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[slide 1]

The main objective of this survey conducted with IPSOS MORI, is to compare the perception of the main issues by the inhabitants of two major world cities. The question focuses on the trajectories – before and after lock down orders -- while taking into account the multiple scales and geographies in which both cities are embedded.

I will focus on the results for the Greater Paris area (with some insights on the city of Paris, or inner Paris), compared to Greater London, in order to give the english audience a sense of what has been deemed interesting in this survey from the French capital’s perspective. I will cover several dimensions of the survey, the major concerns, the role of the neighborhood, the issues of outward mobilities after the crisis; social issues and inequalities at stake; and finally some environmental issues in a context of climate emergency, the other crisis that is already here.

[slide 2]

A first comment will focus on the perception of the concerns of the inhabitants. Generally speaking, **the health crisis was the main concern for Parisians and Londoners at the time of the survey.**

However, the distribution of other concerns is a bit different: in the Greater Paris, the first concern has been housing, the cleanliness of streets, parks and public spaces, followed by air quality and pollution. For the inner suburbs of the Greater Paris however, crime and law enforcement is first in rank for the outer paris areas. In Greater London, the cost of living, policing, and housing are the major issues in order. More than in Paris, concerns about the economy and employment have increased in London in two years, while Brexit is no longer an issue (-17 points).

[slide 3]

**As Jack already mentioned, the role of neighborhood life, an important element of the “walking city”, stands out as a major topic of satisfaction for metropolitan residents.** We should think of this while keeping in mind that during lock downs (within a 1 km radius for 2 months in France), many have drop their cars keys and rediscovered local parks, services and amenities. Data show that the 15-20 minutes area is appreciated by a vast majority of metropolitan residents (over 93% in Paris, 91% in Greater London) for its level of services and amenities.

[Slide 4]

**In this positive context, the stated preferences are clearly in favor of public transportation as major linkages with big city life.** It is deemed essential for 29% of the Parisians, and more significantly by 44% of the inhabitants of Greater London. Elements related to safety, proximity to green spaces, and health facilities are considered equally important by Londoners and Parisians (around 30%).

3:20

[Slide 5]

**Among the major issues at stake during the pandemic and its aftermath, the question of residential choice in the near future is paramount.** After Jack’s presentation, I just want to take the opportunity to comment a bit the proportion of Parisians who say they plan to leave downtown Paris in the next five years is 44%, which and has been rising since 2019.

Indeed, the demographic context has not been in favor of Paris: population has increased by only 0.1% a year over the last decade ; while greater London population grew 1% in a year. The attractivity of Paris is at stake here: the inner city has lost inhabitants over the past 5 years (-54,000 between 2013 and 2019).

**So the demographic gap between Paris and London extends to how immigration is being perceived as a burden or an opportunity** : Londoners have a much more favourable view of immigration to their city than do Parisians. However, this shall be discussed in nuance.

61% of Londoners believe that immigration from abroad has a positive impact on their city, compared to only 27% of residents of Greater Paris ( and only 35% in downtown Paris).

**Nevertheless, this attitude of Parisians is not only a distrust of immigrant populations, but also a perception of Paris as an isolate: only 34% of Greater Paris inhabitants see the arrival of populations from other French regions as having a positive impact on the city, vs. 58% in London.**

This reluctance of Parisians towards new incoming population is surprising, and is probably against the very structure of what a capital and global city is in terms of demographic and economic polarization and redistribution, with inflows and outflows structured by age, life-cycle and occupational groups.

As a result, Parisians don't think that their city needs to receive more population flows (only 14%), either from international immigration or interregional migration, and a strong majority (52%) expresses against such flows.

[Slide 6]

**Many other dimensions of our survey highlight how inequalities cut across the two capitals**. Working at home has redefined the workplace during the crisis, at least for "non-core" functions, that have massively shifted to telework. London seems particularly favorable to full-time work from home (33%), which is consistent with the structure of its economic activity, whereas only 19% of Parisians say they can do it all the time. If we add partial telecommuting situations, 38% of Parisians have this option, against 53% of Londoners - so much so that work from home may become a norm --. Results in the inner suburbs of Paris however show that transportation, industrial and commercial functions are obviously reducing the potential for telework for residents of the inner suburbs (down to 32 %, against 49% in the center of Paris), because of the spatial socio-economic structure of the metropolis.

[Slide 7]

**This being said, in order to work from home**, **one still needs to be able to find a place to live**. The situation, in terms of housing affordability, is very bad, from the point of view of the adequacy between means (income, assets) and prices: 89% of the people questioned said they could not buy a property in London; 77% in Greater Paris.

This problem stems from unequal access to housing: for salaried workers, only assets accumulated, and not income, actually allow to access to property for a majority of households. As a result, only 27% of Greater Paris residents believe that housing is affordable "for someone like them"; this affordability crisis seems even more striking in London where 20 % of residents believe that it is still possible to find affordable housing.

[slide 8]

**What are the levers for policies in this context?** The respondents were asked about the elements on which they were optimistic or pessimistic. The situation related to access to housing is the one on which the inhabitants are the most pessimistic: a vast majority think that the situation will get worse, in Paris and in London. Pollution and employment are also subjects of long-term pessimism, around 30% of the respondants. On the other hand, when the survey was carried out, the services shut down during lock down were positively appreciated and one wants to believe that the offer, the diversity, the accessibility, will improve, whether it be public transport (in particular in Greater Paris, of course with a lot of planned worked and new subway lines), places of hospitality (bars, restaurants and cafés), and culture ( like theaters and museums)

[slide 9] **A last comment on environmental issues, an important part of the survey. We have seen that in Paris as in London, air quality and pollution were perceived as major issues for about 40% of respondents**. IPSOS asked about the opinion on a number of measures to improve air quality: a wide variety of measures are supported in both capitals by a majority of respondents, **and this is an interesting outcome in terms on acceptability of environmental policies against climate change**. : pedestrian zones, reduction of car use **are** supported by a strong share of the inhabitants. It should be noted that speed regulations and low carbon emission zones find support. For instance, downtown Paris has just introduced a 30 km/h speed limit, and the policy finds support by 49% in the Greater Paris are, and by a majority of 52% in downtown Paris, with even higher proportions in London. On the other hand, some attitudes are a little dissonant with the general tone. For example, the reallocation of road space to bicycles and walkers is very strong in London (51%), but weaker in Paris (39%).

On these few elements of reflection, I am sure we will come back to some during Q&As, and during the following talks.

Thank you for your attention.

**[Slide 7]**

This is to me one of the main output of this survey, that addresses many dimensions of the global city. One dimension that has been widely commented on in the news is obviously security, and perceived risk. One of the lessons learned is that, overall, during the day, the inhabitants of Paris and London feel safe, i.e. 8 out of 10 people. Nevertheless, at night, Paris is perceived as less safe by 35% of respondents, a lower score than London.

Nevertheless, the perception is very variable according to gender, and only 22% of women feel safe at night in London, and 29% in Paris: the difference in perception between the two capital cities is notable.

**[slide 8]**

This difference is linked to differences in perception of the feeling of insecurity, and we asked the inhabitants if they had ever been confronted with undesirable or aggressive attitudes or actions. The results: 15% of the women interviewed in London and 10% in Paris declared having been subjected to inappropriate looks; 13.3% of the women in London declared having been subjected to sexual jokes, against only 5% in Paris; 3.5% had been subjected to indecent gestures in London, 2% in Paris. At first sight, the situation is better in Paris than in London, and the gaps between men and women are greater in London. Interpreting these elements directly seems complicated, however, because it is likely, as in any comparative survey, that the relationships of domination are not entirely perceived and reported in the same way, and that the notion of inappropriate looks and jokes is eminently cultural in its construction and in the way the fact is perceived and reported. In one way or another, this survey allows us to question the meaning of these facts, the nature of the reported acts that are not reported, complained about and statistically recorded. In both capitals, the perception of these acts plays a role in the social and political construction of the feeling of insecurity.