

大学专业英语系列教程

# 城市规划专业英语

ENGLISH FOR URBAN PLANNING

张冠增 张剑涛 编著

同济大学出版社

## 内容简介

本书根据近年来同济大学城市规划专业英语教学的实际情况,参考已出版的国外专业读物编写而成。

本教材的主要内容包括:社会学(第1、4、6单元),城市文化(第2单元),城市交通(第3、10单元),城市历史(第5、8单元),城市生态(第7单元),历史保护(第9单元),公共政策(第11、14单元),城市设计(第12、16单元),开发控制(第13、15单元),区域规划(第17单元),新城(第18单元)。

本书可供从事城市规划专业英语教学的教师、规划专业大学生、研究生以及与城市规划有关的人员使用。

### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

城市规划专业英语/张冠增,张剑涛编著.—上海:  
同济大学出版社,2006.1  
(大学专业英语系列教程)  
ISBN 7-5608-3190-7

I. 城... II. ①张... ②张... III. 城市规划—英语—高等学校—教材 IV. H31

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2005)第 129038 号

### 城市规划专业英语

张冠增 张剑涛 编著

责任编辑 朱振华 刘燕萍 责任校对 徐春莲 装帧设计 潘向葵

---

出版发行 同济大学出版社

(上海四平路 1239 号 邮编 200092 电话 021-65985622)

经销 全国各地新华书店

印刷 同济大学印刷厂印刷

开本 787mm×960mm 1/16

印张 10

字数 200000

印数 1—3100

版次 2006 年 1 月第 1 版 2006 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书号 ISBN 7-5608-3190-7/H·387

定价 15.00 元

---

本书若有印装质量问题,请向本社发行部调换

## 前 言

近年来,我国高校不断加强对外开放的力度,国际间的学术交流活动也日渐频繁,这些都为包括城市规划专业在内的大学本科生、研究生提供了优越的英语实践条件。一方面,是大学生、研究生的阅读和会话水平大幅度地提高,四、六级和托福合格者的比例快速增长;另一方面,是学生们在各自专业领域与国外学者的直接交流范围,以及他们对最新知识和最新动态的需求,都远远超出现有教材的容量,英语教学出现了供需失衡的矛盾。为此,根据历年来同济大学城市规划专业英语教学的实际情况,参考已出版的专业读物,我们编写了这本新教材,以尽可能满足当今大学生对专业英语知识的渴求。

和以往的大学专业英语教程相比,本教材有如下几方面的特点:1. 使用范围只限于城市规划专业的学生,因此选材尽量涉及目前城市规划学科各个领域,包括城市社会学、城市规划原理、城市设计、区域规划、公共政策、城市历史及历史文化保护、城市文化、城市交通、城市生态等,力求给学生以比较全面的城市规划学科的知识;2. 本教材所有的文章均节选自国外杂志、刊物、著作,力求提供最新的、有代表性的研究成果;3. 本教材结合学生的英语实践活动,尽可能扩大阅读中的词汇量,重点培养学生灵活使用英文单词、自主开拓阅读空间的能力,而不提倡一词一意的死记硬背和在同一水平上的重复;4. 根据同济大学出版社的要求,每篇文章的后面均附有参考译文,引导学生不拘泥于字面上的含义,而着眼于对内容的理解,提高实践的水平,学习和掌握恰当、准确、结构合理的表达方法。

本书选材比较宽泛,篇幅较多,也有一定难度。因此,在教学中可根据实际情况,有选择地把某些单元作为重点,即精读材料,逐句逐段分析、归纳、思索,同时辅助以课后练习,以增强对课文结构的理解;有些单元可作为泛读材料,主要培养阅读速度,不拘泥于某个词或某段话,以达到对课文内容的了解为基本目的。学习过程应难易相间、长短搭配、重点明确;单词表中未列出的基本词汇和词组,需要学生自己动手查阅词典,从不同用法和词义中比对筛选,以逐步养成良好的阅读习惯;要有机结合精读和泛读两种方法,培养对本专业内相似英文资料触类旁通的技能,既可以通过快速浏览了解文章概要,也能够从语法、词汇、文体的角度深入分析,掌握更扎实的英文知识,为进一步开拓学习领域奠定基础。

在本书编写过程中,同济大学城市规划系主任赵民教授给予了大力支持,出版社的有关编辑也提出了很多建设性的意见,为本书的出版奠定了基础。研究生赵

莹、彭菁菁、毛丽青参加了练习部分的讨论与修改,对很多细节提出了宝贵意见,在此谨一并表示衷心的感谢。

限于编者自身的水平、选材的局限性以及时间的紧迫,书中的错误和不当之处在所难免,敬请广大读者及时发现问题并反馈到同济大学出版社,以便我们在今后的工作中予以改正。

本书由张冠增全面规划和组织,并负责编写了社会学、城市文化、城市交通、城市历史、城市生态和历史保护部分;张剑涛负责编写了公共政策、城市设计、开发控制、区域规划和新城部分,全书最后由张冠增统稿。本书可供从事城市规划专业英语教学的教师、规划专业大学生、研究生以及与城市规划有关的人员使用。

编 者

2005年6月

# CONTENTS

## Unit 1

<b>Community Participation in Urban Regeneration Partnerships</b> .....	( 1 )
Exercises .....	( 5 )

## Unit 2

<b>Cultural Planning for Urban Sustainability</b> .....	( 8 )
Exercises .....	( 12 )

## Unit 3

<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b> .....	( 15 )
Exercises .....	( 19 )

## Unit 4

<b>Qualitative and Quantitative Data</b> .....	( 22 )
Exercises .....	( 26 )

## Unit 5

<b>Early City Form</b> .....	( 29 )
Exercises .....	( 34 )

## Unit 6

<b>Cities as Actors in EU Governance</b> .....	( 37 )
Exercises .....	( 41 )

## Unit 7

<b>Agricultural Landscape Preservation</b> .....	( 44 )
Exercises .....	( 48 )

## Unit 8

<b>An Economic History of Zoning</b> .....	( 51 )
Exercises .....	( 55 )

## Unit 9

<b>The Renewal of Clusters in Old Industrial Areas</b> .....	( 58 )
Exercises .....	( 63 )

## Unit 10

<b>London's Transport Plans</b> .....	( 66 )
Exercises .....	( 69 )

## Unit 11

<b>Public Housing and Urban Renewal</b> .....	( 72 )
Exercises .....	( 76 )

## Unit 12

<b>Architectural Design Review</b> .....	( 78 )
Exercises .....	( 82 )

## Unit 13

<b>Regulatory and Discretionary Control</b> .....	( 84 )
Exercises .....	( 88 )

## Unit 14

<b>Public Action and Private Interest</b> .....	( 90 )
Exercises .....	( 93 )

## Unit 15

<b>Certainty, Flexibility and Accountability</b> .....	( 96 )
Exercises .....	( 99 )

## **Unit 16**

<b>Imageability</b> .....	(101)
Exercises .....	(104)

## **Unit 17**

<b>The Continuing North-south Divide</b> .....	(107)
Exercises .....	(110)

## **Unit 18**

<b>The Social and Economic Impact of the New Towns</b> .....	(113)
Exercises .....	(117)

<b>Appendix I : Key to Exercises (Units 1~18)</b> .....	(119)
---	-------

<b>Appendix II : Chinese Translations of the Texts (Units 1~18)</b> .....	(121)
--	-------

# Unit 1

## Community Participation in Urban Regeneration Partnerships

Across Europe, there are a wide range of schemes which have attempted to tackle urban social exclusion by involving local people in area-based regeneration schemes through the medium of partnerships. Community participation in urban regeneration partnerships is thought to make schemes more efficient and effective in the sense that it helps to ensure that they address the problems which local people perceive as important<sup>[1]</sup>. Residents often come up with<sup>[2]</sup> new and innovative ideas/methods for dealing with problems and their participation ensures the legitimacy of such schemes. In addition, community involvement ensures that preexisting community groups, and their activities, are not ignored, but are drawn into the regeneration process. In terms of the four institutional dimensions of exclusion discussed above, area-based schemes can contribute in a number of ways:

—It is hoped that some unemployed residents will be able to gain direct employment in schemes which are part of the projects.

—Training schemes will equip others to find employment in regeneration projects or elsewhere in the city.

—By providing services such as welfare advice centers, many people will be better equipped to take up benefits to which they are entitled but have not previously claimed.

—Local authorities will, either voluntarily or through pressure from residents, provide better services to the area.

—The very act of participation itself will reduce the “alienation” many excluded people feel from the political system.

—And, finally, the process of participation may bring the community together, as they attempt to identify and articulate their interests, and

therefore enhance social cohesion in the area.

Clearly this is an ambitious agenda and one would not expect to find every project exhibiting all these characteristics to the same extent, if at all in some cases<sup>[3]</sup>. A great deal will depend upon the previous national experiences of urban regeneration and, as noted above, there are considerable variations between member-states with regard to this issue<sup>[4]</sup>.

It is perhaps here that the Commission has an important role to play by launching initiatives which will help to disseminate examples of best practice, to stimulate innovation and, in some instances, to raise awareness of problems which have previously not figured on the political and policy agenda or in the public's consciousness.

At the supranational level, initiatives such as Poverty 3, URBAN, INTEGRA and a range of other schemes associated with the structural funds have fulfilled this function. For instance, the majority of Poverty 3 projects were located in urban areas and thus played an important role in raising the awareness of urban social exclusion in individual countries such as Spain where previously such issues had not figured on the policy agenda. At national level, there are a wide range of schemes such as *the Single Regeneration Budget*<sup>[5]</sup> in England, *kvarterloft* in Denmark; and *Contrats de Villes* in France. With varying degrees of explicitness, these schemes have sought to counter social exclusion and facilitate integration by involving communities in regeneration partnerships. However, it needs to be stated that partnerships and community involvement are no panacea for these problems, they bring with them their own limitations and difficulties. For instance, many of the problems experienced by people living in excluded spaces have their origins in wider structural (i. e. economic and social) forces, political actions and institutional/organizational problems. On their own, area-based initiatives cannot solve the problems of these areas; it is vital that such schemes articulate with, and are supported by, wider policies (on the economy, employment, social protection) — in other words, place-based policies need to be integrated with people-based policies<sup>[6]</sup>.

Turning to the multi-sectoral partnerships that have increasingly come to characterize area-based urban regeneration, we need to acknowledge that they are often problematic. In part, this derives from the relative newness of

organizations which attempt to combine the public, private, voluntary and community sectors. Until relatively recently, there has been little experience of how such organizations operate and as a result partnership formation is very much a “learning process”.

For instance, until recently in France urban regeneration partnerships were largely partnerships between different levels of government, and the community and voluntary sectors were ignored. In a sense, all the participants have to learn to work together and, at least attempt, to set aside their individual interests and develop a notion of the “common good”. Many of the problems which partnerships have experienced stem from an unwillingness to recognize that they involve power relations and there has been relatively little sustained discussion, at European or national levels, of what partnership means or of the processes of partnership formation and operation<sup>[7]</sup>.

(Rob Atkinson, *Combating Social Exclusion in Europe: The New Urban Policy Challenge*, *Urban Studies*, 2000, Vol. 37, No. 5-6, 1037-1055)

## Vocabulary

agenda <i>n.</i>	议事日程,会议议程	efficient <i>adj.</i>	效率高的
alienation <i>n.</i>	离间,疏远感	entitle <i>v.</i>	给……资格,给……权利
articulate <i>vt.</i>	清楚表达		利
be integrated with	与……融合	exclusion <i>n.</i>	排斥,拒绝
characterize <i>v.</i>	以……为特征	explicitness <i>n.</i>	清晰度,明确程度
cohesion <i>n.</i>	凝聚力,粘结,团结	facilitate <i>vt.</i>	给……提供机会,有助于
counter <i>v.</i>	对抗,反击		于
<i>n.</i>	计算器,交易	figure <i>v.</i>	出现,露头
derive <i>v.</i>	从……得到	initiative <i>n.</i>	主动性,创始
dimension <i>n.</i>	量度,维度,部分	in a sense	从某种程度说
disseminate <i>vt.</i>	传播,散布	in terms of	就……而言
effective <i>adj.</i>	能产生效果的,显著的	launch <i>vt.</i>	发动,发射

legitimacy	<i>n.</i>	合理性,合法性	stem from	<i>phr v.</i>	发源于……,来自
limitation	<i>n.</i>	局限性	stimulate	<i>vt.</i>	刺激,促使
multi-sectoral	<i>adj.</i>	多重因素的	structural funds	<i>n.</i>	结构基金
panacea	<i>n.</i>	灵丹妙药	supranational	<i>adj.</i>	超国家的
perceive	<i>vt.</i>	意识到,察觉	sustain	<i>vt.</i>	延续,遭受
problematic	<i>adj.</i>	有疑难点的	tackle	<i>vt.</i>	解决,处理
scheme	<i>n.</i>	计划,方案	take up	<i>phr v.</i>	获得
set aside	<i>phr v.</i>	搁置	voluntarily	<i>adv.</i>	主动地,志愿地

## Notes

1. Community participation in urban ... which local people perceive as important. 在英语中,这样较长和结构较复杂的句子很常见,在翻译时应首先抓住其基本结构。本句的主语是 Community participation, 谓语是 is thought to, 表示认为能达到的预期目标, 而 in the sense that 是个修饰性的状语从句, 其中的 it 又是个小主语, 最后由 which 来引导一个定语从句, 修饰从句中的宾语 the problems。
2. come up with, 固定词组, 表示: 想到、提出。
3. if at all in some cases, 基本结构是 if in some cases, 而 at all 表示疑问: 即便是有……。
4. with regard to this issue, 或者 in regard to, 表示就这件事而言。
5. the Single Regeneration Budget, 独立振兴预算, 词义内容与丹麦、法国有所不同, 但表示同样内容的城市政策。
6. it is vital that ... need to be integrated with people-based policies. 虽然句子很长, 结果却不复杂。主语是 schemes, 由 it is vital that 来引导, 被 articulate with 和 be supported by 两个动词结构所限定, 对 wider policies 发生作用。in other words 则是另一句话, 和前面的表述 it is vital that ... 并列。be integrated with 是“与……融合”的意思。
7. Many of the problems 是主语, 后面紧跟一个由 which 引导的定语从句, 然后是谓语 stem from, unwillingness 是由 to recognize 及后面的部分来限定的。而 there has been 和注 6 的情况一样, 引导出另一个独立的句子。

## Exercises

---

### Ex. I Question and Answer

*Directions:* Read the following questions carefully and answer them in accordance with the contents of the text.

1. Community participation in urban regeneration partnerships is considered important, because . . .
  - A. it will address the important problem of the local people.
  - B. it will assure that the activities of the community will be noticed.
  - C. the community will be more concerned about the urban regeneration.
  - D. It will make the regeneration schemes more efficiently and effectively.
2. How can the people take up benefits to which they are entitled but have not previously claimed ?
  - A. They have to gain direct employment from the area-based schemes.
  - B. The local authorities will help them to take up benefits under the pressure of residents.
  - C. People have to be educated at the welfare advice centers before they are aware of what benefits they're entitled to but never claimed.
  - D. The process of participation will bring the community together and people will learn how to identify and articulate their interests.
3. All the schemes have sought to counter social exclusion and facilitate integration by involving communities in regeneration partnerships, but
  - A. different countries have their own situations, community involvement can not solve all the problems.
  - B. social exclusion in some countries is not a problem at all.
  - C. at the supranational level, the range of schemes is so wide that social problems can't be solved effectively.
  - D. only at the national level that all the schemes will effectively face even difficult situation of social exclusion.
4. What is the meaning of "placed-based policies need to be integrated with people-based policies" ?
  - A. Social problems could not be solved by either placed-based policies or people-based policies respectively.

- B. Wide range of policies on economy, employment and social protection will support schemes of urban regeneration, and these policies are on the basis of place and people.
  - C. Social problems shall only be solved by the local government, which will make the policies in accordance with the people and the place.
  - D. Every policy has two aspects, one is the people, the other is the place.
5. Why the multi-sectoral partnerships are always problematic ?
- A. Because the participants are only interested in area-based urban regeneration, not the problems experienced by the local people.
  - B. The partnerships attempt to involve all the related factors, but they don't have any experience and the operation itself is quite new.
  - C. The multi-sectoral partnerships is formed at the national level.
  - D. Some people don't like so many sectors be involved in the partnership.
6. In what way shall the participants learn to work together ?
- A. They have to discuss with each other about all the schemes.
  - B. All the participants have to know each others' experiences and difficulties they are facing in the cooperation.
  - C. They have to set aside their own interests and develop a common interest.
  - D. The participants have to tell each other what power relations they had involved in.

## Ex. II Vocabulary in context

- |                 |                    |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1. dimension    | B. being powerful  |
| A. room         | C. being useful    |
| B. size         | D. being wonderful |
| C. length       | 3. alienation      |
| D. weight       | A. change          |
| 2. legitimacy   | B. distinction     |
| A. being lawful | C. uniqueness      |

- D. estrangement
- 4. initiative
  - A. important step
  - B. preparing step
  - C. introductory step
  - D. careful step
- 5. efficient
  - A. effective
  - B. able to bring about the

- result intended
- C. able to work with high speed
- D. able to solve problems
- 6. articulate
  - A. speak obviously
  - B. speak distinctly
  - C. speak differently
  - D. speak directly

# *Unit 2*

## **Cultural Planning for Urban Sustainability**

### **1) The historical trajectory of urban cultural policies in Western Europe**

It is extremely difficult to generalize about the evolution of urban cultural policies in Western Europe, because of the scarcity of comparative research and standardized data, the great diversity in the definitions of “culture” adopted by policy-makers, and other important variations in different national contexts<sup>[1]</sup>— for instance, in the levels of local political and fiscal autonomy, the size and nature of local markets for cultural activity, and the improvement of the private sector in the policy-making process.

Despite these differences both between and within countries, it is possible to outline a common trajectory in the evolution of the arguments used to justify expenditure on urban cultural policies from the end of the Second World War to the 1990s. There are some differences also in terms of periodisation between different countries, but three broad phases can be identified: from the late 1940s to the late 1960s; the 1970s and the early 1980s, and from the mid-1980s to present day. It is important to emphasize, however, that a policy rationale does not neatly replace the previous one with the passage from one historical period to the next. The process is more one of accumulation, with the — often uneasy — coexistence of old and new nationalisms.

### **2) Contribution of contemporary urban cultural policies to sustainable development**

In terms of economic sustainability, it is possible to conclude that the direct impact of urban cultural policies in the 1980s and 1990s on the creation of wealth and employment was relatively small. Their main contribution was in the construction of urban images able to attract visitors. As a complementary factor in the competition between cities and regions, the quality of local cultural

life was also important to appeal to investors and skilled personnel. The use of cultural policy for urban and regional economic development, however, gave rise to policy dilemmas such as those between cultural provision in the city center and in disadvantaged, peripheral neighborhoods, between consumption-oriented strategies and support for local cultural production and innovation, and between investment in buildings and expenditure on events and activities<sup>[2]</sup>.

### **3) Policy dilemmas**

Economic inequities have clear spatial manifestations in many major European cities. New conflicts emerged in the 1980s and 1990s between affluent city center and suburban residents, and low income citizens living in run-down inner city areas and outer housing estates, whose opportunities for participation in the city center's cultural renaissance were seriously undermined by difficulties in physical and economic access<sup>[3]</sup>. These problems applied even to those cities which had most imaginatively and successfully used cultural policy as a strategy for urban regeneration. The quality of life of the residents in Glasgow's peripheral and severely deprived housing estates of Pollok, Drumchapel, Easterhouse and Castlemilk<sup>[4]</sup>, for example, continued to deteriorate at the same time as the city center was being regenerated and revitalized through a variety of cultural initiatives. This fuelled frustration with, and protest against, the 1990's European City of Culture' celebrations, by groups such as "Workers' City" (Boyle and Hughes, 1991)<sup>[5]</sup>.

A second type of spatial dilemma produced by economic development-oriented cultural policy-making is linked to the fact that, as one graffiti in Montreal proclaimed, "artists are the storm-troopers of gentrification"<sup>[6]</sup>. The establishment of certain areas of cities as "cultural districts"— as in Frankfurt's new Museum Quarter — generated gentrification, displaced local residents and facilities, and increased land values, rents, and the local cost of living. These processes ironically drove out many cultural producers, who had been instrumental in the district's designation as "cultural" but could no longer afford to be based there.

Most city governments prioritized, and concentrated resources on, consumption-oriented policies aimed at developing and promoting urban cultural attractions and activities as magnets for tourism, conventions, retailing, hotel

and catering. Where they existed at all<sup>[7]</sup>, policies to support publishing, film, TV, electronic music, design, fashion and, more generally, production skills and infrastructures for the local cultural industries had a relatively minor role in terms of both budgets and status. Such strategic orientation is problematic because the success of consumption-oriented strategies often depend on factors over which cities have very limited control, ranging from airfare prices to changes in the level of the residents' and visitors' disposable income.

One of the legacies of consumption-oriented urban cultural policies is the fact that maintenance costs and loan charges on “flagship” cultural buildings such as museums, art galleries, libraries, concert halls, opera houses and theaters are often so high that they absorb most of the resources available<sup>[8]</sup>. In times of financial stringency city and regional administrations are more likely to curtail revenue funding for those activities which are seen as “marginal”, and often aimed at disadvantaged social groups<sup>[9]</sup> or innovative and experimental in character, than to withdraw money invested in theaters, concert halls and other building-based, traditional arts' institutions. Greater use of public and open spaces, temporary structures and buildings combining culture with other types of activities could have freed up<sup>[10]</sup> resources to fund more innovative, participatory and decentralized cultural activities and projects.

(Franco Bianchini, *City and Culture — Cultural Processes and Urban Sustainability*. in: Louise Nyström & Colin Fudge (ed.). *The Swedish Urban Environment Council, 1999: p34*)

## Vocabulary

accumulation <i>n.</i>	积累, 积聚	catering <i>n.</i>	餐饮业, 宴席承办
affluent <i>adj.</i>	富裕的, 富足的	coexistence <i>n.</i>	共存, (尤指) 和平共处
air-fare prices <i>n.</i>	飞机票价	complementary <i>adj.</i>	补充的, 互补的
appeal <i>v.</i>	恳求, 吸引, 感染	consumption-oriented <i>adj.</i>	消费性指向的
budget <i>n.</i>	财政预算, 经费	contemporary <i>adj.</i>	当代的, 同龄的
<i>v.</i>	制定预算		