



## Paths to mixed-use development: A case study of Southern Changping in Beijing, China



Hui Kong<sup>a,\*</sup>, Daniel Z. Sui<sup>a</sup>, Xin Tong<sup>b</sup>, Xun Wang<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Geography, The Ohio State University, 1036 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210-1361, USA

<sup>b</sup> College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 19 August 2014

Received in revised form 7 January 2015

Accepted 17 January 2015

Available online 19 February 2015

#### Keywords:

Mixed-use development

Beijing

Urban development

New Urbanism

### ABSTRACT

Mixed-use development has been widely accepted as a strategy in urban planning to address the problems resulted from the traditional zoning in the West, and it has also been increasingly adopted in many Chinese cities in recent decades with quite different results. However, few studies have provided empirical support to the claimed benefits of mixed-use development and little is known about the process to achieve the desired benefits of mixed-use. This paper reports our investigation of three typical urban development models commonly used in China – “top-down” centrally-controlled development model, “bottom-up” individual-dominant development model, and “bottom-up” collective-dominant development model. Using Southern Changping of Beijing as a case study, where the mixed-use development has been adopted in the past decade, we conduct a systematic evaluation of the three approaches and assess the impacts of mixed-use on urban development in Beijing. By conducting questionnaire analysis and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare the job-housing pattern, career development of residents, sense of community and community vitality of the three models, the paper discovers that the community under “bottom-up” collective-dominant development model effectively achieved mixed-use development, while the “top-down” centrally-controlled development may lead to functional division and the “bottom-up” individual-dominant developed community ended up in disorder and chaos. Our findings indicate that under current policy framework and development trends in China, the “bottom-up” collective-dominant development model and social inclusion would be an effective way to achieving the intended goals of the mixed-use development.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### Introduction

Mixed-use development encourages urban planners and developers to form the compact, walking-friendly and mixed communities by fusing together different functions such as commercial, residential, and recreational land uses, so as to improve the economic and social vitality at the community level (Lynch, 1984). While the term frequently appears in the planning and real estate literature, the definition of mixed-use development is an ambiguous, multi-faceted concept (Rowley, 1996), and is rarely elaborated upon with substantive and empirical support (Herndon, 2011). The definition developed by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) are consistently referenced in the literature (Herndon, 2011), which defines a mixed-use project as a coherent plan with three or more functionally and physically integrated revenue-producing uses (ULI, 1987). We follow this definition of mixed-use in this paper.

The concept of mixed-use development is proposed against the functional division in urban design and planning in Western cities in the 20th century (Lynch, 1984). Influenced by the principles of functionalism, zoning had been firmly entrenched since the 1920s in the European and North American cities as a strategy to increase efficiency and safety by separating incompatible land uses (Hoppenbrouwer & Louw, 2005). Zoning had played an important role in the reconstruction and recovery efforts after World War I. However, like many other well-intended urban policies and planning initiatives, functional zoning created many of its own problems as it was repeated mechanically in these cities, such as congestion, pollution, urban sprawl, workplace-residence separation and the loss of urban vitality (Grant, 2002; Herndon, 2011; Qiu, 2009; Rowley, 1996). The rationale behind the functional division in urban planning was challenged when Jacobs (1961), an influential urban scholar and critic, published her classic, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, in which she argued that the mix of diverse uses created vibrant and successful neighborhoods. As urban renewal was proposed in 1960s in the US and European cities, the idea of

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 765 586 7956.

E-mail address: [kong.174@osu.edu](mailto:kong.174@osu.edu) (H. Kong).

rebuilding the mixed-functional urban space was gradually accepted by urban planners in western countries, and the mixed-use development became one of the key components of modern urban theories since the 1980s (Burton, 2000; Chen, Jia, & Lau, 2008; Handy, 2005). As the most representative ideas of mixed-use, the new urbanism put forward two modes to achieve mixed-use development (Duany, Speck, & Lydon, 2010; Rodríguez, Khattak, & Evenson, 2006): Transit Oriented Development (TOD) mode and Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) mode (Grant, 2006). With the emergence of sustainable development as a new development paradigm/strategy, urban sustainability has become widely adopted as a new practice, and the mixed-use development was widely considered as an important path toward the “compact city” and “smart growth” (Barnett, 2007).

During the past three decades, Chinese cities have repeated similar mistakes as western cities. In the urban fringe areas where rapid urban sprawl took place, large-scale single functional areas quickly come into being, which brought about severe urban problems (Qiu, 2009; Zhuang & Ren, 2011). The villages around these urban fringe development zones, however, were transformed into urban villages under the spontaneous construction of individual villagers, with overloaded population, insufficient infrastructure and disordered management (Wang, Wang, & Wu, 2009; Wei & Yan, 2005; Zheng, Long, Fan, & Gu, 2009). These problems in Chinese cities could be attributed, to a large extent, to the functional division in city reconstruction which is similar to western cities, as well as the particular land-use mechanism and urban planning systems in China. Therefore, extensive attention is paid to the mixed-use development in Chinese cities, especially in urban fringe areas (Li, 2010; Ying, 2009; Zhuang & Ren, 2011).

Support for mixed-use development has increased in the literature and by interdisciplinary researchers around the world. For developed countries such as the United States, Canada, Japan and European countries, in which the urbanization level is high, mixed-use development has become a key element in both modern urban theories and planning practice. Studies provided evidence for the benefits of mixed-use development, treating it as a tool to address multiple urban problems (Garreau, 2011) and to realize sustainability and smart growth goals (Barnett, 2007; Burton, Jenks, & Williams, 1996; Calthorpe & Fulton, 2001; Frey, 1999). Some scholars tried to develop theoretical frameworks for mixed-use development by working on its definition (Urban Land Institute, 2003), dimensions and scales (Hoppenbrouwer & Louw, 2005), characteristics (Grant, 2002; Witherspoon, Abbott, & Gladstone, 1976), feasibility (Dixon & Marston, 2003; Wheaton, 2001) and obstacles (Rowley, 1998). Empirical studies concerning mixed-use mainly focused on the experience of some mixed-use development examples (Grant, 2002) and the detailed policies, regulations and community design (Schwanke & Flynn, 1987) in the West.

Studies of mixed-use development in Chinese cities, however, are still in the beginning stages. Theoretical research focuses on introducing the theories and experience of mixed-use development from the developed countries (Weng, 1990; Zhuang & Ren, 2011), discussing the importance of mixed-use development for the diversity, vitality and sustainability of modern cities (Qiu, 2009), and analyzing the possibility of successful mixed-use development in inner-city areas, urban fringe areas and decaying areas (Xing, 2005); studies about practice are mainly concerned with the generalization, evolution, mechanism and policies of functional-mixed communities (Zhu, Wang, & Yin, 2010), as well as the evaluation of the existing mixed-use development experience (Liu, 2008; Yin, 2007). All these studies explored the concepts and policies for mixed-use development, but few of them have conducted empirical research about effectiveness and mechanism of mixed-use development in Chinese cities.

Past experiences and studies reveal that the mixed-use development has been practiced in many cities around the world, but the outcomes varied considerably, contingent upon local conditions and circumstances (Dixon & Marston, 2003; Grant, 2002; Herndon, 2011; Li, 2010; Rowley, 1996; Zhuang & Ren, 2011). For example, mixed-use development has been stated as one of the key strategies in the development of urban fringe in the *Beijing Master Planning (2004–2020)*, and has been conducted in Changping, Yizhuang and many other newly-constructed towns, but the results show significant disparity. Apparently, mixed-use development is not just the mix of functions, but a result of the conflicts and compromises between different interest groups (Saich, 2000), which are influenced by different development processes. Therefore, a key question is: what is the most effective path to achieve the goals of the mixed-use development? This paper tries to answer this question based on a case study of Southern Changping in Beijing, China, an urban fringe area where the mixed-use development has been applied in the last several years. Three mixed-functional communities with different urban development patterns and disparate results are investigated, with the goal of teasing out the underlying mechanisms that ensure the effectiveness of mixed-use development.

### Alternative paths for urban development: urban forms and urban performance

According to Lynch (1984), three types of theories aim to explain the city forms. Planning theory, also known as decision theory among planners, is about the development process that asserts how complex public decisions about city development are or should be made. The second type, the functional theory, attempts to explain why cities take the form they do and how that form functions. Normative theory is the third type, which deals with urban performance – the generalizable connections between human values and settlement form, or how to define a good city. Different urban forms will lead to different urban performance.

The compact urban form that comes from mixed-use development is considered as a significant agenda to create and maintain the goals of new urbanism: vital, beautiful, just, environmentally benign human settlements (Talen, 2005). Firstly, mixed-use development is a strategy for arranging the physical space that is required for society to function (Herndon, 2011). Moreover, this mixed-use form revolves around the desire to alter the undesirable growth patterns characterized by traditional zoning. Furthermore, it “forms part of a strategy for sustainable development as well as a theory of good urban form, with the objectives of economic vitality, social equity, and environmental quality” (Grant, 2002).

However, mixed-use urban form is not a panacea, and the effectiveness of mixed-use development could not be absolutely assured. As Coupland (1997) points out, “while some of the advantages of mixed-use can be accepted as absolute, others may or may not be true in certain circumstances”. In the previous experiences, cities have different performance even with the similar urban form characterized by compact and mixed-use. This suggests a topic worthy of exploration: what causes different performances in the cities and communities pursuing the similar urban form of mixed-use development? Obviously, the effective urban performance requires not only urban forms, but more importantly, the proper development process to realize the urban forms, functions and performance. Urban development in China is now at a crossroads. Decentralization of decision making, market-led urban development initiatives, increase in the number of players/stakeholders and conflicts of different interest groups have challenged fundamentally the practice of urban planning (Yeh & Wu, 1999). In China, several stakeholders will participate in the urban

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1008317>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1008317>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)