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CHAPTER 9

MODERNIZATION AND MOBILIZATION
Parisian Retail Market Halls, 1961–1982

Emeline Houssard

Introduction: Modernization through Reconstruction?

Covered markets appeared in the nineteenth century as one of the paragons of hygienist architecture, lauded for their concern with ventilation and impermeability and their rationalist approach to spaces and flows. Studies published on Parisian ones since then have tended to focus mainly on Baltard’s central market halls, known as the Halles de Paris, but fin de siècle Paris was also home to twenty retail covered markets (figure 9.1), several of which were built earlier. Although these two architectural types belong to an overall supply network, their difference in function, based on the distinction between wholesale and retail trade, has led municipal authorities to almost systematically separate the design and management of retail markets from those of central or specialized market halls. In the early twentieth century, such covered markets became commonplace in Europe, often with very similar designs. However, the rise in self-service shopping and other types of commerce led to a gradual decline in footfall, also attributable in part to the poor upkeep of hall structures. Many such markets were demolished or partially converted. Elected officials in Paris often referred to their state of disrepair and numerous architectural projects were launched from the 1930s onward to rid the city of such “hideous buildings” from the previous century and provide more hygienic premises.

Beyond their dilapidated state, the hygienist principles of their nineteenth-century architecture required modernization in light of technological and medical advances. Despite the introduction of penicillin in the 1940s, public health concerns in postwar Parisian public space remained essentially limited to the city’s fight against “insalubrity,” as measured by the number of cases of tuberculosis according to the Athens Charter. As a result, public authorities considered that the healthiness of covered markets depended upon their complete reconstruction. This choice became strategic over the years, for
these new buildings could easily integrate public facilities that were sorely lacking in some districts, such as day-care centers, gymnasiums, and municipal offices. One of the new means favored to ensure the salubrity of such buildings was the generalization of mechanical ventilation, which allowed the restrictions imposed by the natural ventilation of covered markets in the nineteenth century to be overcome.

In postwar Paris, fifteen retail covered markets were still operating, and there were even some signs of a renewed interest in the architectural type, with the reconstruction of the Passy (1st arr.) and Saint-Honoré (16th arr.) ones, located in two of Paris’s upscale districts. Both projects had first been mooted long before but then constantly postponed and redesigned, in large part due to World War II. The Saint-Honoré market, designed by Abro Kandjian and Georges Dumont, took up the entire Place Saint-Honoré: it was a superstructure with a reinforced concrete structure and austere elevations as seen on the photograph and cross-section of figure 9.2. Only four of its thirty-two thousand square meters floor area were dedicated to public facilities. The ground-floor market had nearly seventy stands in regularly spaced aisles with an offset central walkway that opened onto the car park access points. Although the
building was criticized and modified during the design stage, it came to define the principal aspects of covered market design in the 1960s–1970s: a competition to select the architect, difficult negotiations with private companies to fund new public facilities, and reinforced concrete buildings, often exceeding the heights authorized by the current legislation, with a small ground-floor market. Indeed, during the Trente Glorieuses years that preceded the oil crisis in France, retail covered markets became key sites for large real-estate complexes that combined several types of facilities. As this period highlights the different fates of retail markets compared to that of the central Halles, it allows us to redefine the architectural principles underpinning the typology of market design in contrast to supermarkets and shopping centers.

This chapter first demonstrates how French public authorities attempted to rethink the use and appearance of retail covered markets in the 1960s according to the renewed standards of public health. Then, it analyzes the various architectural and technical solutions that were developed in a number of multipurpose projects in the early 1970s in order to respond to these requirements. While this solution allowed for the integration of new social facilities, it also sparked a massive mobilization of protesters led by local heritage associations and a few personalities. Eventually, this chapter echoes the political response given to these protests and their impact on the modernization projects. Following the municipal reform and Jacques Chirac’s election as mayor of Paris in 1977, hygiene and modernity tended to be tied to the old market structures, some of which were ultimately listed on the Supplementary inventory of historical monuments (ISMH) in 1982.

1961–1970: Reinventing Covered Markets for the Modern City

Attempts at a City-Wide Planning Vision and the Search for a “Formula for the Future”

The early 1960s were marked by attempts to develop an expansive program of modernization and construction across Paris, similar to what had happened in the nineteenth century. In March 1961, a prefectural decree established a consultative commission on covered markets in Paris. As part of the development of the Plan d’Urbanisme Directeur (PUD) of the city, the Directorate of Economic Affairs planned twenty-two new markets. The lack of specific directives for covered markets in the various documents that made up the PUD of 1959 meant that numerous projects were eventually included in detailed local urban planning programs, called Plans d’urbanisme de détail. Many of them considered the possibility of including covered markets at various stages of their design.
At the same time, there were discussions on the functions and architecture of covered markets: the decade was marked by the search for a new modernity for this architectural type. Covered markets were initially presented as the natural heirs to open-air ones, held to be “outdated” in a city whose streets had been increasingly taken over by cars since the 1950s. Most concerns centered around questions of hygiene. In 1961, the Directorate of Economic Affairs and Auguste Marboeuf, a city councilor for the Paris-Majorité party, presented a report aiming to define a number of basic principles for modern covered markets. Marboeuf argued that market halls were a solution to protect foodstuffs from dust, bad weather, or sunlight, and merchants from the cold or the heat, thanks to the roof and to modern “air conditioning.” The new buildings had to include between eighty and one hundred fifty stands depending on the local population density, on a footprint ranging between four and six thousand square meters. The site also had to offer parking for stallholders, telephone access, and even childcare facilities for shoppers. The aim was to rival self-service shopping by installing air conditioning, good lighting, and visible, well-lit, attractive signage while maintaining the advantages of market shopping—human contact and cheap prices.

On the other hand, the councilors went back and forth on the issue of single- vs. multipurpose buildings. The minutes of the City Council debates record their uncertainties: in 1966, the Director of Economic Affairs was still discussing the possibility of “small established markets” and multipurpose buildings. Their locations were not clearly stipulated at this point, even though the tendency was to go for a central position in the heart of block developments or green spaces. Although there were some fears about how consumers would react to these “complex real-estate developments,” this solution was preferred by the authorities due to the pressure from the property market, a lack of public facilities, and lower costs. At this time, the types of facilities gathered within multipurpose buildings still varied considerably. In 1961, some programs preferred the traditional association with housing, while a new program combining a covered market and car park was put forward the following year. The latter became “the preferred model” in the 1970s, despite concerns being voiced as early as 1963 by Bernard Lafay over the sanitary risk posed by the exposure of foodstuffs to car pollution. Although this question gradually came to the fore during the 1960s, it did not influence the development of the covered markets built in Paris during this period.

Moreover, the close relationship of market halls with automobiles was part of a longer tradition. In the nineteenth century, public authorities often created new streets around market halls to facilitate traffic, but this solution did not anticipate the development of cars and soon became inadequate. On the other hand, the economic failure of some markets allowed for their partial or
complete conversion into parking lots or garages from the beginning of the twentieth century onward.\textsuperscript{23}

The search for a “formula for the future”\textsuperscript{24} was built on the Saint-Honoré and Passy markets, which were said to attract more shoppers than older markets,\textsuperscript{25} but in reality several approaches were adopted: new markets were created as part of block renovation projects, while old ones on multipurpose sites were modernized. The City of Paris reached individual agreements with social housing landlords as well as private developers. However, only a handful of these numerous projects came to fruition. Indeed, many of them were competing for the same market,\textsuperscript{26} which reflects an eagerness to fill large plots spread evenly across the urban fabric. From 1961 to 1970, three projects were completed and became the prototypes for subsequent reconstruction programs in the 1970s.

Detailed Urban Development Plans and a Single Prototype: The Riquet Market (19th arr.)

While most projects for covered markets within blocks were gradually interrupted in favor of other commercial spaces, the Riquet market was in fact built (figure 9.3). It was part of the detailed urban development plan for the Flandre-Riquet-Curial-Mathis block (19th arr.) and was approved by prefectural decree in June 1966.\textsuperscript{27} Once completed, the program included not only a covered market, but also 1,816 housing units, a retirement home with eighty housing units, a nursery with occupancy for eighty children, a preschool with eight classes, a youth club with a swimming pool and gym, eleven thousand square meters of offices, five thousand square meters of shops, and eleven thousand square meters of green spaces.\textsuperscript{28} An initial agreement was signed as early as 1962 by the City of Paris and the social housing company Foyer du Fonctionnaire et de la Famille (FFF).\textsuperscript{29} The market belonged to the second phase of work on the block, following the retirement home. The Council of Paris was asked to collaborate on the program for the market in December 1966 and, budget restrictions notwithstanding, came up with a relatively ambitious plan for the “first truly modern covered market in Paris,” choosing “the most attractive” option rather than “the cheapest.”\textsuperscript{30}

Following the deliberations, a building permit was quickly issued to Maurice-André Favette,\textsuperscript{31} a modernist architect who had completed several social housing projects since the late 1950s.\textsuperscript{32} The permit came with a brief note on the market, reflecting the ambition and care involved in its design and function. Favette retained the basic principle of a ground-floor market with housing on the upper floors, an association common since the nineteenth century (although Baltard himself had been opposed to it),\textsuperscript{33} and widely used in
Europe during the postwar reconstruction phase. Like the Saint-Honoré market and other Paris markets of similar design, the Riquet market had housing on the upper floors—indeed, extra floors were added in 1971—but what made it really stand out were its volumes: a sort of individual plinth coiffed with three blocks of flats of different heights, as seen in the elevation (figure 9.3).

The market’s internal design ensured a hygienic and practical space, with octagonal sets of four stands each that were more accessible to shoppers (see perspective, figure 9.3). These ushered in a new kind of circulation in contrast to the traditional covered market design of rows of quadrangular stands, practically unchanged since the nineteenth century. On the other hand, Favette retained that period’s hygienic solution of covering walls, pillars, and stands with washable and impermeable glass blocks and ceramic tiles. The market also included an aerothermal heat pump that ensured a minimal temperature of 14°C and provided the storage facilities with a wall insulation (while non-refrigerated stores were only wire-mesh insulated) and electrical refrigeration, which could regulate temperatures for different types of foodstuffs.

In the meantime, the architect prioritized issues of accessibility, visibility, and the market’s power of attraction in the urban fabric. It had three entrances and its façades, set back three meters from the street, were punctuated with independent shops to avoid “the sad, even ‘desolate’ appearance of covered markets without this particular feature.” In order to improve vehicle access for customers and stallholders alike, he also integrated a new street, rue Archereau, thereby solving one of the major problems of the older markets, where car accessibility was often very difficult. At this stage, Favette also gave some consideration to illuminated signs meant to raise the building’s profile from the outside, following the example of large department stores.

The Riquet market, as all later ones, was equipped with modern mechanical air conditioning and refrigeration. However, it did not deviate from nineteenth-century principles of hygiene, as it retained impermeable ceramic tiling for all surfaces. Despite the careful attention paid to the design of the market, the building process was nonetheless fraught with internal disagreements that saw Maurice-André Favette replaced by Martin Schulz van Treeck, who reworked the program to incorporate the famous Orgues de Flandre tower blocks. In 1977, the market was held up as an example for its high levels of customer use. However, defects in the flooring, roof lights, and water drainage system required substantial renovations from 1979 to 1981.
The Lure of Private Developers: The Europe and Ternes Markets

The Riquet market was a totally different case from two other markets that were designed in the same period. Indeed, for the Ternes (figure 9.4) and Europe (figure 9.5) markets, the City of Paris worked with private developers and did not follow the traditional tendering process. These companies took advantage of their previous involvement in the two nineteenth-century markets that were located on the same sites and had been partially converted into a garage and a car park in the first half of the twentieth century. In this instance, the modernization lay in the choice of a mixed-use program for a large building, then in vogue in public architecture, rather than in the design of the covered market itself, which took a back seat. The two projects were shaped by major programs combining public and private facilities, principally car parks.

In 1956, the Messine Automobile company, which already operated the parking lot of the former market, proposed a first reconstruction project. Several proposals followed without success until 1968–1973, when the project designed by Olivier Rabaud was finally carried out. In addition to the market, which only occupied 382 square meters of the ground floor and received little attention in the architect’s project (as seen in the ground-floor plan of figure 9.5), the program featured a car park, municipal premises, a nursery, a retirement home, and office spaces. Like the Saint-Honoré market, the new building accommodated

city departments related to sanitation and sewerage, as if the contracting authorities had seen a correlation between market and salubrity (see figures 9.2 and 9.5). Seen from the outside, the uniform appearance of the curtain walls was nuanced by the alternation of white ceramic cladding and rounded openings on the first level. Contrary to the Riquet market, the Europe market did not open onto the street through large openings and shops but appeared as a small part of a multi-use complex enclosed on its plot. The building, markedly different in design from the rest of the Haussmann-style neighborhood, was given a frosty reception.\textsuperscript{45}

Building the Ternes market (17th arr.) took a similar amount of time, but for very different reasons. The Council of Paris profited from both the end of a rental lease in 1961 and the forthcoming end of the market concession to reach an agreement on the rebuilding of the market with a car park.\textsuperscript{46} It started working with one company in 1963,\textsuperscript{47} before the Compagnie parisienne des parkings (CPP) submitted a study to the city authorities later that same year.\textsuperscript{48} On June 29, 1965, the city signed a lease with the CPP for a new building with a ground-floor market with storage space on the ground floor and the mezzanine, eight levels of office space, and four underground parking levels.

The first building permit was signed in 1966 for a design by Pierre Dufau. This was later revoked and a second permit was granted in 1968. As in the case of the new Europe market, the Ternes one played with the legal limits of height and volume, thus requiring several revisions and approval for breaching height restrictions. The agreement with the City of Paris left all the interior features up to the city and the 890.5 square meters of market space were delivered without wall finishes or internal partitions. Given the need to increase the budget to complete the interior, the offer was renegotiated in the spring of 1968 and the architect and his team installed openwork paneling in it.

The three markets built in the late 1960s thus reflect three different approaches employed by the Prefecture and the City of Paris to determine the most appropriate program and financial model to modernize market facilities. In the early 1970s, even before these markets were finished, they were used as examples to argue for or against the modernization program.


Multi-purpose Complexes and Heterogeneity of Form

In the early 1970s, municipal authorities adopted the formula of the multipurpose complex, while at the same time striving to produce buildings of better architectural quality. Once again, they set out to establish broad guidelines for
the modernization of the old markets, thereby speeding up the implementation process. At the end of 1970, funds went into a study for the reconstruction of the Carreau du Temple market,49 while the City Council discussed developer-led rebuilding projects for the Saint-Germain50 and Batignolles ones.51 In this wake, the Council of Paris received a memorandum on the Paris covered markets on November 25, 1971.52 It summarized the city’s recent achievements in building the five new markets of Passy, Saint-Honoré, Ternes, Riquet, and Europe and laid out plans for eleven additional markets at an estimated cost of two hundred and fifty to three hundred million francs. The memorandum only made a few solid recommendations, reflecting the city councilors’ considerations on covered markets since the start of the 1960s. It referenced both the need to keep them open for locals and traders and doubts over their economic viability. While the memorandum welcomed the possibility of adding more facilities to the market plots, it did not come down firmly on either side of the issue of public financing or private developers.53 As a result, the economic solutions chosen for later projects differed. Public funds fully financed market projects built in the city center, where the arrondissements were under the control of the council majority, such as Saint-Germain (6th arr.) and Carreau du Temple (3rd arr.). On the contrary, private developers funded such projects in less central areas, controlled by the council opposition, like Saint-Quentin (10th arr.) and Batignolles (17th arr.).

The Batignolles project (figure 9.6), designed by Georges Massé and Fernand Roy for the Moines-Batignolles property management company and Lemercier-Brochant LLC, proved to be a turning point: it was the last market rebuilt during this period. Modest in size, it combined a ground-floor market with housing, a senior citizen’s club, and parking facilities.54 Massé, who like Van Treeck and Favette had worked with Ginsberg on some ten projects,55 offered a modernist reinterpretation of the arcaded building by playing on the polychromy of the wall-paneling.56 The quadrangular block had four stories over the ground floor and four underground levels, with the sixty-stall market taking up most of the ground floor. The design featured four entry points, one on each façade, echoing the geometrical layout of the stands and perpendicular aisles. The levels were arranged around a central void so that the market benefited from zenithal lighting. There were also roof terraces as in the Riquet market. Massé provided a space for unloading merchandise in the basement, in order to avoid congestion on adjacent streets. He also included mechanical ventilation in masonry ducts and electrical access to each market stall and storeroom. Finally, Massé introduced floor coverings made of epoxy, an impervious component whose use began to spread in the 1960s.57

A similar approach was planned to light the market and reuse the roof at the Saint-Quentin market (10th arr., figure 9.7), designed by André Korniloff.
The project, which in the end was never built, was for a complex with a three-star hotel with three hundred and fifty bedrooms, a garden terrace, a restaurant, meeting rooms, a nursery, a sports hall, and parking for fifty-three vehicles. Like the Ternes and Europe markets, this massive project also benefited from special waivers regarding its height and land use. It also proposed an involuntary synthesis of these earlier designs: the ground floor served as a base for the elevations, as in the Riquet market (figure 9.3), and the openwork partitions were similar to those chosen by Pierre Dufau to decorate the ground floor (figure 9.4). The latter contrasted with the vertical treatment of the elevations, according to the rhythms already seen in the Soissons hospital completed by Korniloff around the same time. Indeed, Korniloff was mainly known for designing hospitals, which made him the ideal candidate to ensure the hygiene of this building.

Almost at the same time, the Prefecture had applied for building permits for two covered markets that reflect the great gap between two generations of architects after May ‘68. On the one hand, the Carreau du Temple project (3rd arr.) is a monumental complex in a modernist and almost sculptural style commissioned from Louis Arretche (figure 9.8), who had attracted the attention of the jury during the Halles design competition. In addition to the market, the project incorporated a nursery, a preschool, a gymnasium, a library, and a retirement home. The building, which had been refurbished several times, offered about sixty honeycomb-shaped stands in a very elaborate modernist style. On the other hand, the Saint-Germain market (6th arr., figure 9.9) is the work of the young architects Pierre Colboc (a student of
Arretche), Renaud Bardon, and Jean-Paul Philippon, as well as Philippe-Georges Lamy. Its hybrid design associating a new iron and glass structure to the old market façade, came rather opportunely at the point where one architectural trend was giving way to another. Indeed, this project stands between a radically new modernist approach and a return to heritage design.

The highly ambitious reconstruction project of the Saint-Germain market intended to emphasize its ancient structure, built in 1811 by the architect Jean-Baptiste Blondel, the last one from the period of the French Empire still in operation. The project took an extremely long time to come to fruition, eventually being inaugurated in the mid-1990s. Work began on pre-projects and studies in 1963 and the decision to rebuild was agreed upon in principle in 1970, combining the market with a swimming pool, a gymnasium, a service for children with special needs, a mental health center, a nursery with room for sixty children, and a senior citizen’s club. An anonymous competition open to architects across the Paris region was held, attracting forty-four submissions. Five winners were selected in January 1973, including very young architects who had not yet made a name for themselves, while leading architects like Guillaume Gillet were not chosen. Once the results had been announced, an exhibition opened in the Saint-Jean Room at Paris City Hall, where another on Les Halles had taken place six years earlier. Of the five winning designs, three kept parts of Blondel’s arcades, while the others were deliberately at odds with the architecture of the market and the surrounding

buildings. These differences reflect the jury’s indecision after the Ministry was called upon to decide the market’s fate in 1970 and put forward two completely different options—classifying the market as a historical monument or agreeing to demolish it “on serious grounds.” The terms of the competition only vaguely referred to “a design appropriate for a neighborhood protected by a number of measures under historical monuments and sites legislation.”

The winning project broke with the approach of earlier Paris market buildings by keeping all the external arcades: the metal and glass elevations formed a striking contrast with the original stonework while echoing the shape of the round arches below (as seen in the perspective of figure 9.9).

The market itself seemed to nod to self-service shopping by creating islands with a central void for the traders at their various stands. To ensure the preservation and cleanliness of the foodstuffs, each stand was provided with access to both water and electricity. According to Jean-Paul Philippon, the architects took only a passing interest in typologies of market design. The explanatory note accompanying the building permit even stated that the specialist market furniture would be “low” to “preserve the transparency between the arcades and the inner courtyard.” Public health concerns remained essentially limited to the search for better thermal control of the building. The architects were praised for a less-polluting heating system, choosing tinted glass and steam-based district heating for the storage areas. However, the temperature of the market itself was to be regulated with highly consuming infrared heat lamps installed on each stand.

Pierre Colboc had discovered advocacy planning in the United States and the importance of involving local communities in project development. He and his team set out to develop the market’s public face by bringing the inner courtyard of the Blondel market, which had been covered over in the early twentieth century, back into use and pedestrianizing some of the abutting streets. The idea of a “forum” was then fashionable in Berlin shopping centers. The perspective generated new connections with Claude Vasconi and Georges Pencreach’s Forum des Halles, whose façade borrowed the final 1976 version of the Saint-Germain market’s round metal arch elevations. The various project managers also listened to traders to some extent. At their request, they added a mezzanine for a new kind of self-service shopping that heralded today’s cooperatives and direct sales.

The Rise of Community Activism

Faced with these new projects and the need to prevent their implementation, local communities, supported by public figures, formed protest groups. The argument went back and forth for many years, until eventually the Batignolles market was rebuilt, while the Saint-Germain and Saint-Quentin market proposals were thoroughly reworked, and the latter underwent several modifications from both users and commissioners.

In the 1960s, anxiety over the projects became palpable among locals. In 1962, a written question was asked to the city council about the alleged loss
of the Ternes market, to be replaced by a “supermarket.” The rumor was denied by the Prefect for the Seine department, but it nonetheless indicates that locals were taking an interest in the question and were keen to protect their traditional markets from the increasingly dominant self-service model. The first true signs of community activism began with a new reconstruction project for the Europe market. Although the mobilization went relatively unnoticed outside the local district, it was already soliciting a variety of appeals and arguments that were to be used ten years later against other market projects. The locals presented a petition to the local council on March 14, 1964. At the same time, the 7th arrondissement branch of the Union féminine civique et sociale and the nonprofit organization Vivre à Paris, founded just a few months earlier, sought to cancel the project on the grounds that it would threaten the neighborhood’s appearance and architectural coherence. Likewise, The Syndicat de Défense des riverains du marché de l’Europe was founded in 1964. These different bodies distributed handouts, contacted the Ministry for Construction, and made use of the various urban planning and historical monument protection regulations to support their statements and invalidate the building permit, which had already benefited from a number of exemptions. Initially, they succeeded in cancelling the reconstruction, but in December 1968, the project managers and contracting authorities brought out a similar project which was quickly approved and completed in 1971.
However, this episode did not attract significant attention and it was not until the Halles de Paris scandal in the early 1970s that the issue led to major protests. The same names spearheaded the movements against Les Halles and the covered markets—Michel Guy for the political authorities and André Fermigier for the intellectual and public spheres—when some architects put forward projects for both Les Halles and retail markets, such as Louis Arretche and Pierre Colboc. Retail covered markets became a topic for debate in their own right, regularly covered in the national and even international press.

In the meantime, the main protests were driven by nonprofit organizations, many set up specifically to address the issue. They proved highly effective, organizing demonstrations (figure 9.10), petitions, studies by various experts, press conferences and publications, and even putting forward alternative architectural projects. They were also supported by other nonprofit organizations such as the local-interest groups Comité des habitants du 3e arrondissement and SOS Paris and the heritage body of the Société pour la Protection des Paysages et de l’Esthétique de la France (SPPEF). With the help of lawyers, they managed to suspend or even overturn several building permits for the Batignolles, Saint-Germain, and Carreau du Temple markets. The protests often took a similar course but with differing motivations and results. Initially, activists protested against the terms and conditions of these projects—on the grounds of their privatization, their height, their density of use, and even their appearance—rather than against the demolition of old buildings per se. For instance, the Plateforme des associations de participation à l’urbanisme announced in 1972 that it planned to set up “information and activity centers for the local community” on the sites of covered markets scheduled for demolition and only criticized the participation of private developers in the case of the completed Europe and Ternes markets. Later, the Association des habitants et des commerçants du 3e pour la défense du projet d’équipement socio-culturel et commercial sur l’emplacement du Carreau du Temple argued against the proposals put forward to save the market by the Association Sauvons le Carreau du Temple, founded one year earlier. Broadly speaking, these nonprofit organizations, working with local councilors favorable to their cause, rejected the Modernist architectural vocabulary that was fashionable in early 1960s supermarket design, including elements such as escalators, roundly criticized in the projects for Batignolles and Saint-Germain markets. Specialists lent their support to the criticism, such as André Fermigier’s 1975 virulent article in Le Monde on the new covered markets in Paris. Gradually, as the Halles were demolished, the movement to save original markets grew. Further, legal opportunities to revoke planning permission could also be seen as a factor.

In this context, the Association de défense du marché Saint-Germain-des-Prés is emblematic in a number of ways. It was the first nonprofit
organization specifically founded to save the market in February 1971, one month after the publication of Pierre Branche’s article announcing the project.\textsuperscript{102} The association organized an exhibition on the market, presenting the project designed by the firm Dynamique urbaine and its École Spéciale d’Architecture (ESA) graduate architects Alain Oudin and Lionel de Segonzac, in March 1972, even before the design competition was officially launched in October that same year.\textsuperscript{103} In an article published in \textit{Le Monde}, Pierre Branche had even suggested to the city that the exhibition should be held at the 6th arrondissement town hall rather than at Paul Prouté’s art gallery.\textsuperscript{104} Once the competition results were announced in October 1973, Michèle Prouté began to contact the historical monuments department to request heritage protection for the building. Her determination and extensive network put her in touch with the highest authorities, including the Senate\textsuperscript{105} and even the president himself.\textsuperscript{106} From 1971 to 1977, many requests were submitted to revoke building permits for the Saint-Germain, Batignolles, and Carreau du Temple markets, generating numerous changes of direction and stoking tensions between councilors, architects, and local inhabitants. Faced with the resonance of this conflict and in the electoral context of the mid-1970s, the debate on the future of covered markets became highly politicized.


\textbf{Retail Covered Markets and Electoral Issues}

The 1975 law on the reform of the administrative structures of the Paris region and the status of the city of Paris, followed by the 1977 election of Jacques Chirac as the new mayor, profoundly changed the debate around Parisian retail covered markets. From the mid-1970s onward, political parties, especially left-wing ones such as the Parti socialiste unifié (PSU), the Parti communiste (PC), and the Parti socialiste (PS) (figure 9.10), began to join nonprofit organizations and produce posters and handouts making the case for the preservation of the markets.\textsuperscript{107} The focus of political debate on this question was evident at the time of the 1977 municipal elections. Several articles in \textit{Le Monde} discussed the issue,\textsuperscript{108} and Françoise Giroud, a candidate for the Giscard d’Estaing list defeated in the 15th arrondissement, attempted to destabilize Chirac by bringing up the Saint-Germain market.\textsuperscript{109} The front-runners Michel d’Ornano\textsuperscript{110} and Chirac\textsuperscript{111} eventually included covered markets in their manifestos. A similar trend was apparent within specific arrondissements: when the 3rd
Jacques Chirac and the Art of Compromise

One of Jacques Chirac’s first actions as mayor was to organize a “tour of the markets” to soothe tensions between councilors, architects, stallholders, and users. He met traders from the Secrétan, Carreau du Temple, and Saint-Quentin markets, as well as the architects of the project for the Saint-Germain market. Facing criticism from his opponents, who held some forty seats on the City Council, Chirac pushed the administration and partners outside city hall, seeking quick and efficient compromises. He often brought in local councilors, though some felt as if he was acting outside his remit. The impact of the market defense associations led to a change of direction, with councilors now almost systematically referring to the opinions of market users and the organizations representing them, demanding that users should be kept abreast of project developments to avoid challenges to the completed design. Chirac initially lent his support to Paul Bas and the architects who came up with the winning design to rebuild the Saint-Germain market, while at the same time trying to persuade them to alter it and come closer to the defense organizations’ requirements. Compromise proved impossible and the project was reduced to the completion of underground levels with parking facilities and a swimming pool.

With regard to the Carreau du Temple market project in the 3rd arrondissement, back in Parti socialiste hands, the decision to interrupt the work and cancel the entire project was taken in May 1977, despite the outlay for a temporary market structure that had only just been completed when the decision was taken. Again, Chirac and the City Council as a whole tried to follow the needs of market users, who presented a white paper in 1976 arguing that Jules de Molinos’s structure was “one of the market’s major assets.”

The policy led to uncertainty for the Saint-Quentin market. Following the setbacks of the Saint-Germain market, a less expensive design competition was organized to rebuild the Saint-Quentin market in 1978, taking the wishes of the traders into account. The new rebuilding program had been launched prior to Chirac’s election in June 1976. Six finalists were selected from one hundred and twenty-six entrants, including Michel Duplay, François-Noël Deffontaines, and Ramzi Mahallawi, young architects who had taken part in the international competition to design the Centre Pompidou seven years earlier. The finalists handed in their detailed pre-projects a few months later. Of the six projects, only two retained the original façades, including the winning
design by Patrick Rabourdin and Jean-Louis Sivadjian, which punctuated the curtain wall elevations with rounded arches and other sets of curves in dialogue with those of the nineteenth-century building (figure 9.11). In the end, however, the challenging economic climate meant that the project was canceled by the authorities, who took quite some time to communicate the decision. A meeting with the fifty or so stallholders made it possible to accept the principle of a straightforward renovation of the façade. Given the lack of response from the authorities, the stallholders directly contacted the winning architect, Patrick Rabourdin, to establish a rehabilitation project. A few months later, and with a somewhat forced hand, the Paris city hall officially tasked Patrick Rabourdin with renovating the market, to avoid any further conflict with both
users and architects. At a cost roughly in line with earlier market rebuilds, the metal structures were renovated, the floor was lowered to street level to improve access, and goods lifts were added to bring stock up from the basement storage area. Electricity, water supply, and drainage were also completely overhauled and under-floor water pipes were installed for heating and to prevent freezing. The architect, working closely with the local community, broke with the legibility of a regular, straight visitor flow typical of nineteenth-century covered markets and sought instead to create a more leisurely impression, giving shoppers the feeling of strolling around the stands. Indeed, from the 1980s onward, markets had come to be seen not only as places to shop for essentials but as leisure and even tourist destinations in their own right.

Market Rehabilitation and Heritage Enhancement

Following the major protests of 1975, the debate and decisions of the City Council tended to take the view that existing buildings should be maintained—though the planning process still proved convoluted. From December 1976, an initial study conducted by the Atelier parisien d’urbanisme (APUR) with a view to restoring the Secrétan market (19th arr.) was discussed by the councillors. Once elected, Jacques Chirac asserted a “comprehensive policy” for the restoration of the Parisian markets. In 1977, work began on renovating the Carreau du Temple and Secrétan ones.

At the same time, the possibility of listing the various Paris markets as heritage buildings was studied from 1975 onward. On November 14, 1977, the Délégation permanente et commission supérieure des monuments historiques approved listed status for the oldest and best-preserved markets with the aim of protecting a range of their styles. The Saint-Germain market, which had been partly dismantled, was listed by the Commission des sites in 1981. The Carreau du Temple one was listed on the Supplementary inventory of historical monuments (ISMH) by a decree dated January 14, 1982, followed on March 8 by the Enfants-Rouges, Beauvau, La Chapelle, and Secrétan markets. This even predated the listing of the Pavillon Baltard, which was moved to Nogent-sur-Marne, just east of Paris, on October 20, 1982.

In 1982, Chirac commissioned his friend Clément-Olivier Cacoub to design a new project for the Saint-Germain market, which was supposed to respect the surviving original structure. The latter produced multiple designs leading up to the one realized in the 1990s. They were criticized by the market protection organizations and the Commission des sites, as a result of which Cacoub increasingly tried to hide the new additions beneath reconstituted brick roofs or in the old market courtyard. For unprotected markets such as Saint-Didier and
Saint-Quentin, the question of reconstruction arose in these years but was finally ruled out in both cases between 1979 and 1980 in favor of rehabilitation, as was also the case for the La Chapelle one. Thus the late 1970s and early 1980s heralded a new chapter in the history of Parisian retail covered markets. Since then, the public authorities have been trying to preserve the nineteenth-century buildings, which have undergone the necessary modernization.

Conclusion

From the late 1960s to the early 1980s, Paris repeatedly tried and failed to develop a clear plan for its covered markets. During this period, one new market was created, five were rebuilt after their demolition, and another five were rehabilitated. These projects demonstrate the interest of public authorities for this type of facility: in Paris, like elsewhere, hygiene was strongly associated with the renewal of old buildings rather than the modernization of their structure. Following a broader trend in public architecture, these reconstructions gradually shifted from large, tall multipurpose buildings to lower-rise buildings, or even simple renovations of the original structure. Simultaneously, community involvement, media, and public interest reflected how fond Parisians were of their markets and their architecture, extending far beyond Baltard’s Halles. Despite the setbacks faced by councilors involved in attempts to rebuild the markets, and though some of them were eventually listed on the Supplementary inventory of historical monuments, the 1990s saw what might be described as a resurgence of the past with the completion of the Saint-Germain and Saint-Martin markets, both modern pastiches that preserved elements of the original building. The most telling example, however, remains the Enfant-Rouges market (3rd arr.). A project to rebuild it was eventually canceled due to increasing public protests and the 1995 municipal elections that saw Jacques Dominati lose his position as mayor of the 3rd arrondissement. Today, the increasing number of Inventer competitions has brought retail covered markets back into multipurpose buildings, as evidenced by David Chipperfield’s design for the former Préfecture Morland building, which includes a ground-floor covered market alongside nine other functions.
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Notes


6. A similar design had previously been used for the municipal market in Hussein-Dey, Algeria, by the architect Dupin: see “Marché couvert à Hussein-Dey (Algérie),” *Architecture d’aujourd’hui* 11, no. 3–4 (1940): 56.


12. These include the block developments, called *îlots*, at Saint-Eloi (12th arr.), no. 13 (17th arr.), Plaisance (14th arr.), Gros-Boulaivilliers (16th arr.), passage Thiéry (11th arr.), later, Lahire (13th arr.), and Saint-Blaise (20th arr.). See, respectively, Conseil de Paris, Session of July 8, 1960, *BMOVP Débats* 80, no. 128er (July 25, 1960): 552–57; Conseil de Paris, Session of July 6–7, 1961, *BMOVP Débats* 81, no. 139er (July 25, 1961): 544; Conseil de Paris, Session of


23. Subsequently, in 1917, a report considered turning all Parisian covered markets into car parks and garages in response to the rapid increase in car use in the city. The proposal was rejected, since the author considered the nineteenth-century buildings to be too cramped. See Conseil de Paris, *Rapport au nom de la 2e Commission, relatif à l’exploitation en régie des camions automobiles achetés par la Ville de Paris présenté par M. Fiancette, conseiller municipal*, annexe 2, no. 69 (July 11, 1917): 21, 26. Similarly, in 1961, a city counselor suggested raising each market to house


25. Ibid.

26. Multiple projects for various facilities were put forward for the same sites, for instance the Gros-Caillou market in 1964 and 1965, *BMOV P Débats* 84, no. 28 (January 23, 1965): 21 (minutes for 1964); *BMOV P Débats* 84, no. 13 (November 29, 1965): 422. In the 1960s, other reconstruction projects were considered for the markets Wagram, Batignolles, Carreau du Temple, Saint-Martin, Saint-Quentin, Secrétan, Saint-Germain, Aligre, La Chapelle, and Nicot.


34. A letter dated January 20, 1953, from the director of the Vienna Market Office to the Augsburg Market Office, Germany, demonstrates the interest in this postwar system, described on a study visit by elected municipal officials.

Vienna. Likewise, the Conseil de Paris was interested in a similar solution for the Pré-Saint-Gervais market, *BMVP* 81, no. 2 (March 18, 1961): 36.


37. The plans included parking for five large delivery lorries, and the two first basement floors had loading bays for up to ten lorries at once and parking for thirty lorries. These features, which were not included in subsequent projects for the Ternes and Batignolles markets, proved to be crucial for good market performance. *BMVP Débats* 98, no. 12 (November 10, 1978): 640.


53. Ibid.
56. He and Jean Ginsberg had already revisited an eighteenth-century private mansion at 19 rue du Docteur Blanche (16e arr.). Dehan, Jean Ginsberg, 68.
Moreover, the Arretche and Colboc families were very close, according to Thierry Roze in “Louis Arretche architecte (1905–1991)” (Master Diss., Université Paris I – Panthéon Sorbonne, 1997: 5).

These are the future founders of ACT architecture.


Of the original four, only the Blancs-Manteaux market, converted in the early twentieth century, remains today. Curiously, it was never mentioned by those in favor of rebuilding the Saint-Germain market or by advocates of the old market.

This can be explained in part by the changes in architectural approach brought about by the impact of May ’68, the succession of three distinct presidents of the French Republic, the structural reform of municipal organization, and the evolution of urban planning rules with the new POS, voted in 1977 but applied in advance since 1974.

“service pour l’enfance inadapté,” “centre d’hygiène mentale.” The authorities also wanted to add a parking, a sports hall, and a meeting room and to improve road access. Pavillon de l’Arsenal, Photothèque de la Direction de l’urbanisme, numbers on the back of photographs 108649 to 108660, Competition program, on-site reconstruction of the Saint-Germain market and development of various public facilities, 1973.


The display then moved to the 6th arrondissement town hall for just under a month.


MODERNIZATION AND MOBILIZATION

75. The Compagnie parisienne du chauffage urbain (CPCU), active since the late 1920s, ensured the system.

76. Jean-Paul Philippon considers this theoretical reference to be essential for understanding both their project and their incredulity in the face of the virulent criticisms voiced by some inhabitants of the neighborhood. See also Pierre Colboc, “Advocacy planning: Échec ou réalité de la démocratie directe,” *L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui*, no. 153 (December–January 1970): 34–37.

77. Especially the Steglitz Forum, which received widespread coverage in European architectural journals in the early 1970s.


81. An independent association under the law of 1901; *JO*, October 9, 1964, 9320.

82. This was to prove a reference point for both market advocates and opponents. Other examples fed into their respective arguments, such as Covent Garden Market in London and the Halles de l’île in Geneva.

83. Other public figures actively defended the Saint-Germain market in a letter to Michel Guy, May 20, 1975, signed by Ionesco, Leiris, Chastel, Levis-Strauss, and many others. Later, on April 27, 1985, the Association Suisse d’Historiens d’Art also wrote to the mayor of Paris and to the French president. Files about the Saint-Germain market, 1970–1986, Michèle Prouté Private Archives, Paris. Michel Guy and André Fermigier were both close to the Prouté family, which was very active in the Association de défense du marché Saint-Germain-des-Prés.


87. The first, organized by the Association de défense du marché Saint-Germain-des-Prés, received forty-five hundred signatures in 1972. It continued throughout

88. For instance, the Compagnons du Devoir were called on to examine the wooden frame of the Saint-Germain market.


91. The first president of the Association de défense du marché Saint-Germain-Des-Prés, Gérard Lolivier, was a lawyer. Thereafter, Michèle Prouté and her entourage had their own lawyer to conduct legal proceedings.


96. Declared on June 19, 1977, it represented locals and traders who sought to replace the Carreau du Temple market with a social and cultural center.


100. Fermigier, “Batignolles.”


103. Both had devoted their graduation project at the ESA to the market; their new project was presented at the Paul Prouté Gallery after solicitations from the two architects. Alain Oudin, email correspondence with the author, April 28, 2020.


106. Letter-petitions were sent to Valéry Giscard d’Estaing in 1975, Prouté, Le marché Saint-Germain, 21.

107. Michèle Prouté’s private archives contain numerous PC, PSU, Union de Gauche, and PS handouts.


111. Chirac wished to maintain the support of Pierre Bas and therefore took a more nuanced stance.


115. Ibid.


119. Bernard Billaud, one of Chirac’s closest collaborators wrote a note to the Director of Finance and Economic Affairs dated July 20, 1979, testifying to the direct reports of the mayor and stallholders, at the Riquet market in this case, which lead to a decision by the mayor. Archives de Paris, 1436W carton 2, 85.7, marché Riquet 1969–82.

120. Chirac’s surprise visit to the Secrétan market stallholders was heavily criticized by Henri Fiszbin, a left-wing politician and former candidate for the municipal elections. *BMOPV Débats* 97, no. 4 (May 23, 1977): 65–69. Similarly, Jean-Paul Philippon, a young architect at the time, admitted that he was taken aback by the request to modify the project for the Saint-Germain market and the addition of “stone.” Jean-Paul Philippon, interview with the author, Paris, March 4, 2020.


122. For example, Pierre Guidoni boasted that he was “in permanent contact with the Saint-Quentin market traders’ association,” adding that his colleague “Mr. Marcu, deputy of the 10th arrondissement, is in permanent contact with the association that was created between users and traders for the reconstruction of the market.” *BMOPV Débats* 98, no. 7 (July 18, 1977): 253.


124. Ibid.

125. “At that time, we did some hybrid projects that I’m not at all proud of, to try to meet this demand. Our project was coherent and it was quite difficult to falsify it in this way—even though we kept the principles, it was quite watered down. … This attitude was criticized, including by the Director of the APUR, Ligen, who criticized us for getting into this game.” Jean-Paul Philippon, interview with the author, Paris, March 4, 2020.


128. After the building permit for Korniloff’s project was revoked and while a reconstruction project was being drawn up, councilors were forced to approve urgent renovation work to keep the market open: Conseil de Paris, Session of June 25, 1975, *BMOPV Débats* 96, no. 14 (July 31, 1976): 761–63.
129. The competition did not require a highly detailed study at the first stage, since unsuccessful entrants were not paid. The prize panel only selected six competitors who had to draft a proposal. *BMOP Debats* 98, no. 13 (December 3, 1977): 574–78; “Reconstruction du marché Saint-Quentin,” 1977–1983, File 85-1, Box 1, “Dossiers d’affaires,” 1436W, Archives de Paris, Paris.

130. Ibid.


132. The project was canceled in June 1979 and the decision was published in the 10th arrondissement journal before the architects were officially notified. The file also contains letters from several candidates urging the city to seek compensation. “Reconstruction du marché Saint-Quentin,” 1977–1983, File 85-1, Box 1, “Dossiers d’affaires,” 1436W, Archives de Paris, Paris.

133. The 1979 memorandum on the various rehabilitation options still considered the nineteenth-century structure unsuitable for a modern market: Ibid.


137. In France, only a few market halls from the second half of the nineteenth century were listed before this date. These include markets in Sens, Nevers, and Dijon that were listed in 1975.


141. With the exception of the Saint-Martin market, rebuilt at the end of the 1980s.

142. As early as 1980, the Communist councilors were preoccupied with the project of rebuilding the Enfants-Rouges market and were already vehemently opposed to the idea: “Aussi veillerons-nous à ce qu’elle soit abandonnée,” Conseil de Paris, Session of December 15–16, 1980, *BMOP Debats* 100, no. 12 (February 16, 1981): 931.
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