1. What are the functioning spaces of social encounter for refugees and how do these encounters have a bearing on relational, interactive and indentificational aspects of integration (Ager and Strang,2008; Valtonen,2004;Efms INTERPOL,2006)? How do the refugees perceive this relationship?
2. To what extent do these social encounters take place/facilitated by space in neighborhoods and local centers?
3. Which role does the home play, and the relationship between private and semi private arenas and public spaces in the local areas play for social interaction between refugees and the host community? What qualities of the various spaces and the relationship between them facilitate social encounters that may have consequences for social integration?
4. Is there a visible dimension to the integration process, and if so – how does it come to expression at a local level in Trondheim (and where?)

We hope that knowledge developed through looking more into these questions, will give insights that may be useful in a further discussion on the organization of policy domains and implementation structures in the Municipal administration when it comes to the broadly framed objectives set out in the local center strategy.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Ager, A. & A. Strang (2008): “Understanding Integration” in Journal of Refugee Studies, 21 (2) 166-191

Allmendinger, P. 2009. Planning Theory. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Andersen, H. T. 2001. The New Urban Politics of Euprope: The Area-based Approach to Regeneration Policy. Andersen, H. T. and van Kempen, R. Governing European Cities. Social fragmentation, social exclusion and urban governance, 233-253. Ashgate, Aldershot, Burlington, Singapore, Sydney.

Arthurson, K., Levin, I. and Ziersch, A. 2015. What is the Meaning of ‘Social Mix’? Shifting perspectives in planning and the implementing public housing estate redevelopment. Australian Geographer, DOI: 10.1080/00049182.2015.1075270

ID 1641 | METROPOLITAN PLANNING AND URBAN MINORITIES “ON THE MOVE”. A TRANSNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON INTEGRATION PATTERNS

Adriana Diaconu[1]
[1]Université Grenoble Alpes - Institut d´urbanisme de Grenoble
adriana.diaconu@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

1 INTRODUCTION

Planning traditions in European countries have generally either ignored settlement patterns of underprivileged migrating populations or tried to control them through imposed settlement actions or population redistribution (Desage et al., 2014). Urban integration of immigrants or of poor nationals in a migration situation (such as rural population attracted by employment opportunities in the city or returning expatriates from former colonies, etc.) has been generally addressed by providing specific or standard public housing or by implementing social mix policies. In this paper we address integration patterns by focusing on the characteristics of a “welcoming” territory or its “hospitality”, i.e. a territory that offers opportunities for integration and that showcases its social diversity. We further question the importance of morphologic configurations of metropolization and of governance arrangements characteristic of metropolitan planning for successful incorporation.

New comers to the city claim space and make place. In regard to these processes, we ask several questions: what settlement and place-making patterns of migrants, chosen or imposed, are associated

with metropolization in different world contexts? Can suburbanization be considered an advantage for integrating a new population, and under what conditions? How do city and suburban administrations, be they fragmented or federated in metropolitan governance institutions, respond to these processes of settlement?

In order to address these questions and see how metropolitan urban areas can use take advantage of their suburban morphology and of immigration we have studied U.S. examples of successful "gateway" metropolises of the 21st century. The choice of the North American example was based on the fact that morphological characteristics of metropolization have their origins in the U.S. and that we find in the American scientific literature successful stories of immigrants' incorporation that contribute to economic and territorial development. In addition to the US theoretical model we have studied two contrasting European cases of metropolitan pilot projects concerning immigrant and minority integration: that of Grenoble, in France, and of Cluj, in Romania. These two very different contexts in Western and Eastern Europe are put together here in regard to integration patterns of a similar population, impoverished Romanian in majority of Roma ethnicity. Highly excluded from the labor market and from formal housing, suffering discrimination and marginalization in Romania (Vincze, 2015), they are low-skilled and very poor immigrants in search of a better life. In France they often live, at least for a period of time, in very harsh living conditions in improvised and informal settlements such as slums and squats, from which they are often evicted.

In regard to this population, we give here the term "minority" a wide meaning that reflects not only a quantitative difference from the "majority" based on objective and/or subjective criteria, but especially a dominated position due to social and economic exclusion, and to forms of marginality (such as informal or illegal occupations and housing). We focus on the movement of these populations, chosen – such as their economic migration to western Europe – or imposed – such as resettlement after forced evictions – that makes them "new comers" with low resources in a territory where they aim to settle and make a living. In the American literature on migrations and cities, different types of immigrants (high and low skilled, with high and low human and social capital, etc.) are considered together as complementary in their settling and integration patterns. However, the different examples show that generally highly skilled workers have always been more easily integrated, whereas "poorer and less-skilled immigrants – who are often the backbone of the service economy – have met more resistance" (Singer et. al., 2008: 155).

1.1 METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Concerning the European cases discussed in this paper, the term "metropolitan planning" stands here for several types of processes that affect at present suburbs and urban areas. We will mention here three of them. Firstly, there is a territorial morphological change similar to the metropolization processes in the United States that challenges the traditional structure of European cities (Leroy, 2000). In France, for example, a continuous organization of buildings is conventionally defining a city or town. A new understanding of economic and everyday life relations between different territories imposes to consider the networking of urban core(s) with neighboring towns, villages and sprawling areas (Ascher, 1998). This organization generates a discontinuous and heterogeneous structure that alternates higher and lower densities and secondary centralities. The networking of urban, sub-urban or péri urban areas through an increased connectivity – that becomes more important than proximity – increasingly erases the importance of hierarchies between centers and peripheries. These new territorial arrangements, present in certain parts of Europe since the 1970s, are no longer reserved to metropolises or greatest cities but increasingly affect conurbations of less importance, in which most economic activities are relocated in the suburbs.

A second aspect of metropolization concerns administrative reform following this morphologic change. This process is marked in Europe by decentralization of decision-making from the State to the local level. In this process the metropolitan scale is often considered to be the most appropriate for local policy making (e. g. in housing and spatial planning). Encouraged at the European Union level, these reforms are put into practice at different pace and in different ways in European countries. In France, metropolitan governance has been reinforced especially since 1999 (Chevènement Law) and the decision-making power of Metropolitan administrations in spatial planning and housing issues is increasing. In Romania where "metropolitan associations" of town halls are only currently emerging on a voluntary basis and do not have any primacy over municipal authority in regard to specific competences.

A third aspect, “metropolitan planning” aims to give a tangible form to cities’ ambitions for distinction in the global competition between them. In relation to the economic dimension of a metropolis metropolitan developments and regeneration strategies generally aim to bring in innovation, specialization and cutting-edge technologies in order to foster economic dynamism. In this quest for excellence, metropolitan projects aim to attract specialists, highly skilled and creative people and in return they should find here good living conditions. Therefore metropolitan planning contributes to the homogenization of the metropolitan territory by reinforcing connectivity and developing or regenerating derelict areas left behind in the growth process, most often trapped as “gaps” in the metropolitan urban structure. In this way it contributes to raising the potential value of all properties regardless of their location, distance from the urban core, proximity to former industries of railway infrastructures, etc. From this point of view, metropolitan planning signifies injecting resources for the recapture of these forgotten territories in a quest for densification, intensification of urban life and distinction.

1.2 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The American model serves here as a theoretical background for the interpretation of the two European case studies. The latter two have been studied in detail (through field observation, discussions with decision-makers, institutional and NGO representatives, analysis of planning documents, of policies and discourses, etc.). However, difficulties in studying together the three examples arise from different paradigms on integration of immigrants and minorities in the three national contexts (Escarfré-Dublet, 2015).

Fundamental differences appear between the ways countries like the US and Great Britain, on the one hand, and France, on the other, incorporate their long histories of immigration in the conceptual construction of society (Noiriel, 1988; Lapeyronnie, 1993). France has developed a universalistic model of integration in which the individual foreign origin has to be kept in the private sphere and become increasingly invisible in the process of assimilation. In this model, ethnic communities are considered to be antagonistic to the integration in the national social body. In the American pluralistic model, personal origin can be made visible in public space and can be claimed by ethnic communities. Communities can thus be recognized as initiators or stakeholders in local development, and as place makers that inscribe their identity in space. This is not the case in France, where ethnicity (and ethnic communities) are not considered as stakeholders in decision-making and in planning (Escarfré-Dublet, 2015).

Romania is a country that recognizes national minorities (such as Hungarian or Roma). Their presence is related to the multiethnic historical composition of the society, to the important movements in territorial borders in the region and to late formation of nation states. However ethnicity is mostly related to cultural aspects and to the preservation and promotion of these cultural specificities.

A relevant example of differences and incompatibilities arising from different paradigms for minorities’ inclusion in France and Romania is that of the reactions produced in the two countries by the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020. To the Commission’s request that all member states design integration strategies for Roma living on their territories, France has expressed the impossibility to adopt such a strategy on the basis of its universalistic model that does not recognize ethnicity and cannot assign advantages on the basis of this categorization[1]. On the other hand, Romania – the European country that is the most affected by the marginalization and poverty of its important Roma minority – proposed mostly cultural measures for their integration[2].

2 THE THEORETICAL MODEL OF GATEWAY CITIES IN THE U.S.

Northern American researchers have studied the way immigration affects cities and the changing patterns of these phenomena especially at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the Twentieth century (Price and Benton-Short, 2008; Singer et al., 2008). Using statistics on the percentage of foreign-born in the

[1] Une place égale dans la société française : Stratégie du gouvernement français pour l’inclusion des Roms dans le cadre de la communication de la Commission du 5 avril 2011 et des conclusions du Conseil du 19 mai 2011.
[2] Strategia Guvernului României de incluziune a cetățenilor români aparținând minorității rome pentru perioada 2012-2020.

overall population Audrey Singer has theorized a typology of gateway cities based on the historical evolution of urban immigrant settlement in the United States throughout the last century.

In addition to the “established gateways” of the 20th century, that are still attractive to immigrants (such as New York and Chicago), new gateways have emerged. They are called “twenty-first-century gateways” and are places where immigrant population has been rapidly rising since the 1980s (“emerging gateways” - e. g. Atlanta, Dallas-Fort South, Washington) or even more recently, since the 1990s (“preemerging gateways” - e. g. Raleigh, Durham, Austin). Finally, among these new destinations there are cities that had been attractive to immigrants one century ago, and that are now “re-emerging as immigrant gateways” after a period of lost drawing power in the middle of the century.

It is important to note that all these destinations that successfully incorporate immigrants experience overall population growth, and not only an increase of their foreign-born population. This dynamic shows that they have strong economies and that these territories are overall attractive (Singer, 2008: 12). Immigrants are drawn to these areas because of employment opportunities and their presence further contributes to the regions’ overall economic growth.

Singer shows that the settlement patterns in these “twenty-first-century gateways” have changed from previous ones in relation to the “restructuring of the U.S. economy, the decentralization of cities and the growth of the suburbs as major employment centers” (Singer et. al., 2008: 5). Suburbanization was accentuated by morphological transformations of suburbia towards denser and more heterogeneous landscapes that can be described as “suburban metropolises – decidedly not cities, but for the most part large, loosely bounded, lower density, sprawling, auto-dependent metropolitan areas (Ibid. : 15). In these areas new comers can find a series of opportunities such as: jobs, affordable housing, possibilities to establish small businesses and easy access to communication corridors.

2.1 FROM THE ‘ETHNIC ENCLAVE’ MODEL OF THE CHICAGO SCHOOL TO THE ‘ETHNIC COMMUNITIES’ OF THE 21ST CENTURY GATEWAYS

The assimilation model described by the Chicago School of sociology in the interwar period has dominated urban studies research on the settlement patterns of immigrants, both in the U.S. and in Europe, ever since. This model gives a particular role to “ethnic enclaves” situated in devalued areas near the city center and that were offering to new comers cheap housing, often in overcrowded and low quality buildings, and the proximity of employment opportunities. Therefore, as an arrival place of installation for the first generation of immigrants, the “ethnic enclave” represented a resource for integration offering the support of social networks of co-nationals or other immigrants. However, the enclave represented a temporary phase, since more economically prosperous or second-generation immigrants were moving out to the more valued suburbs where better quality housing could be found. Once they or their children had acquired linguistic proficiency, and integrated economically, first or second generation immigrants could easier integrate the mainstream population in the new living environment, further away from the city center (Park et al., 1925). Immigrants’ settlement patterns in “twenty-first-century gateways” are different. Unlike in the Chicago School model, many immigrants settle in the suburbs immediately upon arrival and do not go through the intermediary phase of the “crowded inner city immigrant enclave” (Hardwick, In Singer, 2008: 45). This pattern applies especially to immigrants with high human and social capital who can chose to settle in more desirable parts of an urban area. In addition, the establishment in the suburbs rather than in central cities of high-tech and bio-tech corporations and other firms that employ highly skilled and educated foreignborn staff are linked to these settlement patterns of the more privileged immigrants. However, less skilled and poorer immigrants follow the same pattern by settling in suburban areas where they find affordable housing in apartment complexes from the 60s and 70s or smaller homes, less desirable for the local population living in the suburbs. Sometimes overcrowding affects these housing environments, in a similar way as in the central enclaves mentioned before.

Furthermore, dispersed suburban settlement – instead of concentrated enclaves close to the city center – generates new types of communities and new models of integration. 21st century ethnic communities are rather inconspicuous and difficult to identify and delineate in the cultural landscape. For this reason they have also been called invisiburbs (Skop and Li, 2003). Invisibility however does not necessarily signify losing community cohesion and giving up the support community networks offer immigrants. According to Zelinsky and Lee, urban transportation and communication networks, as well as the use of instant

communication technologies (cell phones, e-mail, etc.) allow dispersed populations who lack residential propinquity to connect regularly and to construct and maintain ethnic communities (Zelinsky and Lee, 1998).

These connections, both virtual and physical, constitute the foundation of heterolocalism (Ibid.), as social presence in metropolitan space. 21th century ethnic communities thus differ from "ethnic enclaves" especially in terms of lack of spatial concentration and sometimes of spatial identification that makes them invisible. In addition, "although the most conspicuous heterolocal communities involve the relatively privileged, the model is also valid for certain lower-status groups whose economic survival relies upon movement and transactions over long distances while retaining or creating a sense of peoplehood." (Ibid.)

2.2 DRIVERS OF SETTLEMENT PATTERNS IN 21ST CENTURY GATEWAYS

The most important rationale for the suburban settlement patterns of immigrants in emerging gateway cities in the U.S. is the presence of affordable housing, as we have mentioned before. Housing in the suburbs is of better quality and more affordable than in areas closer to city centers (when these centers exist).

In addition, the presence of good schools and the proximity of places of work or of major public transport corridors offering rapid connections to places that concentrate job opportunities moreover guide settlement choices.

The location of new economic activities further from urban cores, sometimes in addition to the restructuring of territories from small agricultural towns to high-technology corridors for example, plays a key role. These employment opportunities concern highly skilled foreign-born workers, but they also have an effect on low skilled immigrants who can find facilities in these areas for establishing small businesses. Such opportunities offered locally can be for example "a large number of older business properties on smaller lots (less than 1,500 square feet) that are ideal spaces for small family-run businesses", as in Annandale (Singer et al., 2008: 153).

Theses settlement patterns further contribute to increasing densities in suburban areas that become more dynamic, as well as to increasing their diversity. Many places do not have any majority racial-ethnic group and become truly multiethnic places.

> *Over time edge gateways have developed a local identity as places where immigrants can find housing, transportation, jobs, and goods and services that cater to them. It can be argued that many edge gateways are performing the same functions as early twentieth-century enclaves provided. Some of these gateways may evolve into a more familiar pattern of either distinct ethnic communities or ethnic enclaves. Yet it is also possible that a different pattern of immigrant settlement is being realized in suburban Washington, and possibly elsewhere, one in which clusters of immigrants are not easily organized into distinct ethnic communities but live in a more multiethnic context (Singer et al., 2008: 138).*

However, in regard to local existing minorities, researchers have noticed that residential preferences of immigrants are often determined by avoidance of black neighborhoods, even if in these areas rents are low (Singer et al., 2008: 156).

2.3 RECEPTION AND LOCAL POLICY RESPONSES

Even if legislation concerning migration is adopted at federal level, by having to respond to the inflow of new foreign-born inhabitants local administrations have a key role as policy makers in immigrant's incorporation. Thus cities become de facto policy makers in regard to immigrants' socioeconomic and spatial integration (Price and Benton-Short, 2008: 18). They make policies that respond to the needs of new comers in access to housing, education, health care, etc. and those consenting to activities that allow immigrants to claim space and visibility in the suburban landscape (Singer et. al., 2008: 74).

However, not all local government institutions seek to assist or to include the foreign-born, and especially the poorer and less skilled immigrants. Especially the responsibility of local government for immigrant welfare sometimes meets resistance. In many cases adopted local law and ordinances that are designed to control immigrants concern housing regulations (such as zoning, restrictions against overcrowding, etc.) and employment policies. They are mostly directed at undocumented immigrants, but "the public debates surrounding them are socially divisive and contribute to the unwelcome environment for all immigrants" (Singer, 2008 : 4).

The most worrying facts for local communities are related to the visibility or hyper-visibility of groups of poor migrants. For example the installation of places where poor immigrants gather such as Labor Day sites stirs debates and contestations. In a similar way, concentrations of immigrants following the socalled "cousin syndrome" have a segregative effect pushing away locals:

> *As a locality in the suburbs becomes known for affordable housing and good transportation, a complex web of immigrant social networks draws in still more immigrants. […] At the same time, it is possible that large numbers of diverse immigrants settling in a place may make it less attractive for native-born residents who relocate and thus allow room for more immigrants to settle." (Singer et al., 2008: 157)*

3 THE FRENCH CITIES AND IMMIGRANTS

In France, "hospitality" towards immigrants is conceived first of all as a public service (Gotman, 1997). In line with the universalistic model, integration of immigrants is treated as a social inclusion problem. In this country which has a traditional strong position of the State and of non-profit organizations in the welfare and housing system (Esping Andersen, 1990; Kemeny, 1992; Ghekière, 2008) and a large stock of public housing of about 17,4% of the total housing stock (Pittini et al., 2015), hospitality towards immigrants equates to their affiliation to the basic statutory status of nationals ("le droit commun"). Specific measures or services that are especially designed for immigrants (e.g. special residences), actually show the non-access to regular public services, and constitute a "palliative hospitality" (Raffestin, 1997).

Secondly, the claim of space associated with immigration awaits a "gift" of space in a welcoming city. In the context of a strained housing market in most periods of the 20th and 21st centuries this reception has not been without difficulties in France. This un-welcoming city caused the emergence of informal housing clusters (slums) at different moments throughout the 20th century.

Since the 1990s, economic migrations from Eastern European countries (mostly from Romania and Bulgaria) have caused the re-emergence of this phenomenon in France. But from a quantitative standpoint, the phenomenon is a lot inferior to the 1960s slum problem: 12,000 to 15,000 people nowadays, living in about 450 informal settlements in France[1] compared to about 80,000 in 1960 (Olivera, 2011: 13), out of which around 46,000 in the Paris region alone (Barou, 2002: 17).

However today's precarious settlements of poor immigrants have a different relation to urban areas than those from the 1960s, even if their locations are very similar. For example, Portuguese slums from the 1960s near Massy in the south of the Paris Region were rising almost in the same areas as Romanian ones, 40 years after, in the beginning of the years 2000 (as shown in José Vieira's documentary « Souvenirs d'un futur radieux »). However, the present metropolitan organization makes them more visible, since they are not situated at the city margin anymore, but in "gaps" of the continuous metropolitan area. In this new landscape, informal settlements are less tolerated especially since all derelict areas that can host them need to be integrated in the metropolitan design through a strategy of "urban recapture" that all major French conurbations go through. (Oliveira, 2011: 13).

Since 2010 State legislation concerning "illegal settlements" of immigrants has been to encourage systematic evictions by local authorities, together with a social evaluation of the situation of the different families starting with 2012. The most important effect of this policy has been the dispersion of poor immigrants following the dismantling of their improvised settlements. However researchers have shown

[1] DIHAL, 2015. In addition to these European immigrants there were about 7,000 to 14,000 extra European migrants (mostly war refugees) in informal settlements of Northern France.

that informal settlements are not only places of marginalization and rejection, but also a resource for integration by creating social propinquity networks allowing to make a living and to access education, health care, and other services (Bourgois et al., 2015).

3.1 METROPOLITAN EXPERIMENTS FOR EUROPEAN POOR MIGRANTS IN GRENOBLE AREA

The metropolitan area around the city of Gtenoble, called Alpes Grenoble Métropole (AGM) comprises 49 administrative units (cities, towns and villages) and about 440 000 inhabitants. It has a legal status that has been evolving since the 1990s in line with the national decentralization policy. Increasing administrative power has been transferred to it both from the State and from the local administrations of the component localities. Since 2012, the number of European Union immigrants in AGM in a precarious dwelling situation (living in squats, slums or hosted in public shelters or in hotels by the public administration) has been quite constant, of maximum 700 people, out of which almost half were children. Most of these immigrants are Romanians, in majority Roma ethnics, having suffered from poverty and marginalization in the Romanian society.

Since 2013, temporary housing solutions provided by the local administration diminished. This caused an increase in the number of informal settlements, making them more visible in the urban and suburban landscape. More than half of these settlements were situated in the localities that neighbor the city of Grenoble (Table 1), on derelict sites or in locations waiting for regeneration and development. These settlements are continuously threatened by evictions (in average 1 or 2 per year per person) and these evictions engender a constant dynamic of dispersal and clustering in new settlements of variable size (from one family to several hundred people for the biggest ones). However the total number of people living in precarious conditions has remained rather constant, with the ones that access stable housing and employment being replaced by other new comers.

	Beginning of 2013	End of 2013	Evictions during the year 2014	End of 2014	End of 2015	September 2016
Grenoble	8	10	7	10	13	7
St. M. d'Hères	4	4	3	4	4	4
Fontaine	2	2	1	2	2	2
Eybens	1	1	1	1	2	1
Gières	1	0	2	0	0	0
La Tronche	1	2	0	2	1	1
Echirolles	0	2	0	2	1	1
Seysinet Pariset	1	1	1	1	1	0
Vizille	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	**18**	**22**	**15**	**22**	**24**	**17**

Table 1 – Number of settlements per locality in AGM counted at different periodsand number of evictions during one year. Source: MOUS Bilan d'activité, Roms Action.

View this distribution of informal settlements in AGM, the local administrations of the localities in AGM decided to develop a common pilot program for integration, to which the different localities could adhere. This program is specific for EU immigrants living in informal settlements (mostly Romanian Roma), who have the legal right to work in France. The program is based on the partnership and coordination of the different participants who contribute to its different aspects (the AGM, the local administrations of all the localities, their social service agencies, the department administration, the prefecture representing the State, non for profit organizations offering guidance on different aspects of inclusion, education, training, etc.) Starting from existing framework measures for access to housing, this pilot program called MOUS (Maîtrise d'ouvrage urbaine et sociale) as a special procedure for integrating a part of the immigrant EU population. It was officially implemented in December 2013, after one year and eight months of trial. This inclusion program is based on offering access to standard housing for free, or for a very limited financial contribution according to family resources, in addition to a reinforced guidance for training and access to employment. The program is highly selective: in 2016 it had attained a capacity of 22 families in independent apartments (12 families comprising 57 persons by the end of 2013). Once a family can leave the program, a regular income offers it access to standard public housing a new one is selected and integrated the program.

The selection is based on a series of eight criteria that aim to evaluate the “capacity” to integrate. An assessment after the first five years of the program (2012 to 2016) counts a total of 24 families (117 persons) that have participated in the project. The objective was to attain independence through stable employment and access to public housing after 18 months in the program.

Since the apartments used in the program had been offered for free by the different local administrations they were located in different parts of the metropolitan area. This contributed to the dispersion of the families that would contribute to making “Roma” ethnic communities invisible in the local landscape. Moreover, this principle corresponds with general housing policies in France that encourage social mix by distributing public housing evenly in the different localities of a metropolitan area. Such dispersion procedures are applied in urban renewal of existing apartment complexes from the 60s and 70s that concentrate public housing (Lelevrier In Desage et al., 2014). However, in the case of the families having integrated the MOUS program we could observe a perpetuation of community ties with the people still living in the informal settlements.

The good results that the program had, based on its high selectivity, are intended to constitute a stimulation for a more global and systematic intervention strategy for the integration of underpriviledged immigrants. However, even if the coordination of the numerous participants from public administrations and non for profit organizations was fruitful, it was difficult to achieve and triggered some compromises (e.g. in the selection criteria). Moreover, this program cannot be applied directly to a different population, such as non EU refugees who need legal residence and work permits. Since this program was based on a voluntary participation of the different localities in AGM and on financing mechanisms that are not guaranteed for a long period of time, especially since the costs are quite high for a limited number of participants, it is very likely that such integration mechanisms will not expand and perpetuate.

4 ROMA MINORITY MARGINALIZATION IN THE ROMANIAN CITY OF CLUJ

For historical reasons, the morphology of Romanian cities from the north-western part of the country was characterized by a high density and a clear separation of the city from its surroundings. In addition to the traditional form of Transylvanian towns, a state policy from the 1970s against urban sprawl and implementied densification of already urbanized areas (Diaconu, 2013). Even if suburbanization accelerated starting with the 1990s, especially by the creation of new residential areas for the middle class extending the existing urban structure or densifying neighboring villages, the separation between urbanized and non-urbanized territories is still very clear today.

Following European directions and incentives, a feeble administrative reform has started in 2001 (Law 351/ 2001, than laws from 2006 and 2008) in order to create an administrative form of cooperation at metropolitan level. Such Associations between towns, cities and county administrations were created on a voluntary basis in the 12 biggest cities in Romania including the capital, in order to create “growth poles”. The main objective of this national strategy was to strengthen the role of these urban areas as drivers of regional economic growth and reinforce urban-rural relations contributing to reduce territorial disparities. In addition this type of metropolitan planning in line with EU recomandations was potentially allowing to access more EU and other international funding for implementing metropolitan projects. Created in 2008, the Cluj Metropolitan Association (Asociația de Dezvoltare Intercomunitară Zona Metropolitană Cluj) - CMA is made up of one city, the county administration and 19 villages on a radius of 30 km around the main city, as specified by the Law from 2001. The area had 413,761 inhabitants in 2011.

Cluj, one of the few cities in the country that experience population growth and that attract a large number of students suffers from the limited housing stock that is also in a general bad condition. This pressure on the limited housing market and on building areas creates inflation in housing prices, making housing unaffordable for the most vulnerable.

Concerning welfare policies, the liberal state that followed the communist regime diminished progressively social protection. Romania has nowadays the smallest stock of public housing in Europe (1,12% of the existing housing stock according to the 2011 census) and the highest rate of severe housing depravation in Europe: 23% compared to 5.2% European average (Pittini et al., 2015). In addition, the selection criteria for accessing public housing are not in favour of the most vulnerable (Adorjani et al., 2016).

After the structural changes in the Romanian economy since the 1980s and the diminishing of the Welfare State since the 1990s, the Roma minority has been increasingly excluded from the formal labor market and assigned in a marginal social and territorial position: “they are pushed to the social and spatial margins of the local societies, i.e. into positions of unemployed on the formal labor market, and/or towards housing areas that do not benefit of developmental investments.” (Vincze, 2015 : 18). This situation encourages “local entrepreneurs and mayors […] to exploit their poverty and dependence on social welfare or on underpaid day laboring” (Vincze, 2015 : 20).

4.1 SEGREGATION PROCESSES AND GOVERNANCE IMPLICATIONS OF THE METROPOLITAN TURN

In addition to the structural factors mentioned before and to the strained housing market in Cluj, the planning strategies of the city’s public administration encouraged gentrification and produced progressively the displacement of the most underprivileged inhabitants, mainly Roma ethnics from rather central locations to the margin of the city where they created informal settlements. The clustering of about 300 families (more than 1000 people) in an isolated area near the landfill in Pata Rât progressively transformed this process into a public problem. This peripheral settlement suffers from pollution, from all the nuisances brought by the propinquity of the landfill, from isolation (1,5 kilometers from public transport lines) and from extreme deprivation etc. (Dohotaru et al., 2016; Rat et al., 2012).

Forced evictions by local authorities from informal and public housing, without housing alternative or with forced relocations in the same marginal area further contribute to the clustering of marginal communities (Ibid.). The relative dynamic economy of the city of Cluj, especially in comparison to other areas, also attracts poor internal migrants from neighboring towns and villages that can only find shelter in this marginal area. The only resources for making a living in this area are informal work on the landfill – selective sorting activities – in which many Pata Rât inhabitants are involved (Rat et al., 2012) and underpaid day laboring.

In addition to the mobilization of activists concerned by the humanitarian problem related to ethno-residential segregation in a polluted and deprived area, the visibility of the cluster of informal housing near the landfill is increasingly acknowledged as a problem by the local administration because of its propinquity to the local airport. A pilot program funded by the Norway Grants for reducing social and economic disparities in Europe was launched in the end of 2014 (and ended in 2017)[1]. This program for social integration and de-segregation of the communities living in Pata Rât was created by the Cluj Metropolitan Association (CMA). Even if there is a partnership with the local administration of the city of Cluj, there is no direct involvement of the municipality through co-funding or direct participation in the project implementation. Since CMA does not have an administrative and decision-making competence, the transmission of this problem from the municipal to the metropolitan level can be interpreted as an opportunity to access funding and to move the problem from the city to a higher i.e. metropolitan level. This practice is in line with the common opinion that social problems should not be treated at local (city) level and that national and EU resources are necessary. This attitude is also based on the discriminatory way of considering the underprivileged population as not belonging to the city, but rather to the rural areas where they should resettle. Both this imaginary of hierarchy between urban and rural in line with social hierarchies and the power subordination of the metropolitan administrative level to the city level are contrary to the principles of metropolitan planning.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have addressed in the beginning of this paper the conditions under which metropolization constitutes an opportunity for immigrant incorporation in the U.S. The two European pilot projects have further allowed to analyze in which way the metropolitan turn in the administrative reform of European territories can

[1] The program is entitled Social interventions for the de-segregation and social inclusion of vulnerable groups in Cluj Metropolitan Area including underpriviledged Roma (“Intervenții sociale pentru desegregarea și incluziunea socială a grupurilor vulnerabile în Zona Metropolitană Cluj, inclusiv a romilor defavorizați”) http://patacluj.ro

constitute an opportunity of coordination for the implementation of social integration programs for underprivileged immigrants and minorities.

In the U.S. model, the most important factors for successful inclusion of migrants are a dynamic economy, easy access to affordable housing and to transportation, propinquity with good education facilities and a non-hostile environment. In such successful “twenty-first-century gateways” immigrants are allowed to make place and contribute to the densification, local differentiation, economic development of the suburban metropolis. We can argue that there is more available space and that regulations are looser.

In the two European case studies immigrants and minorities are not allowed to take part in place making, especially in visible parts of the metropolis. Reinforced control over space is established through actions of dispersal (enforced evictions in both cases), marginalization (imposed resettlement in Cluj) and an overall policy of making the impoverished communities invisible in the metropolitan landscape. However metropolitan growth patterns and metropolitan planning make the territorial “gaps” of informal settlements increasingly visible.

In France in addition to access to space, access to employment and to affordable housing (public subsidized housing) are also highly regulated. In these conditions, underprivileged immigrants need increased support in order to integrate in society, that only measures that fall under “the basic statutory status of nationals” (“le droit commun”) cannot offer.

In France, the emergence of metropolitan administrations offers the possibility of implementing pilot projects (such as MOUS) that offer this reinforced assistance for social inclusion through employment and housing. They are based on the coordination of an extended number of stakeholders and decision makers interfering in metropolitan governance at different levels and of specialized organizations (in professional training, support on different aspects of integration such as language training, access to healthcare, etc.). However, stakeholders participate only on a voluntary basis and negotiations trigger compromises in the program principles (such as in the criteria for the applicants’ selection). This program matches the community dispersal objective through social and territorial mix. In the same time this politics does not appear to be contrary to maintaining immigrant communities when heterolocal functioning is made possible by an increased connectivity of the metropolitan area.

The high costs and the voluntary basis of this pilot project are obstacles for extending this kind of program to non-EU economic migrants and refugees, and for insuring its permanence. In the Romanian metropolization can hardly be considered an opportunity for the incorporation of minorities. The administrative metropolization is still at its beginnings and only offers city administrations the possibility to pass the embarrassing problem of informal settlements and of marginalization that it contributed to producing to another different administrative level. This tendency is very common among local administrations in different parts of the world that try to disengage from ensuring basic services to poor immigrants and minorities considering that it’s an issue that should be treated at State level (or federal in the US), or even at the supra-national (i.e. European) level. In Romania the Metropolitan Assiciation does not have any real decision-making power and the coordination of players is limited in the absence of a political commitment from the real-decision makers and especially from the city administration.

The questions addressed in this paper should be explored further in order to understand how European territories are affected by migrations and what are the potentials and opportunities they offer for incorporating immigrants and minorities successfully.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Adorjani, J. et al. (2016). Acces la locuire decenta. Proiect pilot Pata Cluj, Cluj: Asociatia pentru dezvoltare intercomunitara Zona Metropolitana Retrieved from http://patacluj.ro/publicatiile-proiectului/

Ascher F. (1998). La République contre la ville. Essai sur l’avenir de la France urbaine. La Tour d’Aigues: Éd. De l’Aube.

Barou, J. (2002). L’habitat des immigrés et de leurs familles, Paris: La documentation française.

Bourgois L. et al. (2015). Du bidonville à la ville : vers la « vie normale » ? Parcours d’insertion des personnes migrantes ayant vécu en bidonville en France, Trajectoires. Retrieved from http://www.trajectoiresasso.fr/_admin/uploads/file/TRAJECTOIRES_Du-bidonville-a-la-ville.pdf

Desage, F. et al. (Eds.). (2014). Le peuplement comme politiques, Presses universitaires de Rennes. Diaconu, A., 2013. « Construire contre l'État en République socialiste de Roumanie (1947-1989)», Le Mouvement social, 245, Special Issue « Les crises du logement en Europe au XXe siècle », pp.71-82.

Dohotaru, A. et al. (2016). Pata, Cluj: Editura Fundatiei pentru Studii Europene.

Escafré-Dublet, A. (2015). « Immigration et intégration à l'épreuve de la comparaison : retour sur trois projets européens de recherché », Espaces et sociétés, 2015/4, n°163, pp. 73-88.

Esping Andersen, G. (1990). The three worlds of welfare capitalism, Cambridge (UK): Polity Press.

Ghekière, L. (2008). Le Développement du logement social dans l'Union européenne, Recherches et Prévisions, 94/2008 « Politiques du logement : questions sociales », pp. 21-34.

Gotman, A. (1997). « La question de l'hospitalité aujourd'hui ». In Communication, 65. L'hospitalité, pp. 5-19.

Kemeny, J. (1992). Housing and Social Theory, London/New York: Routledge.

Lapeyronnie, D. (1993). La France et la Grande-Bretagne face à leurs immigrés, Paris, Puf.

Leroy, S. (2000). « Sémantiques de la métropolisation », L'Espace géographique, 1/2000, pp.78-86.

Noiriel, G. (1988). Le creuset français. Histoire de l'immigration XIXe-XXe siècle, Paris, Le Seuil.

Olivera, M. (2011). Roms en (bidon)villes. Quelle place pour les migrants précaires aujourd'hui ?, Paris, Éditions Rue d'Ulm / Presses de l'École normale supérieure.

Park, R. E. et al. (1984, 1st edition 1925). The City. Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pittini, A. et al., (2015). The State of housing in the EU 2015, Brussels: Housing Europe, the European Federation for Public, Cooperative and Social Housing. Retrieved from http://www.housingeurope.eu/resource-468/the-state-of-housing-in-the-eu-2015

Price, M. and Benton-Short, L. (eds.). (2008). Migrants to the Metropolis. The Rise of Immigrant Gateway Cities, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Raffestin, C. (1997). « Réinventer l'hospitalité », Communications, vol. 65/1, pp.165-177.

Rat, C. et al. (2012). UNDP Research Report. Participatory Assessment of the Social Situation of the Pata-Rât and Cantonului Area, Cluj-Napoca, UNDP.

Singer, A. et al. (eds.). (2008). Twenty-First Century Gateways. Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Skop, E. and Li, W. (2003). "From Ghetto to the Invisiburb: Shifting Patterns of Immigrant Settlement in Contemporary America" In FRAZIER, J. W. and MARGAI, F., Multicultural Geographies: Persistence and Change in U.S. Racial / Ethnic Patterns, New York: Academic Press, pp. 113-124.

Vincze, E. (2015). "Adverse Incorporation of the Roma and the Formation of Capitalism in Romania", Intersections. EEJSP, 1(4): 14-37.

Zelinsky, W. and Lee, B. A. (1998). "Heterolocalism: An Alternative Model of the Sociospatial Behaviour of Immigrant Ethnic Communities", Internationl Journal of Population Geography 4/ 281-298, pp. 1-18.

ID 1702 | PLANNING, PLURALISM AND RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY: THE SPATIAL REGULATION OF MOSQUES IN ITALY

Francesco Chiodelli[1]; Stefano Moroni[2]
[1]Gran Sasso Science Institute; [2]Polytechnic University of Milan
francesco.chiodelli@gssi.it

1 INTRODUCTION: PLURALISM, RELIGION, AND URBAN PLANNING

In recent times, regulations governing religious practices in European cities have generated widespread debate in many countries. In fact, the growing religious diversity in many cities has significant consequences on the urban environment, and primarily the new spaces that it entails (e.g. places of worship and burial grounds) and new forms of expression in public (e.g. types of dress connoting a particular religious conviction, such as the Islamic veil or the Sikh turban). These spaces and forms of