

# Beijing City Lab

Shen Y, Liu L, 2014, Lessons from Europe: Challenges and opportunities of Chinese urbanism in transition. Beijing City Lab. Working paper #43

# Lessons from Europe: Challenges and Opportunities of Chinese Urbanism in Transition

– A dialogue with Professor Sir Peter Hall

## 欧洲的启示：转型期中国城市化的挑战与机遇

–Professor Sir Peter Hall教授访谈

*This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor Sir Peter Hall, a true icon in the world of urban planning in our time. The most sincere thanks are given to him for accepting our interview about one month ago his passing and giving us the final advice just before his critical situation in UCLH. His extraordinary personality, extensive knowledge and brilliant accomplishment will always be the legacy encouraging all the following generations. We hope that the discussion on the questions that this paper addresses can benefit Chinese urbanisation, which is definitely Peter's wish as well. For us lucky enough to have a talk with him about Chinese new urbanisation, it has been an insanely great honour. He will be missed immensely.*

谨以此文献给Peter Hall教授，纪念这位在我们这个时代世界规划界中的伟大学者，并诚挚地感谢他在离去前一个月仍欣然接受我们的专访并在他病危前给予我们诸多建议。他非凡的人格、学识与成就都将永远成为后辈们敬仰的宝贵财富。希望文中的思考和讨论能为接下来的中国新型城镇化规划和发展带来启发，这也是他的心愿。十分荣幸能够就中国的城市化问题与其对谈，这对我们来说是一份莫大的荣耀。我们将永远缅怀他！

## INTRODUCTION

This interview stems from two events happened at the beginning of 2014: on the one hand, Professor Sir Peter Hall published his latest book – *Good City, Better Life: How Europe Discovered the Lost Art of Urbanism* – which has considerably drawn lots of attention in the international field of urban planning; on the other hand, Chinese government just released the latest national planning strategies for the following 6 years – *Chinese New National Urbanisation Planning (2012-2014)*- which has described the detailed developing indices for the urbanisation in the near future. The former one is related to the thoughts of a well-known urbanist about the challenges that British cities are facing, including economy balance, housing development, integrated planning between transport and land use, sustainable neighbourhood development and good mechanism of urban regeneration (Hall, 2014), whereas the latter one is about the adjustment of aims of urbanisation in the biggest developing country. The new developing goals are explicitly put into words covering five topics as the following: improving the quality of urbanisation, optimizing the spatial structures of metropolitans, promoting the sustainability, ameliorating the public service and completing the market mechanism (Chinese National Council, 2014). It is not hard to recognise that these two events concerned some similar aspects of urbanisation. Hence, what we really care about is whether the proposed “New Urbanisation” in China could learn from the art of urbanism in Europe.

This interview is a discussion about the necessity and possibility of Chinese cities learning from the present experience in Europe. In the main part, two broad issues emerging not only in Chinese urbanism but also in the international modernisation are addressed: the development of city clusters and the urbanisation of the population. Based on the Professor Sir Peter Hall's recent thoughts of European cities, this interview explores the relevant issues in proposed *New Chinese National Urbanisation Plan (2014-2020)* and highlights the benefits of the lessons from Europe.

## 引言：从 2014 年初的两件事说起

本次采访构思于两个事件的时间交汇节点：一方面，彼得霍尔教授的新书《Good City, Better Life: How Europe Discovered the Lost Art of Urbanism》发表并受到了国际规划学界的强烈关注；另一方面，国务院发布了《国家新型城镇化规划（2014-2020）》（下文称《新城化规划》），对接下来 6 年的中国城市化战略做了具体的描述。前者是一名国际规划学者对现今英国城市发展面临的挑战的思考。通过总结欧洲大陆其他国家城市发展的成功经验，霍尔教授对英国城市发展的五大挑战逐一进行分析和论述，包括平衡城市经济、建造城市住宅、统筹交通与土地利用规划；节约能源消耗以及重塑城市开发机制，最后根据欧洲大陆其他成功城市的经验提出了具体的改进措施和建议（Hall, 2014）。而后者是一个国家的中央政府明确了接下来 6 年的城市发展的核心目标，其中包括：提升城镇化质量、优化城镇化格局，提倡可持续发展，改善生活服务以及完善城市机制（国务院，2014）。因此，一幅有趣的时空画卷得以展现：一个拥有最长城市化历史的国家在反思自己的发展路径；一个拥有最快城市化速度的国家正在展望自己的未来。我们关心的是，前者是否·能够给后者带来一些具体的思考。抑或，中国的新城化能从当今欧洲的经验里获得哪些启示以避免类似的发展问题？我们该如何应对新型城镇化中的机遇和挑战？

由此本次访谈以浅谈中国新城化问题和向欧洲借鉴的必要性以及可能性为引。本文将主要围绕两个国际城市发展的关键问题：城市群发展以及人口城市化。同时结合霍尔教授最近关于欧洲城市的思考，试图对处于转型期的中国新城化进行探讨，并期待对下一步新城化的具体实践有所裨益。

**Respondent:** Professor Sir Peter Hall is a well-known British geographer, urbanist, fellow of the British Academy and Bartlett professor in Bartlett School of Planning in University College London (UCL).

**受访嘉宾:** Peter Hall, 英国著名城市地理学家，英国皇家科学院院士，英国伦敦大学学院（UCL）巴特雷规划学院教授。

**Interviewers:** Yao Shen, a PhD candidate in Space Syntax Lab in Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, and Lixun Liu, a PhD candidate in Bartlett School of Planning, University College London.

**采访者:** 沈尧，英国伦敦大学学院巴特雷建筑学院建筑系空间句法实验室博士研究生，北京市城市实验室学生成员；刘璘珣，英国伦敦大学学院巴特雷规划系博士研究生

In the following text, the letter I stands for the interviewer; and the word H denotes to Professor Sir Peter Hall.

在下文中，I 用于代表采访者，H 代表彼得霍尔教授。

## 01 VIEW ON THE NATIONAL PLANNING

### 01 对于国家级规划的总体看法

**I:** *Chinese New National Urbanization Plan 2014-2020* was argued by some scholars that a plan at such a national scale may risk a counterproductive result. Therefore, what do you think of such a national wide urban planning?

**I:** 《新城化规划》被认为标志着中国城市化从寻求‘量变’到追求‘质变’的转型，然而其中也不乏很多担心。一些学者认为国家尺度的规划可能潜藏着事与愿违的风险。因此，参考欧美国发展的经验，请问您如何认识这样一个全国性城市规划的必要性与重要性呢？

**H:** Basically, in the last 20 years many countries have an ambition to develop a national spatial strategy - notably of course, France and UK, which has developed sub-national strategies. In England, the government has refused to do that.

I believe it is a good idea to develop a broad spatial strategy in growing urban areas, as long as you recognise that it is a strategy, not a fixed plan. Because all of our experience show that you cannot entirely predict what is going to happen even in a country with such a strong urbanisation trends that you are experiencing in China. But in particular, I agree with the notion that China is going to continue to urbanise. It will go from 50% to 60%, perhaps not 60%, maybe 59% or 61%, but that does not matter, as long as you know the direction of travel. Then you can again particularly plan the infrastructure that you need to accommodate all these people or the house of these people. Because if you fail to do that, you can have a very chaotic result, as we have seen in other rapidly urbanizing countries that failed to make subject provision.

So in general, I think that a broad urbanization plan is ok, as long as you recognise that it represents the direction of travel not something that has to be absolutely fixed in every detail, a master plan. That is an important distinction.

**H:** 基本上来说，在过去的 20 年中，非常多的国家都曾有雄心去发展一个国家级的空间战略，尤其是英国和法国，都曾制定各自的次国家级战略规划。然而英格兰政府是拒绝制定如此大尺度的规划的。

不过我相信为发展中的区域制定大致的空间战略规划是必要的，只要能够将这种规划变成一种战略政策，而不是既定的规划蓝图。既往的无数经验告诉我们：完全预测一个国家的发展是几乎不可能的事，即便是对于处于快速发展期的区域，比如中国。显而易见，中国不会停下城市化的脚步。中国城市化率将从 50%左右提高到 60%。具体的数字并不重要，重要的是具体的发展路径。只有明确了发展路径，才能具体地规划未来城市人口所需的基础设施与住房。一旦发展的路径动摇便会带来非常混乱的结果，就像一些未能做好基础设施和住房供给的其他高速发展的国家一样。

因此，制定大致的城市化规划是没有问题的，但其前提是这样的规划拟定的是发展的战略方向而不是事无巨细的既定发展指标。这两者具有重要区别。

## 02 REGIONAL CLUSTERS DEVELOPMENTS AND PLANNING

### 02 都市群的发展与规划

**I:** The urban regional clusters are the main concerns of Chinese New National Urbanization Plan. However, the urban regional cluster is still a concept without a clear definition. Meanwhile, constructing the urban regional structure is criticised for ignoring its reasonable developmental regularity. Therefore, how to properly define the Chinese urban regional clusters? Which places in China can potentially emerge as important urban regional clusters? And what kind of factors should be paid special attention to in order to better understand the developmental process of urban regional clusters and properly conduct the planning of them?

**I:** 《新城化规划》提出了城市群为新城化发展的主体形态。但是城市群仍旧是一个没有明确界定的概念。然而现行的都市群发展政策也时常被质疑为忽略其正常发展规律。那么，您认为如何能更加恰当地界定中国的城市群？中国哪些地方有潜力成为新的重要城市群及区域增长极？什么样的因素需要被关注才能正确地认识城市群的发展，进而合理的规划它们？

**H:** It is an interesting and important question. I have been personally researching this over the last 10 years. It is clear that there are three very important regional clusters in China. These are the ones that have been defined in the urbanisation plan: Beijing & Tianjin, the Yangzi River Delta and the Pearl River Delta. Now these are remarkable phenomena, especially the last two, because they are what we have called mega-city regions. They are mega-city regions on a far larger scale than what we can see elsewhere in the world. Some people compare them with the Tokkaido Corridor in Japan, but I do not believe that is an apt comparison. Because the Tokkaido Corridor is simply a long corridor that is about 500 kilometres long, whereas these are regions, containing a number of cities that are quite highly networked with each other. And we see similar phenomenon in other parts of the world that, Americans such as, begin to identify such regions in the United States, and we have identified South East England in an area around London as a similar region, by way of comparison. Our South East England, a mega-city region, or the Greater South East, some call it, has around 20 million people in comparison. It is very difficult to calculate, but your Yangzi River Delta has perhaps, I do not know, 80 million. And the Pearl River Delta, in some definitions, has over 100 million. It is very difficult to draw a fixed boundary in such regions. Perhaps it is not even wise to do so, except to recognise that there is a broad realm that constitutes cities in such a region.

And then an important point, I think it becomes the relationship between these cities. Let us concentrate on these two cases. The Yangzi River Delta has Shanghai as the absolute dominant city and of course also a number of important cities. In the case of Pearl River Delta, you have Hong Kong at one end and you have Guangzhou at the other, but again you have a number of really large important cities. It is clear in both cases that growth decentralises and de-concentrates. It has got to, because the central city cannot accommodate all its own growth. So Shanghai exports its growth of people and jobs to neighbouring cities, and likewise both Guangzhou and Hong Kong. So the real question concerns the rate of de-concentration, and the way that de-concentration takes place. The Dutch planners who have been experiencing this phenomenon for 50 years, in their Randstad Holland, have described a phenomenon of “concentrated de-concentration”, and that is a term I like. You de-concentrate the population out of the big cities but you re-concentrate it in other cities. Thus Shanghai de-concentrated, but its population re-concentrated in Suzhou. However, it is also locally de-concentrated in Suzhou, as Suzhou grows. And it is a process we try to understand how here in South

East England. Now 70 years ago in 1944 we had the famous Abercrombie Plan for London. That said “put a Green belt around London, and build new town on the other side of the green belt”. We did that, and in a word, we still have the green belt, we still have new towns. But the growth has gone on taking place and going farther and farther from London. So it is now happening up to 100 and 120, 130 kilometres distant from London. And a similar phenomenon is happening, I think, in the Yangzi and Pearl River Delta. So the real question is how to accommodate this outward de-concentration, a truly substantial issue, I believe.

And I would like to insist that the green belt has been successful for us, and I think can be successful for other places. But it raises many questions, for instance, how wide should such a belt be, should it be a narrow park belt for recreation, for the people, for the city? Should it be a wide belt? Should it become a total green background? A central principle we used in planning in this country was a term invented by Raymond Unwin who was planning London even before Abercrombie: “towns against a background of open country”. I rather like that term and it works rather well in Southern England, where the towns which are still growing. Oxford, and Cambridge, and Colchester and Maidstone and Brighton, are actually sitting against a background of open country. That is quite a nice idea as long as you provide sufficient space for the growth of cities. And a definition may have to change from time to time. You may have to see this as an area of open country, but now it becomes an extension of the town. But I think that the principle is having a number of strong towns and city very well networked together. Your high speed train system is helping to do that and then growing in turn through urban extensions. It is a very good principle from studying the examples of good practice cities in Europe. That is what this topic is all about essentially.

Also I should say you are right with three urban regions and then you have four others because these are the growing regions in central China. They are deliberately being planned to expand to take some of the pressure coming out of the rural areas and the west into the one concentrated on the east coast almost following the curve of the sea. And that is a very good principle I think, it is something which we found very difficult to achieve in this country because - as you undoubtedly know about us - we have this north-south divide and this north- south debate. People says too much growth has occurred here in the south east and too little in the north, and this has become a major political policy issue; I share that concern. But we find it very difficult to do much about it in this country, the underlying forces are pushing and pushing towards London all the time.

**H:** 这是一个非常重要的问题。我个人在过去十年为此做了很多研究。中国现在有三个明显的区域都市群：京津冀、长三角以及珠三角都市群，并且它们都已经被《新城化规划》确认为国家级都市群。特别是长三角和珠三角都市群，是真正意义上我们所说的“巨型城市群”，甚至是世界上发展规模最大的都市群。一些学者曾把这些都市群与日本东海岛都市群比较，但我觉得其实它们之间不具可比性。因为东海岛都市群是一个五百千米长的城市走廊，而珠三角和长三角都市群内城市联系更加紧密，形成了网络状的都市群形态。在世界很多地方我们都能观察到类似的情况。美国已经开始定义这种紧密联系的城市群为都市群。在英国，英格兰东南部的伦敦周围地区也被定义为大伦敦都市群。东南英格兰的巨型城市区，或者我们所谓的“大东南区”有大约 2000 万人口，而长江三角洲则大约有 8000 万人口，珠江三角洲则有大约 1 亿人。由此可见，都市群规模不一，我们很难为这些都市群准确划定固定的边界。或者说，除非能够发现一个较为明晰的地理区域包含这些城市，否则试图找寻和定义一个准确的都市群边界可能本身就是不明智的。

都市群发展规划的要点是协调都市群内部的城市之间的关系。让我们继续用长江三角洲和珠江三角洲都市群为例。长江三角洲都市群有许多重要城市，但仍旧在很大程度上依赖于上海作为核心城市；与之相较，珠江三角洲都市群则略有不同，它也有许多重要城市，但是香港和广州则形成了分布两端的双核心。显而易见，这两个都市群的城市增长力开始分散而变得不那么集中。这是必然的现象和过程，因为核心城市不可能一直容纳不断增长的人口。因此，上海一

直在将人口和就业增长转移到临近城市，广州和香港也是一样。因此一个核心问题便是城市疏散的比例以及如何疏散核心城市的功能。荷兰的规划师们对此研究了近 50 年，在荷兰的 Randstad 城市群，此类现象被称为“疏散的再聚集”，这是一个我认为对都市群发展和规划较为合适的提法。首先必须将核心城市的人口转移到其他次级城市，同时又需要采取措施使得这些人口在那些城市再度聚集。这就好像上海将部分人口、产业向苏州转移，而人口则重新在苏州聚集。但与此同时，苏州区域内也会发生本地的扩散，进而苏州又继续发展。我们也一直在英格兰大东南区域研究这个扩散和聚集的过程。1944 年，阿伯克龙比教授完成了著名的大伦敦规划并提出在伦敦周围建设绿带，在绿带外建设新城。遵照这个规划，伦敦现在拥有绿带也同时拥有新城，但是城市增长却仍旧从伦敦扩散到很远的地区，从现在看来已经到了距伦敦 100-130 公里远的区域。我想，对于长江三角洲都市群和珠江三角洲都市群也是一样。所以都市群发展的一个延伸的核心问题就是如何支持和适应这种扩展的机制。

绿带规划也很重要。英国实行了绿带规划用以控制城市蔓延，并且看起来是成功的并且值得推广。但是关于绿带仍有一些悬而未解的问题值得商榷，比如：绿带应该多宽？它是否应该是一个狭长的公园带以满足市民娱乐及休憩？它是否应该很宽？它是否需要全部是严格的绿地？对于这些相类似的问题，Raymond Unwin 曾提出了一条原则：将城市建筑在开放的乡村上。他也是伦敦的早期规划师之一，甚至早于阿伯克龙比爵士。这一条经典原则在英国规划界被认为是规划的核心原则之一。我想这个原则是正确的，也在英格兰南部地区得到了验证。牛津、剑桥，科尔切斯特，梅德斯通以及布莱顿等一些还在发展的城市就坐落在开放的乡村上。这是一个很好的想法，只要城市的生长能够被辅以有效的空间规划。但关于绿带的定义则需要与时俱进。这样开放的乡村才能成为城市的延伸，进而形成较好的城市和绿带的关系。但在此之上，我认为更加重要的前提是建设一个紧密联系的城镇体系。城市的快速轨道交通系统将有利于实现这一目标并且带来城镇的发展。这是在研究欧洲相关城市实践的案例时需要特别关注的一项城市规划原则。如何有效地联系不同的城市才是城市群发展的本质问题。

此外，我认为中国在原有的三个主要都市群的基础上新增了四个正在发展的国家级城市群是正确的，因为它们主要都在待发展的中部。集中力量发展这些都市群会帮助缓解新型城市化过程中给东部沿海城市带来的压力。这是一个有益的想法，在英国，这是很难实现的。关于英国南北发展的分歧和争论一直存在。人们抱怨英国东南部区域得到了太多的发展机遇而北部则较之少之又少。近年来相关的争论已经成为主要的政治话题。即便如此，潜在的各方力量仍在不断地推动伦敦地区的发展。

## 03 BALANCE WITHIN REGIONAL CLUSTERS

### 03 区域协调发展

**I:** Within some urban regional clusters, such as Beijing Metropolitan Area, increasing effect has been made for transferring some of the resources from Beijing to the surrounding small and medium sized cities. Therefore: taking the Beijing Metropolitan Area as an example, do you think what kinds of functions can potentially be transferred from the central city to the surrounding cities, aiming to balance the developmental discrepancy? How to coordinate the different developmental level among different tiers of cities, in order to construct a more efficient functional polycentric cluster?

**I:** 在一些中国城市群的内部结构中，主要城市往往依旧对周边城市有很强的虹吸作用。比如京津冀城市群，北京具有绝对的支配作用。尽管中央政府持续推动二三线城市的发展，然而在地区范围内，优势资源仍然源源不断的通过行政路径高度集中到大城市。那么，以北京都市圈为例，哪些城市功能能够从中心城市转移向周边城市，从而获得更大的区域协同发展的可能？

如何协调都市群内部不同城市之间的建设与发展，从而构建更高效的功能多中心化的城市群结构？

**H:** Unlike Shanghai and the Pearl River Delta, Beijing is a governmental city, important for thousands of years as the capital of China. Therefore, it has the same characteristics as London and Washington D. C. So it will not be possible for government to have more control over this process. There is more public sectorial activity in Beijing, relative to the entire economy, even say than in Shanghai. And if you take the example of London, which is comparable because it is a capital city that deliberately de-concentrated. 70 years ago, manufacturing was very important and the government found it easy to develop structures and incentives, which made it attractive for manufacturing industry to move out of London into the new towns. Now manufacture is not important for us anymore, but it is still quite important in China, although relatively less so in Beijing, Yangzi River Delta and Pearl River Delta. However, I think it is possible to de-centralise governmental functions out of the central city into other places. We have moved central governmental agencies to other cities, sometimes at a considerable distance from London and many of our pension payments are made from Glasgow now. For instance our tax system is run out of Glasgow and cities in Yorkshire. I pay my tax every year in an office in Yorkshire, not in London. When I renew my driver's or car licence I send the form to Swansea in Wales. And so on and so forth.

Another very interesting example was that I saw recently, Network Rail, the public company, is a real transport agency of government that runs our railway infrastructure, including signals and stations. It has recently moved from central London to Milton Keynes new town which is 80 kilometres away. 3,000 people now ran the railway system from Milton Keynes. This is a very good example, I think. This kind of agencies can be simply moved and operated perfectly and efficiently outside the capital city because it all requires linkages of those people. For example, the persons in Network Rail require to meet with officers in the Department for Transport in Westminster very frequently with a very fast train service in Euston station in 30 minutes and then they take the underground down to Victoria in 10 minutes. Hence, this kind of model with easy connections would be suitable for Beijing.

Regarding with the second question, there is a big debate currently here. The big debate began to develop here concerning so-called head offices and back offices. We have used this distinction for a long time. Head offices are the places where the big decisions were made, where the CEO, the chief financial officers and the board meet, and where they control most often global corporations. Back offices in contrast serve a limited range of functions for local clients. Some people argued the back office is now dead and there is no need for back offices anymore with modern information technology. Certainly, we have noticed that in outer London, or the outer London boroughs, they seem to be losing office employment. In Ealing, where I live, offices were built in the 1960s, have recently been converted into apartment blocks. But I am not persuaded by this. Because when I travel down the railway line to Reading out of London, I notice Slough, Maidenhead and Reading are major office centres. So back offices seem to survive outside London. Maybe there are some facts here: maybe it is car parking and maybe in these back offices most people commute by car, so they need big car parks but they cannot find them in Ealing, yet they can find them in Slough. So I would argue that the back office is not dead. This is particularly interesting, because - as you may know - we have a big government decision recently, to develop a so called garden city in Ebbsfleet, which is the first station on our high speed line, Eurostar, from St. Pancras to Paris and Brussels. One of the big puzzles about Ebbsfleet is that it never developed. We all expected it to be a big success, not only as a garden city or new town for housing, but also for big office development. The developers at Ebbsfleet are now saying, "we cannot let the offices if we build them, no one would come", and this is puzzling, they say there is no demand for offices in the place which is just 17 minutes by high speed train from central

London. There is a debate here. I do not know the answer, perhaps they should build an office and find out.

**H:** 与长、珠三角都市圈的结构有所不同，北京不仅是京津冀都市圈的核心城市也是千百年来中国的首都，从这点上北京非常类似于于伦敦、华盛顿。因此要控制资源过度集中于首都城市对于政府而言几乎是不可能的。相比较其他城市，公共资源总是自然地集中于北京。伦敦在这点上是一个好的例子，它是英国的首都并且一直以来被规划疏散部分职能。在过去的七十年里，伦敦政府不断通过调整产业机构和激励机制从而较容易地将工厂转移到新城中去。对于伦敦而言，过去这些制造业曾对城市发展十分重要，而今已经不那么重要了。在当今的中国，虽然在最大的三个都市圈内一些区域也已经不再依赖工业制造，但是对于绝大部分区域制造业仍是城市发展的重要部门。因此，完全在短时间内转移所有工业功能可能并不现实。然而，我认为一些政府职能部门是可能从核心城市转移到其他城市的。在英国，核心的政府机构已经被转移到临近的其他城市，比如养老金申报和领取现在在格拉斯哥；财税系统也从已格拉斯哥迁往位于约克夏郡；而驾照年检等则在威尔士的斯旺西。

另一个例子是有关于公共企业。网络铁路公司，事实上是负责建设铁路基础设施和运营的政府部门，已经从伦敦中心区迁到米尔顿凯恩斯新城。如今网络铁路公司有约 3000 名员工，都在米尔顿凯恩斯工作。这是一个很好的例子，并表明类似的部门和公司比较容易迁出首都且依旧运行良好。政府只需要保证这些部门和威斯敏斯特的核心国务中心保持良好的联系，并且确保相关人员的通勤时间在四十分钟左右即可。因而迁出部分政府职能部门以及公共企业并保证其与决策机构之间良好通勤联系的模式应该会适合京津冀都市圈发展的需要。

关于城市之间的协调发展模式确实有很大的争论。在英国这种争论最近集中在总部和当地分支事务部门之间。总部指的是核心决策部门；事务部门主要指的是在地的支部。一些学者指出在新城中在地的事务部门已经消亡，因为当今的信息社会已经不再需要在地事务的分支机构。事实上在伦敦周围的区县，确实已经发现办公就业正在减少，许多六十年代所建的办公建筑已经被置换为公寓以供居住，比如伊林地区。但是我并不认同这种看法。我们仍旧可以在一些地区发现办公功能的聚集，比如伦敦西部的斯拉夫、梅登黑德以及雷丁都还是主要的办公聚集地。因此，办公仍旧能在非核心的新城存活。这种现象的一个解释可能是由于停车位。因为在小城市的分支机构的工大多数都是依靠私人轿车通勤，因此需要大量的停车用地。伊林地区停车空间较少，而斯拉夫则较多，所以办公功能才聚集在后者。最近英国已经决定实行一项计划，即在伦敦东面的爱贝斯费特再建设一个田园城市。爱贝斯费特是欧洲之星高铁沿线的第一站（从伦敦的圣潘克洛斯途径法国巴黎至比利时的布鲁塞尔），虽然它从未被开发，但仍被寄予较大期望将取得很大成功，因为它不仅是一个仅有居住的卧城，同时也综合了大量的办公开发项目。但是爱贝斯费特项目的开发商则对此持消极态度，他们觉得那里不会有办公需求，因为它距离伦敦市中心仅有 17 分钟高铁行程。关于这种发展还存有一定的争论，事实上对此我也不知道答案，也许只能等待建设后来检验。

## **04 DEVELOPMENT OF RAILWAYS TRANSIT SYSTEM**

### **04 轨道交通发展**

**I:** In China, many cities have conducted or are conducting the construction of rail transit systems. However, in the slow-down economic speed, appropriate and effective investment is especially important. How to plan the high speed rail and rail transit development properly and effectively, and

avoid the excessive investment in the mean while? How to effectively promote the development of the regional urban clusters and the cities by the high speed trains and rail transit? How to secure this value uplift by rail transit investment being distributed in a balanced manner in concerning the winners and losers?

**I:** 在中国很多城市已经规划，或者正在进行轨道交通的建设。然而这里不乏脱离实际的倾向，甚至包含了急于求成与好大喜功的个人意愿。然而在目前经济增速放缓的形式下，更应该进行合理有效的投资。那么您对中国城市轨道交通的规划情况您有什么建议，结合欧洲的经验应该注意哪些问题？怎样才能合理有效地规划，避免交通的过度投资？怎样才能更为有效地通过轨道交通的发展推动中国城市群之间以及市域范围内的发展？如何才能保证开发利益的均衡分配？

**H:** We know a lot of about planning high speed rail (HSR) system from experiences firstly from Japan, and now here in Europe. The traditional research shows high speed rail work best for journeys between about 2 hours and about 4 hours - that is for cities spaced about that far apart. But that is not entirely true, because there are different models for HSR. The HSR system we have in this country is rather low speed, in Britain 200 km/h, with frequent stops. But in other countries, for instance France and Spain, traditionally the trains go very fast, 300 km/h and do not stop. And this is the cause of a big debate now with our proposed HS2, High Speed Two from London to the Midlands and North of England, which would be a 300 km/h railway. I would say therefore, the right priority is really in China to develop 300km/h to 350 km/h HSR railways connecting cities up to perhaps 4 or 5 hours apart, because it is such a huge country. It is interesting even beyond this in China, because you are trying to connect the whole country. I still doubt whether someone in Beijing is going to take the train to Hong Kong, when they could fly. And it seems to me, that is a flying distance. If you can prove my doubt is wrong, that is going to be great, because the distance is changing the parameter we have said, as a planning decision. But that would be my priority.

The second question is that I think we need to consider better how to integrate the high speed system with the low speed traditional railway system. Now you are lucky here as we are in most of Europe, in that we built high speed rail on the same gauge, 1435 mm, as the traditional system. In Spain for instance, they have the problem that the traditional railways have a bigger gauge as the new speed system, which therefore has to be a completely new system. They cannot integrate properly. But that is a special Spanish problem. It is also a Japanese problem by the way, because the Japanese system is a narrower gauge, and the Shinkansen is standard gauge, so they cannot integrate the two easily. Integrating the system is important because otherwise you have the system that only connected to the big cities, as we say buffer to buffer, start here, stop there, but we really need is one that can run further out. We called it “irrigating the region”, is a term that the French developed, very cleverly, irrigating their regions by extending the HS railway into those regions. France has done it creatively in the north of France, and that provides a lesson. I think we can learn from the French.

Regarding the value uplift, I think it should probably be done by the agency that builds the HSR, which should actually acquire land around the train stations, and use it to secure uplift to pay further extension and perhaps also to cross subsidise of the development in other parts of the regions. A good model for this exists in Hong Kong of course, which traditionally controls the land development, if you take the huge West Kowloon Development, where the HSR station is going to be built in Hong Kong. The city, acquires the value uplift, and we can then use the value uplift in anyway it likes. And Singapore has the same model. I think this is a very good model, as long as you do not use it simply to get more and more development around the big train station, but you use it to subsidise developments in other parts of the region.

**H:** 城际快速铁路最早起源于日本而后在欧洲得到长足的发展。传统的研究表明最有效的快速城际快速铁路运行距离大约在两小时到四小时之间，进而提倡城际快速铁路的有效城际沟通距离也应该与这个距离类似。但这并不完全正确，因为城际快速铁路（HSR）有多种不同的模式。比如在英国，快轨系统运行速度较慢一些，大约两百公里每小时，期间停靠许多站点。而在法国和西班牙，高铁一般运行得非常快速，接近于 300 公里每小时且没有中间站。高铁的运行速度也是现在关于伦敦高铁 2 号线的争论焦点。中国幅员辽阔，优先建设 300 至 350 公里每小时的高铁系统联系距离四五个小时距离以内的城市是很必要的。但是中国正在尝试运用高铁系统联系起整个国家。对此我有一些疑问：比如从北京乘坐高铁到香港的必要性，因为那样的距离远远超过五个小时而实际上应该更适合乘坐飞机。但是如果你们能证明我的疑虑是错的那将会是一件很有意思的事，因为那样的距离将会改变我们刚刚讨论的关于高铁合适运行距离的参数设定，进而影响许多相关的规划决策。因此，研究对于中国最为合适的高铁运行时间与距离是规划它的首要问题。

轨道交通的发展是否能推动城市群的发展需要更加注意如何整合高速铁路系统和慢速铁路系统。在欧洲的绝大部门地区，高速铁路交通系统和传统交通系统的轨道宽度是一致的，都为 1435 毫米。而在西班牙，传统铁路的轨道宽度大于现在的城际高速铁路系统的轨道宽度，因此他们不得不新建一套完整的系统，由此带来的问题便是很难将二者整合。日本也存在类似的问题：传统轨道窄于新干线也使得二者结合并不那么容易。因此，整合不同的轨道交通系统非常重要，否则我们只有联系大城市之间的轨道系统而没有能够延伸到其他中小城市的系统。国家正真需要的是一种广泛联系的轨道交通系统，我们将它称作“灌溉都市区域”：通过延伸和整合轨道交通系统到不同的区域<sup>1</sup>。关于这方面，法国北部的实践可以作为成功的案例。

关于城市区域内部的快速轨道交通系统投资过程中开发利益的分配问题，我想轨道交通公司应该获得轨道交通站点周围的土地开发权并妥善开发以保证地价上升后可以支持中长期的发展以及补贴和帮助其他区域的发展。香港和新加坡都是很好的案例，轨道交通公司一直控制大型轨道交通站点周围的土地开发。城市需要通过轨道交通的建设获得土地价值收益，然后妥善地加以利用。只要不将进行轨道交通获得的土地收益简单粗放地鼓励大型轨道站点周围的发展，而将这些收益应用于发展区域内的其他欠发达地区就能在区域内均衡开发利益。

## 05 POPULATION URBANISATION OF RURAL IMMIGRANTS

### 05 外来人口城市化

**I:** This question is related to the urbanisation of 100 million “rural immigrants”. There will be 100 million rural immigrants who will settle down in cities or towns with legal city residence statuses. In the projected New Urbanisation Planning, the social welfare of these new citizens is managed to be secured through the well distributions of affordable housing and basic public service. Consequently, our questions here are: within the process of becoming a global city, what kind of efforts have been made in London for solving the emerging housing shortage and social welfare delivery due to the booming of immigrants population? Should we have to control the population in the big cities in order to avoid urban diseases? If not, do you have any specific suggestions for Chinese cities that are proposed to face these issues in the increasing fast process of population urbanisation of rural immigrants?

---

<sup>1</sup> 详见 Hall & Chen (2013), Using HS2 to Irrigate the Regions, Town & Country Planning.

**I:** 首先是关于第一个“一亿人”的城市化，即外来人口城市化的问题。我们在新的规划中强调，对于落户的外来人口实行住房保障的全覆盖，包括社会保障房共有产权房等，对于常住人口实现基本公共服务的全覆盖。对于怎样才能引导外来人口在城市中安居乐业，伦敦不乏经验。在伦敦的发展中，是如何关注外来人口的一系列社会问题的？伦敦对解决外来人口的住房问题与健全社会保障机制做出了哪些努力？对于中国城市的这个问题，您是否有一些建议？

**H:** These are very difficult questions, and I am afraid that I do not have very coherent answers. London, as you would know, has not done very well here, because it has recently allowed a very high rate of immigration. This has resulted in substantial groups of people living in the very substandard housing. Because the government has stopped building the kind of public social housing that we have built for many years between World War I, from 1919, down to the end of the 1970s. I bet now a big debate in London about the need for the return to a big public housing program, especially for lower-income people. But there are very difficult issues about how you then allocate this (social) housing. Because you may find that even more people come in who have got very urgent problems, for instance, old parents and mothers with small children must be housed. So, it is not easy to manage this if you have a very high rate of immigration. I think you cannot simply allow uncontrolled immigration into the cities if you have big differences in income and welfare between one part of the country and another. In China, you still do. People living in the in poor villages in western China will always say, at least the young ones, say that “I am going to make my fortune in the cities!” while their licenses will still leave them as second-class citizens in China for many years, though now many of them may become first-class citizens. But I think you still have a real issue about managing the rate of change. Immigration is not easy to do that in a simple case that anyone can go to the station and buy a ticket to go to Beijing.

**H:** 这些都是难题，我想我可能也没有特别与之契合的答案。如你们所知，由于一直以来保持较高的移民准入率，伦敦在解决外来人口的相关城市问题方面也并不是做的很好，这导致了大量的人口还居住在相对简陋的房屋里。从第一次世界大战伊始（1919年）到上世纪70年代末、80年代初，英国政府建筑了大量的社会住宅。然而后来中央政府停止了建设这样的社会住宅。如今，在伦敦存在一个很大的争议便是是否要重新实行那样大型的社会住宅计划，特别是针对那些低收入人群的需要。但事实上更重要的一个难题是：如何配置这些社会住宅？因为在实施这项计划的过程中，人口的大量涌入会给城市带来许多其他同样紧迫的问题，比如其他孤寡老人以及妇女和他们孩子的居住需求如何解决等。因此，如果城市移民比例很高，那么管理和配置相对应的住房和其他政策确实会不太容易。

我想，当区域间收入以及社会福利差距很大时，简单地允许不受控制的人口迁入城市是肯定不可取的。在中国，似乎仍然如此。居住在西部较为落后农村的人们十分期待改变自己的命运，特别是年轻人，总是期待能够进入城市创造自己的财富。然而，由于户籍制度的原因，他们很可能不得不在很多年里只能成为都市里的二等公民，虽然现在他们有可能变成一等公民。但我仍认为如何管理人口城市化的速率是一个非常现实且亟待解决的问题。城市移民和人口城市化并不是一个简单的进程，我不应该简单地认识它，否则它就成为了一张车票，人们可以任意购买然后全部涌入北京。

## **06 POPULATION URBANISATION IN URBAN REGENERATION**

### **06 城市更新中的人口城市化**

**I:** Moreover, we will focus on another 100 million people in the cities - “urban grassroots”. The living standard of another 100 million people living in so-called “urban villages” will be improved through a series projects of urban regeneration. Urban regeneration is a challenge that almost all the cities are

facing now. The vital aim of urban regeneration is to secure the benefit of local grassroots. So, what can we do to secure the social equality in the regeneration of those “urban villages” as much as possible? What can we learn from the recent practice in British or European cities for urban regeneration in Chinese cities?

**I:** 其次是关于第二个“一亿人”的城市化，即城中村（或者城市中较为落后的地区）人口的城市化问题。伦敦和欧洲的诸多城市都有类似丰富的经验。最近的研究也表明英国早期的社会住宅如今仍旧现存在一些社会问题。英国政府也一直发现存在住宅供应不足的情况。那么在英国和欧洲的经验里，城中村（或者城市落后地区）的改造是如何在提升居住品质的同时又避免过度绅士化而带来的对社会公平的破坏？欧洲近年来的哪些实践值得我们借鉴？

**H:** Well, again, (it is) a difficult question. I have learnt a great deal from the course I teach in urban regeneration, where many of my students in the past two three years have been Chinese students. I have learnt a very great deal from their presentations, and unfortunately, some of these were negative, because the presentations essentially said you have this urban regeneration scam. It was supposed to benefit poor people, and also benefit local artists, in the form of cultural regeneration. But it was taken over by some real estate interests, wanting to make a lot of money, so the poor and the artists were thrown out. It seems to be the same story in development after the development. Although this is very difficult, I think that you need a strong form of public control in some kinds of development corporations that will guarantee social equality in these developments, because the underlying issue is gentrification. Now gentrification is not necessarily a bad thing. Or it is not automatically a bad thing. In the cities that have gentrified, you can find that people are doing more gentrification jobs now than seventy years ago when most people here did blue-collar work which was very unpleasant dirty and hard work, however, very few people do that now, so cities gentrify simply because people do different jobs. But if rich people push out poor people, and they know ways to do this, that is a really serious issue and I think it is true to some extent here in London now, where there is a property boom. Because it is making difficult for poor people to find any kind of place to live, so you do need the elements to control the phenomenon with much bigger provision than you have, I think through some form of social housing. I am not sure the British cities provide a good example here, but some cities in my book, I do think provide some interesting examples. What curiously I have just discovered in some of the best cities in Europe that the gentrification is occurred there too, because we have this so-called “return” to the cities. In countries like in Switzerland as well as Britain, people who grow up as children in the suburbs or small towns now say when they grow up and go to university, “Oh, the suburbs are boring and I would not live there!”, and they are returning to the cities, so you have this real revival of cities in Europe, with a new pattern where the rich are more and more living in the central and the poor are living at the edge, which is what is happening in Stockholm now. It is a very strange phenomenon. But it is just the social dynamic, you know. It does not matter very much if the cities have super transport like Stockholm, the poor can easily get some good transport from their suburbs, and in twenty minutes they can be in the centre of the city, so it does not matter. In big cities, it may matter more. You can find yourself having to spend one or two hours getting to and from your job. Therefore, accessibility is quite important on this issue.

**H:** 这又是一个难题。在过去的两三年，我常在我所教授的城市更新课程里，从中国学生那里听到非常多相关的讨论。从他们的汇报里我学习到很多关于中国城市更新的问题，特别是关于相关议题的负面评价。比如中国的城市更新时常有名无实。在一些项目中，城市更新的初衷是为了使得居住条件落后或者收入低下的城市居民能够直接获益，也同时支持本地的艺术工作者，或者可以被称为文化更新。然而这样的目标总是让位于对现实经济利益的追求并最终导致低收入人群被迫迁出。这是一个再开发中时常发生的情况。虽然要控制或者杜绝这种情况相

当困难，但是我想中国仍然需要加强对相关项目开发商的公共管治以保证在城市更新过程中的社会公平。

城市更新的潜在核心问题是绅士化，但是绅士化并不是一个坏事情，或者说，它并不一定就是不好的。在一些绅士化的城市或者地区，如今人们更多地从事“绅士化”的工作而在七十年前绝大多数当地人都是蓝领工作者，从事着很多脏活累活，因此这些城市的绅士化是因为人们从事了更多多样化的工作。但如果高收入人群的进入导致低收入人群的迁出，那么情况就变得严峻起来。我想现今的伦敦就一定程度地存在类似问题，因为房价存在一定的泡沫。

而对于中国城市而言，城市更新带来的绅士化已经让低收入人群难觅居所，因此接下来创造更多的住房供给是当务之急，比如某种形式的社会住宅。在这点上我不认为英国城市是一个好的案例，但是一些欧洲城市却可以被视为一些有趣的典型案例，我的新书谈到了这些城市。更加有趣的是，在一些非常优秀的欧洲城市现在仍能够观察到绅士化现象。然而，略有不同的则是我们把这种现象称作“向城市中心的回归”。在一些国家比如瑞士和英国，成长在郊区或者小城镇的年轻人在进入大学后总说：郊区太无聊了，我再也不想住在那里了！“。现在他们正在重新回归城市中心。因此，与早前的郊区化相反，现在许多城市中心的复兴已经正在发生，比如斯德哥尔摩。这个现象看起来有些奇怪，但是实际上只不过是一种社会发展的动态性。对于斯德哥尔摩以及其他与之类似的城市，这种城乡之间不同收入人群的钟摆效应并不会有很多的负面影响，因为它们都拥有优良交通系统的支持。低收入人群可以在郊区获得很好的交通通勤条件，在 20 分钟内他们就可以到达市中心。然而不可否认的是，对于大城市，绅士化会产生更多的负面影响，比如低收入人群通勤时间加长，甚至到达一两个小时。因此，交通可达性是在城市更新中是另一个很重要的方面。

## 07 ADJACENT POPULATION URBANISATION

### 07 就近人口城市化

**I:** Here are some questions about the third 100 million people - “rural residents in middle and west China”. About 100 million rural residents in the middle and western China will be guided to settle in the nearest cities in the middle and western regions. Nowadays in China, the economic gap between the east regions and the mid-western regions and the disparity between the big cities and the small ones are increasingly wide. Hence, How to coordinate the contradiction between the market and the policies in regional economy balance based on the experience in UK? What are your advises for promoting the strategy of adjacent population urbanisation in the middle and western China?

**I:** 再次是关于第三个“一亿人”的城市化，即中西部人口就近城市化问题。在当前的中国，东、中、西三个区域之间的差距依旧十分明显。主要城市群仅占 10%的国土面积却承载超过 70%的 GDP 和 1/3 的人口。乡村的贫困离心力和城市的就业向心力依旧十分明显。不难发现，过去十年我国实行过西部大开发、振兴东北以及中部崛起等诸多均衡发展战略。中西部地区的基础投资增速远高于东部地区，但是投资效率却远低于东部。整体出现了行政力量西向，劳动力市场东向的相互反向格局。针对这个问题，英国及欧洲其他城市近年在区域平衡中做过哪些努力？均衡发展中的行政和市场的矛盾如何协调？您觉得中国如何才能成功地引导中西部人口就近城市化？

**H:** Well, it is not easy, I have thought a lot about this. It seems to me that the first aim must be for public policy to try to shift as many as possible of the good jobs in growing activities in the public

sector into those other cities which for us are the northern English cities, and for you, would be some central and western Chinese cities. And high education policies are very important for us and for you, I believe. We are growing our northern universities, and you should be growing your western universities. The problem is exactly the same for you and for us. The first issue for you is that the best universities are traditionally in the east, (e.g.) in Beijing and Shanghai and also in Hong Kong - the ones we built when it was the colony. The good students want to go eastern universities but you have to build up the rivals of home's light in these western cities (in China). Similarly with health care: the best specialised facilities are always in the very big cities, just like UCLH here. So we need to build up very strong hospital complexes in other cities, particularly for so-called "health tourism", because this is a new industry and I think that will happen, because people will increasingly go for their operations to China, where they will find that they can get them performed more cheaply by well-qualified Chinese surgeons. It is beginning to happen already. So encouraging that kind of growth in the central and the west is the key, and there are the only two examples. And I think Research and Development (R&D) is another area. The development of science parks, I know you are doing this in the western part of China. That has to be the answer, I think. Behind it, the private sectors will come in, I think. Once the private sectors see the brilliant research happening in the universities or the research institutes, they will come in because they will begin to cluster around them. So a natural process will occur there.

**H:** 就近城市化并不容易，对此我曾思考良多。对我而言，首要目标应该是公众部门的政策制定。对于英国，政府应该尽量转移公共就业的增长力到北英格兰的城市。而于中国而言，应该促进一些中西部城市的就业增长。对此，高教政策对于中国来说非常重要。在英国，我们正在尝试大力发展北部的大学，于你们来说则应该大力发展中西部的大学。在这点上，中英面临的几乎是一样的问题。中国最好的大学一般都在东部，集中在北京、上海和香港。好的生源也涌向东部的大学，但是你们必须要重塑西部城市的吸引力。

另一个较为简单的途径就是提高医疗服务。现在较好的专业医疗机构和设施都集中在大城市，因此在其他城市建立强有力的医疗机构是非常必要的。这将对发展医疗旅游非常有利，虽然这是一个新兴的产业，但是我认为它会发展壮大因为会有越来越多的人去中国接受治疗，因为中国的医疗费用相对低廉。事实上这个现象已经发生了。因此，鼓励在中西部城市发展教育和医疗等公共服务是就近城市化的关键。

此外，鼓励科研机构的发展也是一个方面，比如鼓励科技园区的发展。我知道在中国你们已经开始了相关的实践。与此同时，私有部门也应该加入进来。一旦私有部门看到大学和科研院所的研究成果，便会自然而然地向它们聚集而形成聚集经济，这是一个自然的过程。

## **08 LAND POLICY IN RURAL AREA**

### **08 乡村地区的土地政策**

**I:** Recently, the discussion about rural land circulation (rural land marketization) has drawn lots of attentions publicly. Some voice claimed that rural residents should have rights to trending their land for the tickets of urbanisation, while other said openness of rural land management would make these vulnerable groups lose their final living assurance. What is your opinion on this debate regarding with the rural land marketization? If the policies of rural land circulation is conducted, what would be the

possible future of rural development and which aspects of planning we should focus for developing our rural areas properly?

**I:** 除了户籍制度，在中国土地制度也被认为是一直束缚人的城市化的主要原因之一。近年来，关于“农村住宅用地入市”和“农村土地流转”的讨论还在持续。一些人认为农民需要获得交易土地的权利并充分参与城市化中的各种博弈；另一些人则认为放松农村土地制度会使得这些相对弱势的人根本丧失土地保障。您如何看待这一问题？在人口城市化背景下，农村又该如何发展？

**H:** Now, I do not think I understand this completely. I know the questions you are asking, but I do not think that I understand the process very well. Essentially, it is a question about whether rural land should be open to market forces, whether peasants should be able to freely buy and sell their plots with negotiated speculative value, which, in a fact that if they get the urban value, which will immediately mean that the rural land gets urbanised, and the people will formally find other land, and then have to go somewhere else. This, very interestingly, is a debate which we had three hundred years ago in the 18th century when we were enclosing our feudal open fields, and there was a terrible distress: people were thrown off the land, and lost their livelihoods and were forced into the cities. People moved to the cities, because they had nowhere to go, they could no longer live on the land, their children had to eat, so they went to the cities often in very difficult conditions, because they were very poor; we have talked about this problem earlier. It is a difficult balance to strike, I almost tend to say, because it requires some kind of public agency that can regulate the process, including, perhaps, if you do decide to or you are going to introduce some market, then maybe you do not have a completely free market, but you can sell the land to a development agency like a new town development cooperation to develop the land, and then you can use the use the profits from that in a way to create other land for people who still want to farm in the kind of reallocation process. And we have had examples in some countries, Japan, for instance, in the 1950s and 1960s, reallocated rural land. Germany did a very large-scale reallocation of small farm plots in south Germany in the 1950s and 1960s, with rural land reform policies which seemed to work reasonably well. These may be examples can be drawn there for looking for those countries to manage the process, because it is very similar at that point. In the case of Japan, it was done by exchanging the plots in a very complicated way. It has been investigated by a guy called Andr Sorensen who has written about it (Sorensen 2000, 2002). In the case of Germany, I do not think it has been so well researched. I think there it was associated with the fact that the plots were too small; they were called "handkerchief plots". You needed to consolidate the plots to make them more viable, because in south Germany, under the law, when the father died, the children had equal heritage and then partitioned the plot. In this manner, the plots will get smaller and smaller, which makes them useless. So, it has to make them more efficient. As I said, I do not know well enough about that process, but these experiences might provide an answer.

**H:** 我最近才接触这个问题，我不认为我完全地了解它，特别是具体的流程。农村土地流转是关于农村土地是否应该向市场开放，而更重要的是指农民是否可以根据协商价格自由地买卖宅基地。事实上，如果农村土地获得了城市价格就会使得农村土地快速地被城市化并且不得不参与城市博弈，寻找别的居所。

关于这个问题的争论也曾发生在 18 世纪的英国，大约三百年前。那时候由于封地恶劣的生存环境，人们纷纷离开耕地而被迫迁入城市。在那种背景下，人的城市化是自然而然的，因为他们没有别的更好的地方可去，也无法养育自己的孩子，因此进入城市后他们就变得非常贫穷。

这样的结果恐怕很难完全避免，因此应该需要更多的公众机构来规范土地流转的流程。假如中国政府已经决定引入市场机制，而且市场并非是完全自由的话，也许可取的方式是将土地交由统一的开发机构，就像英国的新城开发集团来统一开发农村土地，并且重新规划及配给耕地。

关于这一点，国际上也有一些例子，比如日本和法国。日本在上世纪五六十年代重新规划和配置了耕地。德国几乎在同一时间重新大规模地划定耕地同时制定农村土地改革政策，这一系列的举措看起来收效甚好。这两个例子可以帮助我们理解如何管理土地流转的流程，因为在对于农村土地市场化的管理上不同国家面临的问题是非常相似的。在日本的案例中，农村土地地权的转化过程是非常复杂且细致的。一个名为 André Sorensen 的学者曾经著书专门研究了这一问题；而德国的案例暂时还未得到充分的研究，我想这和德国宅基地的规模比较小有关。在德国，这些农村的建设用地被称为“手帕地”，由于大小限制，它们无法在土地流转中产生过多价值。比如在德国南部，孩子们可以在父亲去世后等分已经不大的宅基地。因此几代以后，宅基地就被不断地细分而越来越小且细碎从而无法整体开发。因此，宅基地的流转必须更加有效地利用土地。正如我所说，我并不了解土地流转政策的流程，但是以上所提的经验也许能够算作是一个回答。

## Reference

Chinese National Council (2014), *Chinese New National Urbanisation Plan 2014-2020*. (in Chinese)

Hall, P.(2013), *Good City, Better Life: How Europe Discovered the Lost Art of Urbanism*. London: Routledge.

Hall, P., Chen, C. (2013), *Using HS2 to Irrigate the Regions*, *Town & Country Planning*. 82: 170 – 174.

Sorensen, A. (2000) *Land Readjustment and Metropolitan Growth: An Examination of Suburban Land Development and Urban Sprawl in the Tokyo Metropolitan Area*. (*Progress in Planning*, 53, Part 4 ). Oxford: Pergamon.

Sorensen, A. (2002) *The Making of Urban Japan: Cities and Planning from Edo to the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.