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Rationale for comparative study

• Pickvance (1986) ‘Comparative urban analysis and assumptions about causality’ *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 10 162-184:

  Recognition of varieties of social phenomena, overcome ethnocentric assumptions about what is normal
  Requirement to consider what is (in)essential among the observed differences between countries
  Comparative studies as a means to an end
Types of comparative study


Juxtaposition

Convergence (common trajectory of policy / place)

Divergence (foreground difference / construct typologies)
The new ‘city regionalism’

• “there has been an under emphasis in the city region literature on how territorial forms are constructed ... An especially notable lacunae is serious treatment of the role of the state.” (Jonas and Ward, 2007).
Metropolisation

• Decentralisation Act 3

Loi ‘MAPTAM’ (metropoles) 2013
Loi ‘NOTRe’ (territorial organisation of the Republic) 2015
Loi délimitation des régions, etc. (regional reform) 2015
Tours Metropole

• Tours: a metropole?
• Mobilising local stakeholders
• Building a case
• Networking / lobbying

Amendment to Loi Grand Paris (2017)
The Prefecture
The cumul des mandats
Tours Metropole

- ‘Making’ the metropole
- *Pacte Etat – Metropole*
- Governance

  *Primacy of local mayors*

  *No metropolitan project*
Tours Metropole

- Participation
  *Conseil de développement*

- Urban rural inter-dependencies
  *Contrat de co-operation métropolitaine*
Conclusion 1: from traditional regional policy to territorial competitiveness
Conclusion 2: reform of sub-central governance