




7

/ 4

— 4

f
/

CIP

2 / 4 . —

2007.6

ISBN 978-7-111-15683-3

. ... 4... . - 7 - .F290

CIP 2007

22 100037


2007 7 2 · 1
169mm×239mm ·3.5 ·6 ·103
ISBN 978-7-111-15683-3
35.00

, 7

010 68326294
010 88379639 88379641 88379643
010 88379001



















前言 ▶



300

ה

“

ך

‘

ך

שׁ

‘

שׁ

ך

ך


א



Contents

[illegible]

21	
21	
30	
35	5 .
39	
39	Urban Development Fund
41	MUT Mixed Used Theory
46	SUR
50	IDP
51	UTPs
64	
64	
65	
65	
71	
71	—3
77	50 —
78	—3.2






- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

“ ”

UDF MUT SUR IDP UTPs



CITY 'S REGULATION



h
10

“ ”

20

1.5~2

2

“ ” “ ”

√

3

7





“

”

✓

✓

✓

✓

✓

✓

✓

✓


✓

✓

✓

✓

✓



,

✓

✓

,

✓

7

◆

20 80



7

,

,

7

A

◆

A

W

A

.

A C.

◆

A

7

“

”

“

”

3



✓ 7 ◆
 ◆ ✓

“ ”

ג

ך

✓

,

ך

ה

ה

ך

ש

“ ”




v_i ✓

7

 $\dot{V}$ $\dot{V}$ $\dot{V}$

✓



✓

I

$$v_i$$

✓

 $\mathbf{v}_i$

✓

✓

20

70

7

70%

~~X~~

✓

$$v_i$$

“

”

“(Community Based Planning)

✓



0

“ ” ,
“
— ”

:

ך

19

ך

ך

:

Montague Barlow א Justice Uthwatt

:

ך

ך

ך

ך

א

,

א

ה

“ ”
’ “

” 7

7

√

7 ‘

√ 7 “ ”

:

“ ”

1949

1972

“ ” “ ” 1 “

” 1 √



.

“

”

◆

√

∩

,


,


√

1973

“

”







20 70

7

✓

✓

“ ”

✓

⌘

“ ”

ψ

:

“ ”

✓

✓

✓

✓

ψ “ ” “ ”



x

20

7

◆

1949

1972

7

↑

8

7



ה

ך

א

ח


ח

ח

“

ע

” .



ך

ח

ח

ך

,

ש'

ך

ך

ך

ך

ך

ח

ה

ך

ך

ח

ך

ח

ך

“

”

ך

ך

ן

ח

ך

ח

ך

ח

✓

“

ח


ח


ח

ח

ש

✓








Figure 1. Schematic representation of the experimental design. The subjects were divided into two groups: the control group (C) and the experimental group (E). The control group (C) was divided into two subgroups: the control group (C) and the control group (C). The experimental group (E) was divided into two subgroups: the experimental group (E) and the experimental group (E). The control group (C) was divided into two subgroups: the control group (C) and the control group (C). The experimental group (E) was divided into two subgroups: the experimental group (E) and the experimental group (E).

- 1
1
() 3 1
1965 77 413
115 3
1950~1960 ‘ 28
0.15%
1
‘ “ ”
F 1
8
1
57%
35%
1
1 1
1 1
1
10



1957

Barney Google Row ↗ Shantytown

Barney Google Row

15

↖

↖

↗



1959
Rodgers CBD

Clifton E. Rodgers 3%
CBD

21%

The 100 block of North Queen Street

↴

↴

↴

Second North Queen

Corporation

↴

1920

1890

Earle Hotel

20

1970~1971

↴

1985

Adam-Musser Towns

84

2341

↴ 3042

1985

Duke


Higbee

Adams

Church

↴ Musser

-
- ↴
-



●

✓

●

●

✓



5

35

12

1

20



1



1

1906

3

30

1

1953

7

7

50



5

3



1-24



1-25 /

✓ 7
·

1-

1-

✓

,

,

1967

✓

·

Gerald M.McCue

/

Livingston/Blayney ✓

·

·

John CarlWarnecke

✓

✓

,

✓

·

SOMA

✓

✓

7

✓

·

✓

✓

7

/

—

Schesiner/Arcon-Pacific

“

”

✓

1-

1970

7

✓

7

✓



7 / Olympia & York
· Zeidler Roberts

ז

ז

ז

ז

ז

ז





』

Urban Development Fund

7

1982

7

F


4

7

7

7

1-27



٦

٦A



,

,

٦

٦

MUT Mixed Used Theory



●

●

ך

,

ך

שׁ

MUT

MUT

ך

(ICC)

ICC

ך

ך

●

●

ך

ך

●

,

●

●

ך

●

ך

ICC

●

MUT

ך

ך

“

”

ך

שׁ

,

,


ך



● 7

● 7

● 7





●

ך


ך

-

ך

ך

ך



SUR

SUR

Soft Urban Renewal

I


SUR

I


 v_i

I

1-37




- $\tilde{A}$
- $\mathcal{A}$
-
-
-
- ψ
-
-
-
- $\mathcal{A}$
- WBSF $\tilde{A}$
- $\mathcal{A}$




IDP

1-39 1-40



IDP

1-41



✓ 7

-
- A
-
- F ✓
-

UTPs


✓


ψ (

1-42)

✓ 7







✓ ך

-

ך

ך

ך

✓

✓

ש

ך

ה


ך

Gerard Heins

•

3

2



2.

43


Tax Dividend

Evaluation of Large Urban Renewal Projects

7

3

1






CITY 'S REGULATION



-
- 1.
 - 2.
 3. 6.6



Q

2-1

.

.



✓

7

✓

7

7

I

✓

7

✓

7

✓

7

7

“

♂

✓ ♂

✓

✓

7

7

/ /

✓

7 1 H

I

“

173

10

5-9

10

1

I

I

I

“ “ ”

7

“

7

7

I

7

7

7

7

7

 $\underline{v_i}$

7

vi



26

2000 6

3 5



1999

3

Ã

7

3

$$\mathbb{F}$$

7

3

I

7.

7

“

”

3

7

1

2

3

'E

7

•

7

7

३

7

 $\dot{v}_i$
$$\mathbb{H}$$

✓

✓

✓

7

 $\dot{v}$

“

“

$$v_i^*$$

7

1/3

7

א

880

150~400



7

7

7

7

7

7

7

7

7

60%

,

3

7

7

7

7

3

3

20

3

/

3





!

ך

א

א

ש

א

ך

ך

א

ה

ך

ש



√

170

√

“

√ ♦

√

√

11 “ ♦

”

“

√

♦

”

√

√

(

)

√

,

,

√

1997

√

√

√

,

√

√

√

√

,

√

√

“

√

.....

√

√

.....”

,

√



√

3

1

◆

80

◆

“

”

“

”


1


1

1

√

◆





50

1998

✓ 7 3

7 ✓

✓

✓ 13

50 σ

50 20 90

σ ✓

1998

✓ 2002 ✓

50 σ ✓ ✓

3

7

50

◆ ✓


ψ ✓

50

1-


✓

σ 7 50 50



—3.2





2-7

● ↑ 20.2

9% 7

16.16 1

● 52.5

● 2.3 A 3.2

● 478 215

263

● 6.8 1153 843

6.6 1 34

● 37 9.4%

●

● 480 / 325 37.1

91.5%

● 489 41 A 3.2

●

●

● A 6.4% 1999 3 5

50%

1999 3 5

● 9.4%



ג

ה

✓

“

”

ס

ך

“

”

“

”

5

5

“

ך

”

✓ “

”

ג

“

”

ה

“

”

“

”

✓

“

”

“

”

“

”

ך

“

”

“

”

“

”

“

”

“

”

CBD

CBD

CBD ' ,

CBD

CBD

CBD

CBD

3

'

CBD

CBD

CBD

7

7

“

—

3

CBD ' ,

'

↑

CBD

'

↑

200

●

3

 $\tilde{A}$ ~~X~~

●

200

7.7

7

,

✓

●

● CBD

● 7 160

- CBD ✓

● 7

• ✓

ך ך ✓

• ך

• ך

• ג ך

• ך

• ך ך

• ש ✓

• ך

ג

↑ ך ג
ך

1.

5500

8

2.

125

1200


3. 20

80


17







r





ך

ך

ך

ג



ך

ך

“

”

20 50

ך

1960


ך

1964

ך

30 2.6

20 70



E

Quincy Market

↙

1826

125

Josiah Quincy

↖

19

20

Quincy

Faneuil Hall Markets

Faneuil Hall

Markets

125

↗

3

163

2508

20


50

◆

100



1961	7		7	Boston Redevelopment
Authority				
Thomason	7	-		Rouse Company
			4	
F			7	◆
			4	





3-3

√

√

♥

1200

,

◆

λ

¶

“

◆

¶

‘

‘

◆

√

√

√

1200

√

¶

0

1802 120

20 30

3 10

1961 1971

50

1981 20

1014 70%

15.6% 1981

“ ”

1998 24000

8

3 5

44% 13%

8% 7% 4%

- [1] Bo-sin Tang. Urban Renewal Authority: Negotiation for Property Acquisition and Partnership with Property Owners [J]. Hong Kong Economic Journal, 2000 6(2):100-111.
- [2] Chris Gardiner. Developing Indicators to Assess the Potential for Urban Regeneration: Improvements Using the 1991 Census of Population Samples of Anonymised Records [J]. Urban Studies, 1998 5(9):151-154.
- [3] David Wilens. The legacy of “ Urban Renewal ”: Tale of Two Kinds of Cities [J]. The Slum 2000 4(6):50-75.
- [4] Hugh O Nourse. The Economics of Urban Renewal [J]. Land Economics 2000,7(14): 65-74.
- [5] Jong Youl Lee. Korea: Mode, Governance and Sustainability [J]. The Practice of Urban Renewal in Seoul, 2000(8):9-13.
- [6] Jon C Teaford. Urban Renewal and Its Aftermath [J]. Housing Policy Debate. 1999, 6(11):27-30.
- [7] Kent D Redfield. Trickle Down from the Rising Tide TIFs and Urban Development Policy in Illinois [M]. Illinois :PRAG MATICS 2002.
- [8] Lori Healey and John F McCormick. Urban Revitalization and Tax Increment Financing in Chicago [J]. Government Finance Review, 1999, 6(15):27-30.
- [9] Marvin W Lee. The Impact of Public Investment on Urban Revitalization: A Case Study on the Redevelopment of Downtown Norfolk, Virginia [D]. University Microfilms 'International, 1986.
- [10] Ozlem Dundar. Models of Urban Transformation: Informal Housing in Ankara [J]. Cities, 2001, 6(18):391-401.
- [11] Randy Stoecker. The Community Development Corporation Model of Urban Redevelopment: A Political Economy Critique and an Alternative [D]. Toledo: University of Toledo 1996.
- [12] Stanley McGreal, Alastair Adair, Jim Berry, Bill Deddis and Suzanne Hirst. Accessing Private Sector Finance in Urban Regeneration: Investor and Non-Investor Perspectives [J]. Journal of Property Research, 2000, 17(2):109-131.
- [13] Stanley McGreal, Jim Berry, Greg Lloyd and John McCarthy. Tax-based Mechanisms in Urban Regeneration: Dublin and Chicago Models [J]. Urban Studies, 2002, 9(10):19-31.
- [14] Tim Brindley. Community Roles in Urban Regeneration: New Partnerships on London 's South Bank [J].2000, 4(3):56-78.