



Conclusions from Gap 1st workshop for the 2nd round



Diamont project meeting – Andechs – 4th October 2007

Vincent Briquel



first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

WS1: 'test of tools'

- **Focus on land take management:** broad issue ⇒ comprehensive context analysis
- **Identify needs of test areas**
⇒ call for a SWOT analysis
- **Identify deficiencies of existing instruments**
⇒ discussion with local stakeholders
- **Identify possible conflicts in test areas**
⇒ weaknesses of existing instruments, problematic issues, analysis of divergences between stakeholders



Aspects focused on in the Gap test region

- **Focus on spatial development and main drivers for land take**
⇒ indicator based context analysis
- **Identification of problems perceived** ⇒ synthesis in terms of spatial development issues
- **Capacity of some instruments**
⇒ to reveal development issues
⇒ to share development perspectives in the whole region
- **Conditions for efficient implementation of instruments**
⇒ instruments focused on main issues
⇒ difficulties due to limited cooperation between municipalities

first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

The Gap region

- One central city and 73 smaller communes
- Few communes included in the Gap LMR
- Urban influences go beyond the limits of the LMR: residence functions shared by more and more distant communes
- Efforts to set steer development in the whole region through the Pays Gapençais, beforehand setting up a comprehensive spatial development scheme (SCOT)



Need to identify development issues that are not yet perceived at the scale of the region

Need to identify complementarities between Gap and other communes

first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

The indicator based context analysis

- **Identification of main development trends in the region** through sets of statistical indicators grouped in thematic domains
- **Analysis of effects of main development trends on major functionalities:** housing provision, supply of labour, services distribution, tourism and leisure amenities
- **Analysis of effects of main development trends on the spatial cohesion of the region:** which complementarities or spatial imbalances emerge within the region



General analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the region led by Cemagref, as a starting point for discussions with local actors

first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

Identification of problems perceived

Need to identify most problematic issues against (sustainable) development of the region: which phenomena are worth being observed since they hinder development of the whole region, since they exacerbate spatial imbalances or even lead to important pressure on land use



Discussions with local actors in WS1 on problematic issues revealed through phenomena in link with development trends, for example:

- increasing imbalances between the location of residence, of places of work, of educational services
- ageing residents do not move but call for other services than those implemented locally
- communes cooperate only within small inter-municipal cooperation structures

first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

From problems to instruments

Two main conclusions of the problem analysis:

- Uncertainties on recent developments of identified problems (outdated indicators, divergences between actors on causes and consequences of the problems)
- Issues perceived locally are not assessed against comprehensive development objectives for the whole region, thus existing instruments are not efficiently implemented



- **Call for efficient observation tools (data and indicators, GIS, etc) for the whole region**
- **Reason the way in which instruments are implemented in the region:** since local issues they address differ, they may have negative side effects for the spatial cohesion of the region (e.g. building permits for rented houses in low accessibility areas, uncontrolled greenfield conversions where agricultural areas are not scarce)

first workshop aims and application in the Gap test region

Conclusions of WS1 in terms of instruments

Besides the call for observation tools, main conclusions were:

- There is no lack of instruments, even when further instruments could be mobilised, main issues are more in terms of conditions for their efficient implementation in the region
- The way in which they are implemented can make them ineffective against issues they address: e.g. lack of financial resources and of technical know-how in rural communes
- A more efficient implementation of these instruments calls at first for more effective cooperation within the region e.g. with regard to spatial coherence of planning tools or to capacity to mobilise financial resources coming from the State or other government tiers
- In turn, two preconditions for effective cooperation are to be met: setting up shared priorities and development perspectives in the whole region, and develop awareness (of mayors and of citizens) of benefits from enlarged cooperation

lessons for WS2

Results of WS1 for local stakeholders

- **Positive appreciation of world café method:** everyone takes part in the discussion, and gives his opinion in knowing other participants opinions, however discussions revealed more various aspects of same issues than real divergences in opinions (like as in the WP6 delphi survey...)
- **Indicators proved efficient in initiating discussions on topics they just skimmed over,** mapping main indicator helped in focusing on spatial development issues; thus participants appreciated ways in which indicators were used in WS1
- **Synthetic analyses for the whole region made by Cemagref after WS1 gave added value** (advantages and limits of a regional development model based on attractiveness for new residents in a low populated region)
- **However, persons in charge of the Contrat du Pays Gapençais or of other initiatives (SCOT, Communauté d'Agglomération de Gap) expect more from DIAMONT expertises:** what is to be proposed by the Cemagref, as a research institute, to help them to solve conflicts they are currently faced with?

lessons for WS2

Conflicts in the Gap test region

- **WS1 revealed imbalances or tensions in relation with development trends which can lead to ‘conflicts’ and evoked some conditions in which conflicts could be alleviated**
- **Main conflicts are exacerbated by lack of efficient cooperation within the region, due, amongst others, by fears, in rural communes, to become more and more dependent from Gap. Conversely, Gap conflicts with surrounding communes who benefit from Gap central functions and do not wish to share related costs**
- **Other conflicts come out from divergences within the region in visions of future development: fighting against marginalisation or enhancing residential development, coping with or supporting Gap expansion, etc**
- **Such conflicts hinder the efficiency of existing instruments: ‘best practices’ can be seen as creating conditions to make them efficient**

lessons for WS2

Conflicts solving strategies

- **WS2 will not provide recipes to solve conflicts (Cemagref is not a protagonist!) but can raise awareness on possible strategies to alleviate possible conflicts**
- **Following WS1 conclusions, conflicts can arise from divergent interpretations of the importance assigned to some phenomena e.g. is land take excessive in a given commune, are financial resources efficiently mobilised to meet current needs**
- **Conflicts solving strategies call at first for ‘scientific’ observation of main phenomena which can be regulated through dedicated instruments**
- **They call also for rationalising the implementation of different instruments in the Gap region**

lessons for WS2

Main aspects focused on in WS2

Focus will be given on a general issue: divergences in appreciations that lead to lack of effective cooperation and conflicts within the Gap region

- Which phenomena call for more precise observation to implement instruments fighting against issues they reveal?
- Against these issues, which benefits are expected from more effective cooperation between municipalities? Which instruments will help for that?
- To which degree more effective cooperation will result, in turn, in more effective support from the Région, the State or the EU?

lessons for WS2

Highlights of WS2 moderation plan

Tables dedicated to observation tools with regard to four main issues: mobility, economic activities, land resources, local taxes and finance

- Discussions introduced by brief presentation of existing indicators or observation/information tools
- Identification of main lacks in terms of information with regard to the implementation of instruments which can have effects on the issue
- Identification of conflicts which could be alleviated through common understanding based on more efficient observation tools
- Identification of other conflicts which call for more cooperation between municipalities and of instruments which can develop cooperation
- ‘Open’ opinions of local stakeholders on benefits from cooperation and from related instruments