

The Distinction of the Major Design Principles of Planning Systems and How They Potentially Impact Planning Outcomes

Xing Hu

Sichuan Tourism University, Chengdu 610000, Sichuan Province, China

Abstract: This paper addresses how different urban planning systems play their role in the development of cities, and how this directly affects the role and status of urban planning in social construction, and how to determine the social awareness of urban planning. By contrasting and defining the challenges and advantages of the regulatory, discretionary and hybrid urban planning systems, as well as examining the potential possibilities of each system, which system is more effective will become apparent. Therefore, planning and policy implementation can be more extensive and special. At the same time, a sound planning system can form relevant information feedback to propose amendments and adjustment methods for the city's planning content and policy and planning operation, which comply with the objective requirements of urban development.

Keywords: Planning; System; Land

Publication date: March, 2021

Publication online: 31 March, 2021

***Corresponding author:** Xing Hu, ytlyzy7@163.com

1 Introduction

Planning systems are established in various countries according to their own legal system, administrative system, form of land ownership and differing development goals. Planning is the government's tool of controlling and managing land use according to the legal system. The planning system directly identifies or affects the content and procedures for planning permission required for land development

and construction projects^[1].

2 Regulatory systems

Regulatory planning systems are a direct planning tool that plays an important role in urban planning systems. Control and regulation as an important stage in the planning system, its implementation based on an evaluation of the city^[2]. In the frame of the urban planning system of a lot of countries, regulatory detailed planning becomes the key basis of development control. At the same time, due to the unique regulatory control, evaluation has certain particularity. For example, the implementation process of Harlow S.person has been divided into several parts. Each part has a multi-level and hierarchical model from the top down. Under the actions of an "institutional mind", these parts will be in accordance with the established strategies then implemented on a schedule. With this method, Person believes the operational process of planning is guided by "system thinking". There is a simple combination for the original part of each unit. At the same time, this system is easy to determine the costs and benefits of policy plan, predicts the future development situation and advance to deal with^[3].

The main strength of a regulatory system is that it protects the interests of the public, rather than permitting the development of a single block of control. With the development of city planning evaluation theory, the viewpoint is that planning results and design principles should not be a simple relationship. A regulatory system should see whether the planning implementation scheme embodies the

main intent of the plan. Therefore, evaluation of the implementation of planning should determine whether it does protect the interests of the public, and how to balance the public interest and related interests. However, full regulatory implementation is not necessarily good. In the implementation of any adjustment of a plan, the core objectives of the control rules should be achieved. Therefore, the main weakness is the investigation of the current situation of construction. The core position of regulatory rules is the management of development and construction, and there is a certain procedural regulation for the adjustment of regulatory planning and management.

3 Discretionary systems

Compared with the regulatory planning system, the discretionary planning system is more flexible and the most representative example of it is the British planning system. The regulatory system needs to take into account the details of each scheme and predefined standards or specifications, whereas the discretionary system has a distinct difference^[4].

The discretionary system is generally based on case law and previous cases as the basis of decision-making and policy formulation^[3]. In general, there is no detailed plan for this type of planning, only a schematic representation of development. This type of planning does not specify the content of control. Instead, it sets forth the policies and objectives of development, and decides the specific implementation plan and measures for the control and management of planning. The text of the plan is an exposition of the general land use policy and development policy, and does not stipulate specific land use. Therefore the discretionary planning system provides a large discretionary space for planners and statesmen.

Although one of the most important features of the discretionary planning system is its flexibility, it also has great uncertainty. Specifically, a plan has only defined the goals and policies of development, which is used to guide the development, and the specific control and management work is carried out only through development control^[2]. In addition, statutory planning is only one of the factors for planning approval. Because of this discretionary power, there may be a lot of randomness in planning examination and approval. There is also a need for the urban planning and the various interest groups (including statutory bodies, such as central government agencies

and local governments, and other institutions, such as non-governmental organisations, neighbourhood communities, etc.) to negotiate.

4 Hybrid systems

Hybrid systems demonstrate connections with the previous two systems. To a certain extent, developers can independently evaluate the mixed-use land for more dominant use, and delineate certain areas as related or irrelevant for these purposes^[5]. The dominant use must be chosen in line with the provisions of government guidance and it must fully accept all planning documents. Finally, it is also uncertain. How to develop, and how to develop the government has not put forward a clear regulation. Certainly It is necessary for developers to make decisions on the basis of market autonomy. Such investment is bound to have a certain risk, but at the same time it also makes the maximum use of the land, and thus it is possible to build a prosperous city.

As early as the 1960s, Jacobs strongly advocated the diversity of the city in her book, *The life and death of the great cities of the United States*. She believes that the city is a product of human settlement. Thousands of people live in cities, and people's interests, abilities, needs, wealth and tastes are all different. She pointed out that, from an economic point of view or from a social perspective, cities need to be as complex as possible and support each other's functions to meet people's needs.

5 Potential impact of planning practice

5.1 "Central cities" in Germany

Germany is a typical example of a country with a regulatory planning system. Its planning is achieved through a vertical, consensus-oriented institutional framework^[6]. In response to the social and economic consequences of unity and European integration, the German plan has tried new regional associations. The main goal of the German government is to make the whole society more equitable and sustainable under the framework of reasonable planning. However, the realisation of this goal requires different levels of planning. In order to achieve this goal, the German government first established a federal-state relationship to foster redistribution to poorer and more remote rural areas. The measures that need to be strengthened include: infrastructure, financial

incentives, tax preferences and the priority of federal contracts. This undoubtedly strengthens the design of Germany in spatial terms, not only for investment, but also in the areas of urban development and protection.

In order to minimise social differences in the use of space, the German government has also defined and planned a hierarchical system of "central cities". According to the importance of different regions at the city level, the "centre" is planned to provide services and infrastructure for the surrounding areas so that they may obtain more service functions^[7]. In spite of this, it does not rely on the private sector to perform planning functions in Germany. The federal building law requires municipal authorities to formulate local land use plans, which are both vertical and horizontal. They prepare, discuss and modify the unconstrained preliminary plan, and there is then a vote on the final plan by the local legislature.

5.2 The town and country planning in Britain

The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 established a very important feature for the British planning system, that is to separate ownership and development rights for land. Ownership of land can be private, but the right to develop belongs to the government. Any development construction requires a planning licence and the approval of the government. This important rule has not changed since 1947, and continues to this day. Specifically, the Town and Country Planning Act stipulates that, except for special provisions, all development projects must apply for planning permission. That is to say, developers (or investors) need to apply for planning permission to satisfy local planning and management departments according to the "development plan".

A "development plan" is the legal plan of the UK. Since 1960s, the "development plan" has included "structural planning" and "local planning", as well as the corresponding "unified development plan" suitable for metropolitan areas after adjustment by government institutions. "Structural planning" is compiled by county government. "Local planning" is compiled by the local government. The local government can be either a city or a town government or a rural area government^[4]. According to the new British planning law, a "development plan" features two kinds of planning. One is the "Regional Spatial Strategy", compiled by regional governments and institutional organisations. The other is the "Local

Development Framework" compiled by local government. An important feature of the local development framework is also a key point in the transformation of the development planning system, which is a clear mechanism for planning to respond quickly to the uncertain world and development^[4].

5.3 The "white-site" planning concept in Singapore

According to the amendment of the 1964 Planning Act of Singapore, under a planning permit, the development activity may exceed the prescribed development intensity or the changes specified in the zoning use^[5]. The "white-site" planning concept in Singapore is a potential impact of a hybrid planning system. Under the premise of clear dominant use, the government allows developers to build for some mixed purposes related to their main purpose, in order to improve the flexibility of land use. Started by Singapore's URA in 1995, white-site planning allows developers to provide more flexible space for construction and development. The proportion of land use nature, land-related other mixed use, and land for various uses is permitted by the government as long as the development and construction conform to the construction requirements. During the rent period of the "white site", the developer can freely change the nature and proportion of the mixed land according to the requirements of the contract, without paying an additional premium^[5].

For example, the developer can decide at the beginning of the business land of "white site". In the future, if market demand is increasing, some other types of land can be flexibly converted to retail business, without a special application and land premium. This point same as the conclusions of the case study by Emily Talen, she purposed that after the implementation of the plan, the zoning relationship between the residents and the public facilities should be similar to that of the planning^[8].

6 Conclusion

The planning system needs to provide a mechanism with a rapid reaction capability and an ability to grasp opportunity and make decisions in a short time^[9]. These three types of planning systems have advantages and disadvantages, and it is hard to say which one is superior to another. A country's planning system is closely linked to the country's specific legal system, its historical culture and its political

background. At different stages of development, different planning management methods can be adopted for different regions. First, we need to ensure that the public interest should emphasise the optimisation and function of land use overall, to ensure the urban function of public facilities of the space implementation, reasonably determine the scale and layout of the relevant facilities, and to implement the land. At the same time, in-depth study is required to meet urban public health standards and public safety needs in relevant elements, such as sunshine, lighting, ventilation, and fire protection, and make detailed provisions, with implementation under the guidance of management. At the same time, flexibility in land control should be improved by increasing the mixing function of land use.

References

- [1] Thomas, D., Minett, J., Hopkins, S., Faludi, A. and Barrell, D., 1983. Flexibility and commitment in planning. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- [2] Zhou, Y., 2003. The theory and method of urban planning implementation evaluation. *City Planning Forum*, Vol. 2.
- [3] Booth, P., 1995. Zoning or discretionary action: Certainty and responsiveness in implementing planning policy. *Journal of Planning Education & Research*, Vol. 14, Issue 2, pp. 103-112.
- [4] Yu, L., 2011. Regulatory and discretionary planning and way forward of planning system: Cases of the Netherlands and the UK.
- [5] Xiang, S., 2003. Concept analysis of the "white site" in Singapore. *City Planning Review*, Vol. 27, Issue 7, pp. 1002-1329.
- [6] Stephan, St. 2007. The planning process in the US and Germany: A Comparative Analysis. *International Planning Studies*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, pp. 55-75.
- [7] Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR), 2000. Urban development and urban policy in Germany. Bonn: Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung [German Federal Ministry for Regional Planning, Building and Urban Development].
- [8] Talen, E., 1996. After the plans: Method to evaluate the implementation success of plans. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp. x-y.
- [9] Thornley, A. and Rydin, Y. (eds), 2002. *Planning in a global era*. Aldershot: Ashgate.