

本文引用格式 / Please cite this article as:

Lu, X. (2019). From Polycentric Planning to Polycentric Governance. *Landscape Architecture Frontiers*, 7(3), 134-135. <https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-050001>

基于对大规模人口增长和持续城市化的预测，城市未来学家长久以来已经为他样的城市未来制定了不同的范式愿景。虽然这些不同的趋向各具特色，但创造有序、平衡和美丽的生活环境对规划专业人员具有永恒的吸引力，最持久不衰的趋向之一便是多中心规划，其出现于19世纪后半叶，并以由埃比尼泽·霍华德、帕特里克·格迪斯、刘易斯·芒福德和雷蒙德·昂温等学者所提出的多种宜人尺度的“花园城市”为代表^[1]。花园城市的基本特征可简要概括为围绕多个精心规划的中心发展起来的大都市。这些分中心的协调运作是经济和规划战略的基础，可指导现代大都市的合理建设——综合的运输系统、有效的通信网络，以及均衡的社区将逐步形成，居民也将享受到丰富的文化娱乐生活。

多中心规划的愿景虽然美好，但其中也潜藏着管控方面的危机。由谁来定义“美”的形式和实质？由谁来决定社区的平衡？由谁来仲裁生命的价值并评定“高尚的品味”？当面对这些问题时，多中心规划的拥护者总是以“当然是人民”作为回应，却从未具体说明“人民”所确指的群体及其做出决定的方式^[2]。作为对多中心规划困境的回应，多中心治理在第二次世界大战后城市快速发展的背景下萌发。如果说多中心规划建立在对所谓的必然性和现代技术成果的信仰之上，那么多中心治理则与之相反，依赖于价值判断和哲学思辨。尽管与多中心规划一样将“和谐”置于首位，但多中心治理提醒我们，这种以强制手段、经由专业控制所带来的和谐状态也潜藏着危险。本期的两个项目都试图超越其各自所处的多中心的空间布局，并指出：地区命运不应掌控在某一个评判价值的专业群体手中，而应由多中心治理体系所孕育并提倡的多元的意见与广泛的讨论共同促成。

在《阿尔巴尼亚地拉那的自由景观》一文中，哈佛大学设计研究生院的威廉·鲍姆加德纳指出了在阿尔巴尼亚的首都地拉那实施一项多中心总体规划的挑战。地拉那的2016年总体规划可说是在向花园

城市的传统致敬：其将田园景观设计和多中心空间规划相结合，试图为拥挤和密集的市中心缓解压力。尽管如此，该规划方案忽视了重新振兴该地区公共空间的迫切性——受20世纪后期的政治高压影响，阿尔巴尼亚的城市公共生活已被严重削弱。鲍姆加德纳认为，景观设计不应是大张旗鼓倡导可持续的“漂绿”^①工具，而应成为一种解放和重建个人和城市潜能的催化剂。他的研究项目位于地拉那郊区一个名叫坎比纳特的后工业厂区，其被指定为地拉那大都市区未来的多中心之一。该项目将公共空间置于坎比纳特多方位城市复兴项目的核心位置，旨在重塑一个允许民众自由发声的公共空间。

在《基于区域多中心治理模式的生态恢复——以吐鲁番地区坎儿井水利系统的再生利用为例》一文中，西安建筑科技大学的杜泽慧探索了为中国新疆维吾尔自治区东部的吐鲁番地区引入多中心水治理系统的可能性。由于绿洲的地理独特性，新疆地区的定居点本身就具有多中心的空间分布特征。各个绿洲定居点之间由沙漠或草原隔绝，其大小和位置完全取决于以高山融水为主要补给来源的可用水量。杜泽慧的研究项目聚焦于新疆人口最稠密的绿洲城市之一吐鲁番，指出了该地区水资源安全所面临的前所未有的挑战。这些挑战一方面是由于更大范围的气候变化，另一方面则源于不同经济部门之间不协调的水资源竞争。从对水资源可用性的评估，到对古老水利基础设施的重新利用，杜泽慧提出了一系列涉及公共和私人领域的多层级水管理措施，以保障该地区的水安全。

鲍姆加德纳和杜泽慧的研究指出，“和谐”并非只能或能够由某一决策中心的意愿来定义。促成和谐状态的前提是建立一个真正的对话平台，供持不同意见的民众对那些关系着整个地区命运的重要议题展开讨论。通过多中心治理的视角来审视这两个项目，我们能够发现，“和谐”的生发倚赖一个充满探寻、试错和妥协的漫长而艰辛的过程，并需通过不断的调整 and 适应来维持。

① “漂绿”是一个以“漂白”为蓝本的复合词，指对特定产品、服务、技术或实践的环境效益做出未经证实或误导性宣传的做法。

EXPERIMENTS & PROCESSES

FROM POLYCENTRIC PLANNING TO POLYCENTRIC GOVERNANCE

COLUMN HOST

LU Xiaoxuan

Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Hong Kong

① Greenwashing is a compound word modelled on "whitewash," referring to the practice of making an unsubstantiated or misleading claim about the environmental benefits of a product, service, technology, or practice.

In anticipation of massive population growth and continuing urbanization, urban futurists have historically formulated various normative visions for alternative urban futures. Despite the diverse agendas embedded in these different trends, the ambition of achieving order, balance, and beauty has a timeless appeal to planning professionals. One of the most enduring trends is polycentric planning which emerged during the second half of the 19th century, exemplified by the variants of human-scale Garden Cities envisioned by Ebenezer Howard, Patrick Geddes, Lewis Mumford, and Raymond Unwin^[1]. These Garden Cities were characteristically planned metropolitan developments articulated through a number of clearly defined centers. The coordinated interrelationships between these nodes provided a foundation for an economic and planning strategy from which the rational construction of the modern metropolis could be articulated. Integrated transportation systems, efficient communication networks, and balanced communities could then be developed and land set aside for cultural and recreational purposes.

There is however, a serpent lurking in this Eden of polycentric planning and its name is "governance." Who defines the form and substance of beauty? Who determines what makes a balanced community? Who arbitrates life values and adjudicates "good taste"? Faced with these questions, the proponents of polycentric planning have answered, sometimes petulantly, "the people of course" without being able to specify who they mean or the method by which they make their decisions^[2]. The idea of Polycentric Governance emerged in response to these dilemmas surrounding polycentric planning in the context of an upsurge of urban development after World War II. If the case for polycentric planning rests on necessity and the imperatives of modern technology, polycentric governance takes a contrasting position contingent on value judgments and philosophical disputation. By prioritizing harmony in the same breath as polycentric planning, polycentric governance reminds us of the dangers inherent in the autocratic imposition of professional control. Looking beyond their polycentric spatial contexts, both projects in this issue envision a regional destiny where values are not imposed by professional diktat, but rather emerge from an evolutionary process driven by disagreement, discussion, and debate, enabled and encouraged by polycentric systems of governance.

In *Freescape of Tirana*, Albania, William Baumgardner from Harvard Graduate School of Design highlights the challenge of implementing a poly-centered master plan in Albania's capital, Tirana. While the combination of bucolic landscape design and polycentric planning aiming to relieve

pressure on the congested and dense city center owes much to the Garden City tradition, the 2016 master plan misses the opportunity to reinvigorate the public realm debilitated by the political repression in late 20th century. Rather than using landscape design to greenwash^① the plan, Baumgardner argues that landscape architecture can act as a catalyst to liberate and reestablish individual and civic potential. The project focuses on Kombinat, a post-industrial site of Tirana suburb, which is designated as one of the future poly-centers in the metropolitan region. The project positions public space at the center of a multi-faceted urban revitalization project to facilitate a free and vocal public realm.

In *Ecological Restoration Based on a Regional Polycentric Governance Model — Regeneration of the Karez Water System in Turpan Region*, Du Zehui from Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology explores the potential of introducing a polycentric water governance system to Turpan in the east of Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, China. Settlements in Xinjiang are characterized by their polycentric spatial configuration defined by the geographical reality of the oasis. Isolated from each other by desert and steppe, the size and location of oasis settlements depend entirely on the availability of water sourced from mountain snowmelt. Du focuses on Turpan, one of the most densely populated oasis cities in Xinjiang, highlighting the unprecedented challenges to regional water security caused by climate change and uncoordinated competition for water resources between different sectors of local economy. She explores a number of areas where multilevel governance initiatives involving public and private spheres could help enhance water security in the region, ranging from the evaluation of water resource availability to the rehabilitation of existing historic water infrastructure.

Both Baumgardner and Du challenge the idea of harmony as inevitable or capable of being intentionally prescribed, and advocate for the construction of a genuine arena for debate about meaningful issues which affect the area as a whole. Viewing both projects through the lens of polycentric governance, we discover that harmony is built through a long and painful process of trial, error, and compromise, and maintained by constant adjustment and adaptation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kloosterman, R. C., & Musterd, S. (2001). The polycentric urban region: Towards a Research Agenda. *Urban Studies*, 38(4), 623-633.
- [2] Wood, R. C. (1958). Metropolitan government, 1975: An extrapolation of trends: The new metropolis: Green belts, grass roots or gargantua?. *American Political Science Review*, 52(1), 108-122.