

什么决定了城市的意象？ What Determines the Image of a City?



赵燕菁 Yanjing ZHAO

厦门市规划局局长，教授级高级规划师
Director of Xiamen Municipal Bureau of Planning; Professor-level Senior Planner

翻译 Translated by / 蔡金栋 Jingdong CAI
校对 Proofread by / 陈凯儿 Anna CHAN, 涂先明 Xianming TU

摘要

不同意象的城市，有着与其文化类似的传承关系。但对这种遗传性一直无法进行深入的分析。解开城市风貌之间相似或差异的关键密码，就是城市在其发展过程中所形成的制度。工程技术和城市制度的交汇共同决定了城市的意向。城市风貌不是自由设计的随机结果，而是制度基因的复制和遗传。

关键词

城市意象；城市制度；技术；规范；产权

Abstract

Different images of cities are inherited from their own culture. However, the inheritance is hardly to be analyzed dedicatedly. The password of different appearances of cities is the institution formed in the development process of a city. The convergence of engineering technology and institution of a city determines the image of the city. The appearance of a city is not simply an outcome of design, but duplicate and inheritance of institution genes.

Key words

Image of City; Institution of City; Technology; Standard; Property Ownership

1

早在简·雅各布斯之前，建筑师和规划师们就在反思，是什么决定了城市的成长与死亡，是什么决定了城市独特的风貌和物质形态。就像早期的生物学家一样，我们意识到城市的外观和它自身独特的历史传承有着密切的关系（就像我们知道子女会本能地遗传父母的特征一样），但这种关系常常被归入无法规范化分析的“文化”或“传统”范畴。

在建筑师看来，一个显而易见的事实，就是城市意象的绝大部分都是由建筑物组成的。而建筑的外观很大程度上基于建筑师的设计。一个不言自明的推论是，既然建筑的意象是由建筑师决定的，那么城市意象在很大程度上也是由设计师所决定。换言之，我们可以通过选择建筑设计的风格来决定城市的意象。

30年前，当我从建筑系毕业时，我对此深信不疑。至少，我认为城市意象的80%取决于建筑师的设计。20年前，当我从事了10年城市规划工作后，我对此不那么肯定了。但那时我仍然相信，50%以上的城市意象仍然取决于建筑师所选择的风格。现在，我的看法刚好相反，我相信由建筑师的设计风格所决定的城市意象不会超过20%——一个城市的意象的主要基调，在建筑师开始设计之前就已经被决定了。

2

这些年来，越来越多的中国城市开始引进境外顶级设计师及

其设计。随着建造技术的提升、建筑材料的改进，特别是经济水平的提高，国内建筑师的设计风格也越来越接近“国际水平”。但是，建筑的趋同，并没有导致中国的城市意象和外国的城市意象趋同。

很多中国人抱怨中国的城市“千城一面”，但只要在国外居住一段时间，并走访过足够多的城市，就可以惊奇地发现国外的城市同样是“千城一面”！事实上，即使是外国人，也很容易把那些城市弄混。但是，我们一眼就可以分清哪些是英国的城市，哪些是北美的城市。从文化和传统来看，这两个国家的城市意象本不应有如此大的差异。撇开两者历史年代的差异不谈，仅仅从新大陆城市的路网几乎毫无过渡地从英伦自由式的格局切换到严整的棋盘式格局这一点来看，就足以令人惊叹。

一个城市的意象的主要基调，在建筑师开始设计之前就已经被决定了。

城市间的这种相似性和差异性显示出，城市意象远非建筑设计风格这一单一因素可以决定。尽管建筑师们在互相模仿，但城市意象的差异却并不因此而缩小。也许建筑师可以在不同的城市设计类似风格的建筑，但这些建筑一旦植入不同的城市，就会成



1. 纽约城市意象
2. 伦敦城市意象 © David Iliff
3. 上海城市意象 © J. Patrick Fischer
1. New York city image
2. London city image © David Iliff
3. Shanghai city image © J. Patrick Fischer

为所在的城市意象的一部分。显然，建筑设计并非是影响城市意象的唯一因素，甚至不是主要因素。在建筑皮肤的下面，一定有一个更加有力的因素在决定着城市的意象。

3

技术对城市意象的影响已经被很多人从不同的角度关注了。爱德华·格莱泽在《城市的胜利》一书中指出：“交通技术总是对城市的形式起着决定性的作用。”他注意到，“当人们不得不

依靠步行时，他们总是尽量相互靠近”，古时的街道狭窄曲折，挤满了店铺，通常会有一个明确的中心。“汽车城市则不然，它们只是以一种基本相同的城市扩张方式水平地向外延伸”，“汽车使大量建造中等密度的住宅成为了可能”。

不仅是交通技术，工程技术的进步也在很大程度上决定了城市的天际线。20世纪50年代以前，中国的住宅建筑很少超过3层，砖木结构的建造方式限制了建筑的高度。随着砖混结构的推广，多层建筑开始成为大规模住宅建筑的主要方式。20世纪80年代以前，建筑规范要求超过6层就要配设电梯。在电梯还是奢侈品的年代，大多数建筑有限的预算只能支持建设到6层，最多顶层通过越层方式提高到7层。

经济的发展和技术的进步，使得电梯的造价占建筑总成本的比例迅速降低。特别是随着土地价格占建筑造价的比重的提高，建筑提升高度成为增加容积率的重要手段。20世纪90年代以后，高层建筑越来越多。这时，建筑的高度又被一些其他制度门槛所限定。其中，比较主要的两个是消防限高和航空限高。

在各种“限高”中，城市的天际线被哪一高度主导，并不简单取决于技术，而是取决于技术曲线和城市发展曲线的交点——城市高速发展阶段时的技术水平。如果技术成熟时城市主体的建设已经完成，该项技术对城市天际线的影响就会大大减弱。这就是为什么虽然拥有类似垂直交通技术，伦敦、纽约和上海的天际线却完全不同的原因。

除了外部技术，城市规划自身的“规范”对城市意象的形成也起到了很大作用。厦门曾经试图在新的商务中心推动连续街墙的设计，但却发现受到现有技术规范的限制。比如，技术规范要求建筑必须后退道路红线，而后退多少取决于道路等级和建筑高度。同时，由于消防要求高层建筑必须具有环形车道和最少3个施救面。满足这些规定的结果就是，只要街区有高层建筑，华尔街式的连续街墙就不可能形成。

4

同技术制度的限制相比，产权制度的影响往往更大、更隐匿。很多外国设计师不理解中国何以对建筑，特别是居住建筑的朝向如此看重。南北为主的建筑朝向几乎构成了中国从南到北最主要的城市意象特征。其实在中国的传统城市甚至乡村，建筑的朝向也并不是最主要的考虑因素。为什么在短短的几十年内，“朝向”成为中国居住建筑的集体偏好？

一个有意思的解释是，这一偏好源自于计划经济时代住房的分配制度。在以往的私人宅第中，不同朝向的主房厢房，很容易在不同家庭成员和不同功能中分配。空间资源利用最大化是传

1

Before Jane Jacobs, architects and planners had pondered: What decides the growth and death of a city? What decides the unique landscape and physical form of a city? Like an early biologist, we can feel the close connection between the appearance of a city and its distinctive historical heritage (the same way that we know offspring instinctively inherit the features of their parents). However, such relationship is often categorized into the scope of culture and tradition, which is not able to be analyzed in a standardized way.

From the perspective of an architect, it is apparent that the image of a city is mainly formed by buildings, and the appearance of a building is determined by its architects. Then it could be said that the image of a city is mostly decided by architects since they decide on the image of the buildings. In other words, we can choose the image of a city by choosing the design style of the buildings.

Thirty years ago when I graduated from my architecture department, I had a firm belief in this. At least, I thought 80% of a city's image depended on the design of the architects. However, 20 years ago, after working on urban planning for 10 years, I am not so sure any more. But at that time, I still believed that 50% of a city's image was dependent on the style its architects had chosen. Now I take an opposite opinion. I believe the designing style of the architects can decide no more than 20% of a city's image. The essence of a city's image has been decided before the architects start their work.

2

In recent years, more and more Chinese cities have invited top-level foreign designers and their works. With the improvement of building technologies, construction materials and, in particular, the advancement of economic, the design by Chinese architects has been getting close to the "international level". However, the convergence in architecture does not lead to the convergence in urban image between Chinese and foreign cities.

Many Chinese people complain about the similarity of Chinese cities. However, if you have stayed in a foreign country for a while and visited enough cities, you will find, surprisingly, there are many "similarities" among the foreign cities. In fact, even foreigners get confused by their cities. However, with half an eye we can distinguish English cities from the others from North America. Culturally and traditionally, the urban characters of these two countries should be

quite easy to differentiate. Apart from the departure in history, it is such a surprise that the road network in the new continent shifted from the original style of the Great Britain to the sheer checker-board style without any transition.

Such similarity and difference between cities show that a city's image is far from being decided by a single factor of architectural design. Although architects are imitating each other, the cities are often very different in character. The architects might be able to design buildings of similar style in different cities, but after they are built in different cities, they become part of the fabric of the city. Apparently, architectural design is not the only factor influencing a city's image, even not the major factor. Under the skin of architecture, there must be some other stronger factors that are deciding the image of the city.

3

The influence of technology upon urban image has been noticed by many people from different perspectives. Edward Glaeser pointed out in *Triumph of the City*: "Transport technology has always played a decisive role in the form of a city". He noticed that "when people have to walk on foot, they try to walk as close as possible". Streets in the ancient times were narrow and winding, with shops crowding on both sides and a very clear center. "A city with cars is quite different, expanding and extending out horizontally in a basically similar way." "Cars make it possible for residential areas to be constructed in large scale and with medium density."

In addition to transport technology, the advancement in engineering decides, to a great extent, the skyline of a city. A half century ago, residential buildings in China were mostly no more than 3 storeys. The height of the buildings was limited by the construction technique of brick-wood structure. With the popularization of brick-concrete structure, multi-story buildings has become the dominant form for residential mansions in China. Up till the 1980s, most of the residential buildings in China were 6 to 7 storeys high, because elevators are required for buildings higher than 6 storeys according to the related standards. In a time when elevators were still luxury goods, the limited budget could only afford a building no higher than 6 storeys, or at most 7 storeys with mezzanine.

As the economy develops and technology advances, the percentage of the cost of elevators of total project cost dropped dramatically. In particular, as the cost of land increased, building height has become the

统住宅需要解决的首要问题。而在住房福利分配体制下，不同的家庭获得的住房会存在好的朝向和差的朝向之分。在面积标准一定的情况下，楼层和朝向就成为分配住房时最大的难题。其结果是，尽量避免东西朝向，就成为福利房设计的一项主要原则。住房商品化后，被放大的朝向偏好被继承下来。因朝向偏好带来的房价差异，使得开发商竭力避免在其项目中出现东西向住宅。结果单一的朝向，成为从南到北几乎所有中国城市的共有意象。

另一项对中国城市意象有着深远影响的制度，是计划经济时代的“单位”。那时，城市公共服务的很大一部分不是通过市场，而是通过“单位”完成的。“福利好”的单位不仅有自己的住宅、食堂、澡堂、医疗室，甚至还有自己的影院、学校、医院。这些排他（通过内部票证）的内部福利设施，必然产生越来越多的“大院”和越拉越大的“街区”。这就直接导致了传统城市“小路密网”城市肌理的解体 and 苏联式的大街区和“主-次-支”路网体系的形成。

市场经济改革后，大部分公共福利供给都已市场化。“开发商”取代“单位”，成为当代中国城市制度中一个举足轻重的角色。为了拉开与竞争对手的差距，提升住宅的价值，开发商竞相为各自项目的楼盘提供排他性的公共服务，起初是大花园，然后是会所、游泳池、商店，甚至拥有名牌中小学。这种开发模式进一步推动了城市公共服务的内部化和随之而来的街区大型化。内部的公共空间与道路，占用了原本属于城市的资源，使得城市的支路系统、公共绿地不断萎缩。开发商代替了政府提供排他性的公共服务，并在更高的层次上，延续着“单位”式的城市景观。

原本应由政府提供的公共服务，被开发商内部化，以排他的方式提供给了社区内部的居民。由此，连续的城市肌理被碎片化，社区成为一个个自给自足的“孤岛”。街道生活逐渐消失，



4. 厦门由多项“限高要求”决定的城市天际线 © 赵燕菁
 5. 丽江旧城（左）与新城（右）建筑朝向对比（图片来源：Google Earth）
 4. The city skyline of Xiamen is dominated by all types of "height limit". © Yanjing ZHAO
 5. Comparison of the orientation of buildings in old town (left) and new town (right), Lijiang. (Source: Google Earth)

公共服务私有化，导致城市贫富差距加大。尽管规划师、建筑师们不断呼吁重建“小路密网”的街道模式，但城市依然按照中国自身特有的逻辑蔓延、拓展。显然，只要目前这种由开发商主导的公共服务和住宅的供给模式维持不变，中国的城市就不可能形成西方式的城市街道意象，甚至不可能回到我们自己曾经有过的街道意象（比如北京的四合院、鼓浪屿的街道）——不管人们是多么怀念那种“诗意的栖居”。

5

回到本文的初始，为什么北美城市彼此相似？从制度的角度看，这是缘于这些城市在其城市化的初始阶段，有着类似的建设技术和规范，产权制度也大同小异。同理，北美城市的路网结构之所以迥异于旧大陆的城市，很大程度上也是因为旧大陆城市化是从复杂而稳固的私有土地制度上开始的，路网必须沿着交易成本最小的路径延伸。而北美城市化启动时，土地则多为公有，政府可以用最省事的办法，通过棋盘式的路网分割分配土地。

城市制度归根结底，是关于土地权利的制度——包括土地的出让模式、土地的更新模式。其本质都是界定土地所有者的权益和他人权益的边界。这些权益的划分方式，对城市意象的影响要远比我们曾想象的大。不管我们认知与否，这些与土地制度相关的一系列规则、法律、条例，都在城市建筑背后以隐秘的方式左右着一个城市的意象。

建筑从来就不是建筑师自由意志的产物。制度在城市风貌中起着至关重要的作用。当建筑师们在反思设计理论、比较中西方文化和思想体系的差异时，很少有人意识到，所有这些我们喜欢的和不喜欢的，在我们选择城市增长机制时，就已经被确定了。尽管我们可以通过建筑设计在微观尺度上为城市“整容”，但东方的“城市面孔”依然顽固地维持东西方城市巨大的差异。建筑师们的设计风格影响过我们居住的城市外貌，但从来没有决定过城市的历史景观。建筑师们自大地认为是他们的个人风格决定了城市的外观，而真正决定了城市景观的，却是城市内在的制度——正是城市的制度，决定了哪种风格的建筑师会最终胜出。如果我们把城市视作一个生命体，制度就好像是城市的基因。相似的制度，如同基因一样负载着城市遗传的密码，复制出一个个不同却又相似的城市“种族”。

随着我们对制度认识的深入，制度设计就有可能被纳入到城市规划 and 建筑学的学科范畴，成为和物质设计同等重要，甚至更为重要的专业内容。届时，我们将不仅知道如何通过物质设计来塑造我们的城市，也将能够通过制度设计修补缺损的制度基因，从而影响空间成长和变迁趋势。LAF



important means for increasing the floor area ratio. Since the 1990s, there have been more and more high-rise buildings. Again, the height of buildings are limited by some regulations. Among them, height limits for firefighting and aviation safety are two major factors.

With all types of “height limit”, the domination of a city’s skyline is not simply dependent on technology, but the point of intersection between the technological curve and the curve of urban development — the technological level of a city at the stage of fast development. A technology, if matured when the main part of a city has already been constructed, will have less influence on the skyline of the city. This explains why, with similar vertical transportation technology, the skylines of London, New York and Shanghai are totally different.

In addition to external technology, the “standards” of urban planning can play an important role in sculpturing a city’s image. An attempt had once been made in promoting the design of continuous street walls in Xiamen’s new business center, but was later found that such design was limited by the existing technical standards. For example, a setback is required in the technical specification for a building, but the length of setback is determined by the level of road and the height of the building. At the same time, the firefighting standard makes it necessary for a high-rise building to have a roadway surrounding the building and at least three walls for fire rescue. These regulations make it impossible to form a continuous street wall that resembles the Wall Street.

4

Compared to the technical restrictions, the property ownership system has a greater and more latent influence in China. Many foreign architects find it difficult to understand why Chinese people concern so much about the orientation of the buildings, particularly the residential buildings. The south-north architectural orientation has formed the

most important feature of urban image throughout the country. In fact, in the traditional cities or even the rural areas in China, architectural orientation is not the biggest concern. Then why, in just a couple of decades, does “orientation” become the common preference of the residential buildings in China?

One interesting explanation points to the housing distribution system back in the times of planned economy. In the past, the main and guest rooms of different orientations were easily distributed among the family members and according to different functions. Maximal utilization of space resources is the primary concern of traditional houses. In the welfare-oriented public housing distribution system, there were two extremes for the houses distributed to different families: the house with the best orientation and the house with the worst. While the distributed areas were calculated according to a series of standards, the floor and orientation become the largest problem in the process of housing distribution. This has made it a main principle for designing these public houses to avoid east-west orientation. After the commercialization of housing, the amplified orientation preference has been inherited. Since orientation results in the difference of house prices, the property developers have tried their best to avoid projects with east-west orientation. The result is, the single architectural orientation has become the common image shared by almost all the cities in China.

Another system, which also has profound influence on the image of Chinese cities, is the “public institutions” (as “Dan Wei” in Chinese) established during the times of planned economy. Back then a large part of the public services in the urban areas were not provided by the market, but these “public institutions”. Public institutions with “good welfare” had their own residential buildings, dining hall, bathhouse, medical treatment room, and even cinema, school and hospital. These exclusive facilities, for internal welfare only (certified through internal notes), inevitably led to growing “compound” and expanding “block”, resulting in the disintegration of “dense network of small roads” in traditional cities and the formation of Soviet Union-style large block and the network of “main-supplementary-branch” roads.

After the reform of market economy, most of the public services have been provided by the market. As a result, the “property developers” has replaced the “public institutions” to become an important player in modern China’s urban system. To widen their advantages over their competitors and increase the value of their projects, the developers vie

with each other in providing exclusive services for their residential buildings from big garden to clubs, swimming pools, shops and even excellent new primary and secondary schools. Such development mode further internalizes public services in urban areas and expands the street blocks. The internal public spaces and roads occupy the resources which should belong to the city, resulting in the growing shrinkage of branch road system and public green space. The developers take the place of the government to provide exclusive public services and extend the urban landscape of “public institutions” on a higher level.

Public services, which should have been provided by the government, have been taken up by the property developers and offered to the residents within a community in an exclusive way, fragmenting the continuous urban texture and making self-sustaining communities which are more like “lonely islands”. Street life is disappearing, and the privatization of public services has led to the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor in the urban areas. Although planners and architects have been calling for the reconstruction of street mode with “dense network of small roads”, cities still spread and expand according to the logic featuring a Chinese characteristics. Apparently, as long as the developer-dominant public services and housing supply practice is not changed, it will be impossible for the western urban street image to be formed in China’s cities, nor will it be possible even to return to the traditional Chinese image (such as the “Siheyuan” in Beijing and the streets in Gulangyu, Xiamen) — no matter how nostalgic people are for the “poetic living”.

5

Back to the beginning of this criticism, why there is such a similarity among cities in North America? From the institutional perspective, the reason is that these cities had similar construction technology and standards at the preliminary stage of urbanization, and their property ownership systems were similar with only slight differences. Likewise, the reason why the road network in North America is so different from the cities in old continent is largely that the urbanization of the old continent was launched based on its complicated and steady private land ownership system, and the road network must be extended along the roads with the lowest transaction costs. While in the case of cities in North America, most of the lands were publicly owned when urbanization started, enabling the government to apply the easiest method and cut the lands with a road network resembling the

checker board.

Urban system is basically the system about land rights — including the transfer and updating modes of lands. The essence is to set the boundary between rights of the land owners and the other people. The division of these rights has an influence upon the urban image far larger than we had imagined. Known or unknown, the rules, laws and regulations related to the land systems are influencing a city’s image behind the urban buildings in a hidden manner. If we want to change the image of a city, we need to first redesign these systems hidden behind the buildings.

Under the appearance it is the intrinsic institution that decides the difference of urban landscape.

Buildings are never the product of the architects’ free will. Institutions play a crucial role in urban landscape. When architects are reflecting on the theories of design and comparing the differences between Chinese and western cultures and ideologies, few people realize that all these things have been programmed at the time we select the city’s development. Although, on the microscopic scale, we can give a “cosmetic surgery” to a city through architectural design, the oriental “urban face” still maintain stubbornly the enormous difference between the western and the eastern cities. The architects’ design can influence the appearance of the city we live in, but can never decide the historical landscape of the city. They arrogantly believe their personal style has determined the appearance of a city, but under the appearance it is the intrinsic institution that decides the difference of urban landscape — it is the urban system that decides which architect can eventually be the winner. If we consider a city as a living body, then its institutions are like the gene of the city. Like genes, similar institutions carry the hereditary code of a city, copying one after the other urban “ethnicities” that are different and yet similar.

As our understanding of institution gets deeper, institutional design might be included into the disciplinary scope of urban planning and architecture to become equally important, or even more important than physical design. At that time, we not only will know how to shape our city with physical design, but also the way to repair the damaged institutional genes with institutional design, in order to influence the growing and changing city. **LAF**