses. Three of them were particularly outstanding and innovative in combining different mixed-use activities:

1. Site 1: Morland was previously an administrative building. The first thing architect David Chipperfield proposed was to open it up and make the ground floor a pedestrian passage joining the boulevard to the riverbank. Instead of keeping the building to a single use and active only for part of each day, vibrant round-the-clock uses were proposed. The building combined social and private housing, a hotel, a hostel, restaurants, fitness facilities, a swimming pool and a wet market; the rooftop was dedicated to urban farming.

2. Site 16: The challenge for Pershing was to build over a ring expressway to connect two disjointed areas of the city, while retaining a long-distance bus station on an adjacent site. Architect Sou Fujimoto and Oxo Architectes created an elegant structure connecting both sides of the city with a public park and restaurant street. Above this, different uses were catered for, including a kindergarten, hotel and offices. Both social and private housing were proposed on a garden deck on top of the building.

3. Site 6: Massena comprised of a vacant site and an existing, disused but historic train station (protected by the City of Paris). The winning team based its central idea on a "short food cycle". The proposal sought to bring together food ecosystem researchers, chefs, agriculture specialists, artists, and an urban farming association.
The rooftops and walls of Paris will become greener, new open space will become publicly accessible and new housing units, half of them affordable, will be built.
The success of the Reinventer Paris initiative has encouraged Paris officials to embark on two new projects; one with the City of Le Havre at the mouth of the Seine River, and another with the Metropolis of Greater Paris.

to share their knowledge on ecological methods. Some of these specialists would be able to acquire a unit within the new tower, built out of reinforced timber.

Many of the other awarded submissions, besides mixed uses, also included elements of roof-top urban farming, public open spaces, green façades and co-working spaces. This attracted some criticism that the site proposals lacked actual innovation, and were instead a hotchpotch of current urban trends.

Deputy Mayor Missika responded that the Reinventer Paris initiative had allowed these urban trends to become more common, rather than exceptions. Through these 22 sites, the rooftops and walls of Paris would become greener. In a high-density environment, 26,300 sq m of new open space within private or public buildings would become accessible to the public. The projects would also create 1,300 new housing units, with half of these being affordable housing, in line with civic objectives.

APPLICATION TO FURTHER PROJECTS

The success of the Reinventer Paris initiative has encouraged Paris officials to embark on two new projects: “Reinventer la Seine” with the City of Le Havre at the mouth of the Seine River, and “Inventons la Metropole” with the Metropolis of Greater Paris. Together, these account for a total of 100 proposed sites.

Learning from Reinventer Paris process, some refinements were made. The number of required submissions were reduced from three to two, to lessen the proposal cost borne by participating architects. In the first phase, proposers needed only to

Reinventer la Seine and Inventons la Metropole. Together they comprise 100 new sites calling for the creativity of multidisciplinary teams. For Reinventer la Seine, some of the sites are part of a body of water. For the Port de Javel, the City is suggesting a floating swimming pool or other activities that would complete the neighboring Parc André Citroen. Source: Mairie de Paris – Reinventer la Seine @ http://www.reinventerlaseine.fr/en/, Metropole du Grand Paris – Inventons la Metropole @ http://www.inventonslametropoledugrandparis.fr/en/
provide their program intentions and some drawings. Only finalists would have to produce a comprehensive offer.

Phase 2 of Inventons la Metropole would also involve citizen participation in the selection process. In addition, teams shortlisted for Inventons la Metropole may apply for financial grants from the State funded Investments for the Future Program. This encourages start-ups to compete even if they lack a strong financial capacity.

CONCLUSION

The Reinventer Paris initiative was deemed on the whole to be successful. The French press welcomed the novelty of the project as well as the enthusiastic response, rarely seen in France, for such a form of competition. Le Monde, a widely-respected French newspaper, praised the multidisciplinary teams who transcended boundaries between competencies. In addition, the inclusion of non-architects in the jury, including a mathematician and a microbiologist, demonstrated that the city was willing to accept alternative, non-planning views.

Besides France, the success of Reinventer Paris has catalysed other European cities to consider similar processes. For example, the Architect’s Journal, UK’s leading architecture magazine, stated that “As the London Land Commission prepares to release brownfield land for development, the city would do well to have a good look across the Channel.”

Renowned British architect David Chipperfield, who was part of the winning team for one of the Reinventer Paris projects, compared London and Paris: “In Paris you can be jealous about how much energy and investment there is in London, but at the same time if you live in London and you are coming to Paris, you think how well they are looking after their city”. For him Reinventer Paris has succeeded in encouraging private investment, even on sites that were not in prime locations, without compromising the quality of the city.

The two projects above the ring expressway are expected to be completed by 2022; other sites are expected to be completed sooner. On 23rd May 2017, Mayor Anne Hidalgo and Missika have just launched the second round of Reinventer Paris. This time the program will focus on some of the hundreds of kilometres of underground spaces lying below the City of Paris. In this edition, some privately owned sites are released together with those owned by the City. Mayor Hidalgo, being current chair of the C40, has also encouraged the network of 90 world cities to also actively prepare their own version for a similar call for innovative projects, named Reinventing Cities.
SINGAPORE CONTEXT

Reinventer Paris could inspire Singapore to diversify its land sales mechanism beyond its two current alternative approaches to the normal Government Land Sales system: i.e. the Concept & Price Revenue Tender or the Fixed-Price Request for Proposals. Unfortunately, with the Concept & Price method, the best proposal may not be selected. Fixed-Price tenders have only been used for sites such as the integrated resorts. These two systems have therefore been regarded mainly for iconic sites located in the downtown core or in strategic growth areas. Paris, on the other hand, has demonstrated the benefits of using such competition to market less attractive or technically challenging sites such as those over a ring road. There may be however some possible ways in modifying the Reinventer Paris method to ensure that we are getting fair prices, e.g.:

1) Obtain proposals from participating teams which may, or may not, comprise developers. After selecting the best proposal, then ask for price tenders from developers (open to all). The winning tenderer must adhere to the winning proposal, including working with the winning team (with some reasonable flexibility).

2) Modify the Concept & Price Revenue Tender process to allow negotiation for modifications to the winning proposals.

By releasing a variety of different sites at the same time — not only those significant at the city level but also some neighbourhood sites, Paris intended to show that the innovations developed for each project may be replicable beyond the scope of the competition. In the French context, “innovation” was kept broad on purpose. In the Singapore context, such competition can be based on a more specific theme, such as sustainability or entrepreneurship.
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### Full Listing of the remaining Reinventer Paris Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Plot Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Usable Area (sqm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morland</td>
<td>Former Administrative Centre</td>
<td>8379</td>
<td>43 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hôtel de Coulanges</td>
<td>Historic Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hôtel particulier</td>
<td>Historic Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltaire</td>
<td>Former Electricity Substation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory 13th</td>
<td>Former Conservatory, Historic Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masséna Station</td>
<td>Former Train Station, Heritage</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Rive Gauche</td>
<td>Unbuilt within innovation district</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>Potential of 15 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poterne des Peupliers</td>
<td>Unbuilt along ring road</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>Empty plot</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italie</td>
<td>Currently public space</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bains douches Castagnary</td>
<td>Former Public Baths</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clichy-Batignolles</td>
<td>Currently Bus Terminus</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>15 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel particulier Villiers</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitet-Curnonsky</td>
<td>Unbuilt within Social Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential of 5 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessières</td>
<td>Residential to densify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>Open section of ring road</td>
<td>6450 (excluding ring road)</td>
<td>55 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternes-Villiers</td>
<td>Open section of ring road</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordener</td>
<td>Former Industrial Building</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ourcq Jaurès</td>
<td>Unbuilt along Green Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Eole - Evangile</td>
<td>Unbuilt along railway</td>
<td>10 300</td>
<td>34 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambetta</td>
<td>Former garage</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzenval</td>
<td>Unbuilt within residential</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiat</td>
<td>Unbuilt within residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex

2 – Hotel de Coulanges

**CONTEXT**
Listed Historic Monument.
A hotel built in the 17th century.

**Winning project:** A fashion hub with fashion school and co-working spaces.

3 – Hotel Particulier

**CONTEXT**
Listed Historic Monument.
Former faculty of medicine built in the 15th century.

**Winning project:** An incubator for philanthropy, exhibition and conference spaces, two restaurants and a learning space.

4 – Electric Substation Voltaire

**CONTEXT**
Paris protected building.
Former electric substation.

Program imposed: « inventing the cinema of tomorrow »

**Winning project:** Cinema, rooftop restaurant, public space on ground floor, some offices

5 – Conservatory 13th

**CONTEXT**
Listed Historic Monument from 1980s, former conservatory of music.

Program imposed: Space for “neighborhood associations »

**Winning project:** Student residence, café-restaurant, coworking, conciergerie, cultural and community space
7 – Paris Rive Gauche

**CONTEXT**
Unbuilt plot within new innovation district.

**Winning project:** Algo house (biofaçade of algae) for researchers and artists from group of universities. Plant house for social housing with urban farming. Tree house for housing with café on ground floor.

8 – Poterne des Peupliers

**CONTEXT**
Empty plot along the ring road.

**Winning project:** Last-mile distribution centre with electric car charged on site by solar energy. Funeral parlour. Both are separated by a garden. The two buildings exchange energy.

9 – Edison

**CONTEXT**
Empty plot within a modern and classic environment.

**Winning project:** Services, residences; 30% of the space for shared terraces. Urban farming.

10 – Italie

**CONTEXT**
Currently public esplanade near a large shopping mall.

**Winning project:** In a wood structure, services, green rooftop, spaces for young business creators and innovative brands.
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11 – Bains Douches Castagnary

CONTEXT
Old public baths from the 1930s.

Winning project: Student residences with co-working space. Wood structure and green façade.

12 – Clichy-Batignolles

CONTEXT
Currently bus terminus near major multimodal mode and future Paris Regional Court.

Winning project: Offices for mobile workers, vegetable plots on roof, products transformed on site and cooked. Wood structure, social insertion and urban ecology.

13 – Hotel Particulier Villiers

CONTEXT
Paris protected building. 19th century mansion, used to be Korean embassy.

Winning project: Not attributed due to lack of an innovative project.

14 – Pitet-Curnonsky

CONTEXT
Unused spaces within social housing blocks.

Winning project: Residential and services on the first floor. Wood structure and green façade.
15 – Bessières

**CONTEXT**
Real estate complex with potential for densification.

Program imposed: How to promote residential and functional diversification.

**Winning project:** Residence for IT school students. Shared terraces with surrounding buildings. Some vegetable plots.

17 – Ternes-Villiers

**CONTEXT**
Open section of ring road

**Winning project:** Mixed use development including offices, social and private housing, shops and urban farming. Wood structure.

18 – Ordener

**CONTEXT**
Former industrial building.

Program imposed: «Rehabilitation or demolition/reconstruction project to consolidate the housing and services offered in the neighborhood »

**Winning project:** Kindergarten, social housing and urban farming.

19 – Ourcq-Jaurés

**CONTEXT**
Unbuilt plot along a future green corridor.

**Winning project:** Promoting social inclusion through the circular economy of urban farming.
20 – Triangle Eole-Evangile

CONTEXT
Unbuilt site near future transport mode and along railway.

Winning project:
Zero-carbon neighborhood

21 – Gambetta

CONTEXT
Former garage, parking lot integrated with flat block.

Program imposed: «Give particular attention to the conversion of basements »

Winning project: Dance school, learning and creative spaces.

22 – Buzenval

CONTEXT
Unbuilt site near future leisure centre.

Winning project: Hostel with modular space available during the day for coworking or music groups. A rooftop accessible to anyone.

23 – Piat

CONTEXT
Unbuilt site within residential buildings

Winning project: Space for architecture students who contributed to the project and who will now live in it while continuing to improve it.
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