PUBLIC PARTICIPATION APPROACHES
FOR URBAN PLANNING IN CHINA

Yining Zhang

Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Wisconsin-Madison

04/05/2015

CONTENTS   Section   Page

Front cover: Public participation in urban planning can take many forms. Photo collage: Yining Zhang. Photos: Tencent.com, Shandong Provincial Government, and Environmental Protection Department of Hong Kong.

Executive Summary

In China, the past thirty years witnessed dramatically increasing interest in public participation of policy-makers, practitioners, researchers and the mass public. Many public participation theories were developed, whereas various schools and approaches came with different backgrounds and prerequisites. Despite those passion and prudence, after years of discussion and experiments, public participatory activities in urban planning still remained limited in terms of both substance and style in general. Experience illustrates that the theories as guidance, without an understanding of when and how they work, will not guarantee satisfactory outcomes. This report aims to identify possible approaches of public participation that could be applied to urban planning in China's cities. Three approaches were abstracted according to decision-making power distribution in urban planning process of China; they all have their scopes of application, which are explained and analyzed with some case studies, to provide practical policy suggestions to government officials, planners and other practitioners.

I. Statement of the Issue

1. How we are doing?

Since 1949, the former Soviet Union's model of urban planning system, which hardly include any public participation, was completely adopted in China. In the 1990s, interest conflicts among the public were brought by the growing country's socialist market economy and urban development, while more attention was paid to living environment as a result of improving life quality. People's willingness to take part in urban planning decision making process boosted at that time; government realized former model's limitations, and began to seek new solutions.

In City Planning Law of the People's Republic of China, public participation in urban planning was stipulated in explicit terms; The Measures for Formulating City Planning emphasized public participation, and ensured that citizens should be able to be involved in the whole process. Locally, there are also ordinances regarding public participation, with relatively detailed regulations on participatory process. However there are many differences among the cities—some have refined and adequate instructions, while some have no guidance and are quite unaware of the importance. The regulations on procedures and forms are mostly too simple to act as a useful guide for practitioners, while lack of supervisory resulted to illicit activities. With the improvement of legal environment, in practice, governments of the cities, especially those on the east coastline, made very valuable attempts in the past fifteen years. Citizens took part in many urban planning projects, changed many plans before they were implemented, provided many meaningful suggestions and got accepted in both practice and policy making.

2. Why public participation?

Socialist democracy demonstrates that all power of the nation belongs to the people, and the Constitution guaranteed its people the right to administer state affairs and manage

economic, cultural and social affairs through various channels and in various ways in accordance with the law. Urban planning is a political activity that reflects public interest, and should be an effective way for the citizens to manage the city and protect their interest.

Public participation ensures a positive relationship between government and public by communicating effectively and solving the conflicts in a more gentle way. In many cases when people saw urban planning decisions made without letting them know, they had to act radically, which resulted to potentially explosive situation of the society. Ensuring that a wide variety of opinions are considered will assist the decision makers with understanding the interlinked nature of problems facing the city.

Urban planning is a reflection of ideology and national institution. Public participation means agreement—it greatly enhances political interaction between citizens and government, and enhances the legitimacy of the planning process and the plan itself. A plan would be more effective if a broad coalition supports the proposal and works together to deliver it.

Public participation shows respect to participators' opinion and boost their enthusiasm for citizenship and politics, and strengthen their influence in urban planning and public life. When conflicting claims and views are considered, there is a much higher possibility that public trust and passion increases in the final outcome. This has broader implications for building an active civil society.

3. What problems are we facing?

China has developed many public participatory institutions according to the best practices learned from other countries and the significant theories in the past years, but participation is still weak and inadequate. Well-agreed reasons in academia and public agencies included lack of substantial instructions in laws and regulations, lack of social organization as foundations for involving, the conflict between efficiency and equity, etc.

What had been overlooked, but actually very crucial is that government officials and planners, as practitioners, in most cases decision-makers, do not comprehend the efficacious methods of public participation. Government officials, planners and the public's knowledge on public participation in urban planning is just skin-deep: a list including acknowledgement (*gongshi*), hearing (*tingzheng*), consulting (*zixun*), and seeking comments from the public (*zhengqiu yijian*); however, seldom we could find people who have a systematic understanding of public participation theories and practice. (Sun, 2012) (Zhao & Liu, 2010)

II. Possible Approaches

1. A study to classify

A brief literature review of various public participation related works was conducted to find out possible approaches that may be applied in urban planning in China. This review is organized by a classification of public participation methods based on Arnstein's ladder

theory, Michener's dichotomy approach for third-world countries, and Kingston's six-step ladder. It demonstrates three approaches according to the power distribution between public and government. Considering China's political and socioeconomic environment and some applicability issue, the works cited were carefully selected, not only in classical and mainstream works but also in ones focusing on third world countries; arguments of conflicting positions were also included in the literature. See Appendix I for full text.

2. Three approaches

Theories, some date back to the past decades, some recently demonstrated, were formed in different environment with different insights. The distribution of decision making power could be described as government controlled, jointly controlled and public-controlled.

Government-controlled approach means that government conducts the urban planning process and holds the authority to make the final decision; public remains in a relatively subordinate role from goals setting to implementation. The main purpose of this approach is to promote communication between government and the public. Measures could include survey, information disclosure, consulting, etc. Government aims to gain a better understanding of the situation which the society is facing, and of the public demand, so that it can develop proper and practical planning proposals. This approach focuses on planning techniques—the government and the planning practitioners play a determinate role because they are professional and have the planning-related knowledge and skills. Under this approach, social changes could be relatively mild, while government's attitude toward public participation is usually prudent: public participation is not for changing any framework or the way agencies run, but for building up robust bridges between planners and people involved in the plan, government and mass public, authority and those without authority, to make current relationship solid and secure. That is to say, it stabilizes the society.

Jointly controlled approach stands for a jointly decision making in urban planning. It argues that urban planning proposals should be determined by both public and government; there should be a consensus on current situation, plan objects, subjects, design, even technique, while all stakeholders have equal status with each other. There could be conflicts and disagreements, consultations, negotiations, at which point the government acts as a neutral arbiter and facilitates the negotiation. This approach sets its object as increasing the acceptability of a plan, and emphasizes the character of urban planning as a tool of governance. Urban planning influences people's life; it does not work for a single group of people nor a particular social class, but for the society—it is actually a contract based on different interest, a joint agreement and attempts to reduce the tension by game playing.

In public controlled approaches, public acts as the main conductor of the planning process and holds the ultimate decision making authority without government's intervention. Many experts and scholars expressed their commendation and high expectation on this approach despite that they had hardly seen any practice. Public controlled planning process intends to meet public demand and achieve citizen autonomy. The goal of participation is to create a just output, and a dramatic change, so that the public could be independent of planners.

3. Which one works?

These three approaches could be used in different scenarios respectively according to their advantages and characteristics. Table 1 indicates the three approaches' goals, possible social impacts, advantages and disadvantages and under what kind of scenarios the three could be used. Two cases will be given to explain how different approaches worked in China's urban planning practice.

Table 1. The three public participation approaches and their scopes of application

	Government Controlled	Jointly Controlled	Public Controlled
Decision Making Power	Government's more than public's	Government's equal to public's	Government's less than public's
Goals	Improving the quality of the plans	Increasing the acceptability of the plans	Completely meeting the demands of the public
Social Impacts	Relieve and reduce social conflicts	Solution and settlement of conflicts	Solution and settlement conflicts
Advantages	1) Help develop plans of higher quality 2) Little possibility of lowering decision making efficiency	1) Promote acceptability 2) Reduce backlashes in implementation 3) Reflect more public opinion	1) Completely meet public demands 2) Lower administrative cost
Disadvantages	1) Public not fully involved 2) Public opinion sometimes not effective 3) Limited power reduces public's interest to participate and requires more time and effort	1) Higher possibility of lowering decision making efficiency 2) Difficult to reach agreements among stakeholders 3) Stronger interest groups may intervene too much in the process	1) Some technical details will be less addressed 2) Higher possibility that the interest groups cannot reach agreements 3) Very high possibility of lowering decision making efficiency
Suitable Scenarios	1) Plans with large amount of technical details 2) Plans that does not cause many interest conflicts with interest groups among public	1) Plans with moderate amount of technical details 2) Plans that will cause many interest conflicts	1) Plans with very little technical details 2) Plans with strong impacts and cause

III. Some Cases

1. Government controlled public participation in Shuijing Community, Shenzhen

This is a case where public controlled approach was applied and worked. In 2008, Shenzhen's Urban Planning Board introduced their public participation system, and implemented its "whole process" decision making policy in Shuijing Area planning project. Shuijing had a population of more than 226,000, most of whom lived in urban-villages[1] distributed in seven communities. Shuijing enjoyed a beautiful natural environment, but suffered from poverty, business in shambles and severe living condition. Shenzhen government decided to locate a new passenger transport hub in this area to relieve the traffic stress of the city and boost the economy, and believed it a perfect timing for redevelopment of Shuijing area. Municipal Government and Planning Board commissioned many experts in a consulting company to plan and implement their participation activities. There were two parts: Survey, which was before the drafting, and information disclosure, which is after drafting. Public was not involved in making the final decision.

Table 2 Public Participation in Shuijing Area Planning Process

Procedure	Objects	Channels to participate	
		Short-term Measures	Long-term Platforms
Survey	1. Identify the issues 2. Collect public opinions	1. Questionnaires 2. Public meetings 3. Interviews 4. Consulting	1. mail and email inquiry 2. Hotlines opened 3. Fax accepted 4. Websites and online forums
Information Disclosure	1. Inform public the contents of the proposal 2. Accept feedbacks	1. Questionnaires 2. Complaint boxes	

Source: Shenzhen Municipal Government

In survey part, The staff visited all the community offices, official and unofficial community organizations and local business representatives, spread well-designed questionnaires and interviewed people with questions regarding people's occupation, housing, transportation options, living condition, etc. People's expectation on the new plan was also collected. The surveys took two weeks, during which 87.6% of the 1320 questionnaire sheets were collected. The staff also interviewed 94 residents and 20 managerial members of community offices and estate management offices, and had deep discussions on different aspects of their daily lives, including commute and travel, community sanitation, recreational facilities, education and their comments and expectations on future planning activities. Large-scale community activities were held in which posters, tree of wishes[2], Q&A meetings were used to have a better understanding of public opinion. The participators got many opportunities to talk directly to planners and officials to express their ideas.

---

[1] Urban villages: villages that appear on both the outskirts and the downtown segments of major Chinese cities, surrounded by modern urban buildings and infrastructures, usually inhabited by the poor and immigrants, and are associated with social issues like poverty and overcrowding.

[2] Tree of wishes: a tree on whose branches many pieces of papers or small cards with people's hand-written wishes are hanged, usually used as an attracting tool in collective activities in China.

After a draft proposal was developed by urban planners and got approved by the Planning Board, it was disclosed to public, demonstrated through television, newspapers and internet—here came the information disclosure part. Citizens were able to submit their comments through Secretary Office of the Planning Board in thirty days after disclosure. All the comments were documented and discussed in the Board by professional planners, then classified into "accept" "partly accept" and "deny" according to the results of their discussion. Changes were made to the draft after disclosure period.

This is the first time a city in China develop its own standard public participation mechanism. During the whole process, Shuijing residents had many opportunities to get access to most of the information they needed, with their opinions carefully taken into consideration. An urban redevelopment plan with a transportation hub came with many complex technical details and needs professionals to develop, so the government kept its muscle to control—it conducted all the public participation activities by its agents and itself, and made the final decision on the proposal and implemented it. This proposal received much more favorable comments than other planning projects as a consequence of the reduced interest conflicts and participators' identity that they have contributed and taken seriously.

2. Post-disaster housing reconstruction in Dujiangyan City

An earthquake measuring 8.0 on the Richter scale struck Wenchuan in May, 2008, and caused extensive damage to Dujiangyan City. According to Dujiangyan Post-disaster Reconstruction Office, 81,362 households were affected, in which 4,375 fell down and 28,994 were severely damaged. Dujiangyan Municipal Government planned that 41,000 households, approximately 138,000 people, to be permanently moved to reconstruct housing before 2010. The government tried to understand the substantial demands of the residents with the help of a series of surveys conducted immediately after the earthquake. Table 3 demonstrates the result of demand surveys.

Table 3 Result of Reconstruction Demand Survey

Preparation	Reconstruction	
	Government-led	Independent
		Houses built at original location
Financial aid	Contents of the plans	Diverse housing options
Good communication	Compensation for relocation	Local business re-establish
Temporary housing	Housing supplies	Financial aid needed
Right to participate	Equality and justice	Neighborhood connection
		Balanced interest and equality

Source: Information from Dujiangyan City Post-Disaster Reconstruction Office, created by the author.

Differed from other affected cities, Dujiangyan's reconstructed houses were not only planned by the planning bureau: a considerably large part of the urban plan was conducted by local residents. Government developed a complete and clear process, "Nine-Step Work Plan", to provide instructions for public participation and project management, and paid much attention to protecting local residents' independence considering that their intimate

knowledge of their own community could exceed any urban planner. Dujiangyan government advocated "reconstruct your home" to engage more people into the reconstruction process, respected local residents' interpersonal relationships and social connection, and protected their culture and social identity. Figure 1 is a brief version of the detailed Nine-Step Work Plan translated from Chinese to English. It is worth mentioning that in this plan, government and planning staff shall act only an assistance role and shall not intervene decision-making.

Figure 1 Nine-Step Work Plan for Dujiangyan Reconstruction

1
- Staff investigate current living condition
- Inform all the residents about reconstruction policies

2
- Staff confirm and document reconstruction agreements
- Community offices collects and analyzes all information

3
- Staff help organize public meetings and focus groups
- Collect public opinions and expectations

4
- Staff help establish small leadership groups of residents and future plans, such as budget, timetable, construction quality control, etc.

5
- Govenrment provide options of design institutes to community leadership groups
- Institutes draft reconstruction plan after discussing with leadership groups

6
- Staff help organize general meetings to determine the plan proposal
- Geology investigation starts

7
- Community offices and planning staff applies for funding aids
- Supervisory on finalce and construction quality starts

8
- Reconstruction starts
- Residents provide their part of funds; finish fund raising

9
- Reconstruction completed; residents move in
- Staff assist with legal decuments of the new estates

Source: Information from Dujiangyan City Post-Disaster Reconstruction Office; figure creation and text translation completed by the author.

Post-earthquake reconstruction plan also involves many technical details, but in a post disaster situation, local residents could be helpless and depressed, which can easily result to conflicts and social disorder although reconstruction meets public demands. Dujiangyan government believed it to be very significant if the residents could get confidence and be encouraged by engaging them into urban planning and giving them the authority to make decisions. Planning staff also published specialized ordinance with detailed regulations on

decision-making process, to ensure people's right and authority; they also acted as bridges of communications to make the final result a perfect reflection of public opinion. Such a strategy drew people's approving actions: the Nine-Step Work Plan was implemented smoothly, and the city's reconstruction were completed on time (see Figure 2 and Figure 3).

Figure 2 Figure 3 New Affordable Housing for Post-Disaster Dujiangyan Residents

Source: news.163.com

This is a significant attempt of a transition from traditional government controlled urban planning approach to a jointly controlled, even people controlled approach. Government successfully identified the stakeholders, understood the key issues and demands, assisted and facilitated the important communications with professional guidance, making the planning process legal and efficient. By equally communicate with planners, people once lacked public participation experience gained valuable ability to be civil society members.

IV. More Suggestions

1. Institutions and organizations

It is essential to work on a broader institutional context of public participation process. In China, many constraints are now related to organizational culture of our city governments and planning bureaus, for example, decision makers usually find it difficult to implement the participatory process because it requires a radical change asking government and its agencies to demonstrate a willingness and flexibility to respond. A milder and more practical way to start is to create an active environment that is flexible and open enough to accept advocacies of public participation, which encourages social learning and self-renovation. When Shenzhen and Dujiangyan stepped forward, most citizens in China's cities could hardly find any channel to take part in urban planning; the two cities are opening doors and creating opportunities not only for their people but also for the institutions of themselves.

2. Communication and relationship

The implications of public participation are that governments not only deliver urban planning and development enhancement, but also play a role as contributors to a civil society, including a blueprint of community development, and the civic culture and democracy. In this report, communication is emphasized because a stable and virtuous cycle of trust between stakeholders implies closer relationships and better outcomes. Practitioners should be cautious when there is an imbalance of control among the stakeholders, or an

unreconciled difference in way of thinking, or there is a strong distrust in the participators. Building the capacity to establish and maintain good relationship needs staff training and moreover, attitudinal change, including the provision of incentives for those engaging in participatory and empowering processes. This is also essential for solving long-term and intertwined issues in the cities.

3. Efficiency in planning

There are many concerns about how a city could remain its fast growing speed when having to take a long time to go through its public participation process; this is indeed a problem in China. Public participatory process works best when it is flexible and context-sensitive and iterative, but formal process for ensuring legitimacy and visions is still a required unit. Government and the planners should consider the following points with careful plans and project management skills:

➢ Publish the process with all information complete, understandable and accessible
➢ Include time for reflection and review
➢ Think through, organize and integrate the resources
➢ Handle inputs from other stakeholders
➢ Establish systems/mechanisms for feedback, evaluation and delivery

VI. Conclusions

Public participation approaches can improve urban planning decision-making processes by providing a role for reasoned dialogue between interested parties, while successful participation promotes better urban planning, active citizenship, greater social capital and increased trust in political decisions.

The prerequisite of public participation in urban planning is sharing authority and the public's influence on the process. "Every word count" is not feasible in China's cities now, but it should be required that government and its agencies respond to the public in planning making in proper approaches. Although the three approaches and some best practices were provided in this report, there is no simple model for public participation that can be applied in all, or some generally described circumstances. These approaches require an explicit core that emphasizes power distribution, learning, communication and civil culture. This core influences to what extent should public be engaged, and what approach to choose.

VII. Useful Links and Resources

Chengdu Institute of Planning & Design, Conception Plan for Dujiangyan,
http://www.cdipd.com/pro_chd.aspx?p_id=19&id=109
Shenzhen Urban Planning Official Website, *http://www.sz.gov.cn/cn/xxgk/jggh/*
Urban Planning Board of Shenzhen, *http://www.szpl.gov.cn/szupb/*
Shanghai Tongji Urban Planning & Design Institute-Dujiangyan Campus,
http://www.tjupdi.com/organizational-detail-pW8YYWaA8mA6sik2.aspx

Appendix I. Literature Review

This is a brief literature review of public participation-related works in order to find out possible approaches that may be applied in urban planning in China. This review is organized by a classification of various public participation methods. Considering China's political and socioeconomic environment and some applicability issue, the works cited were carefully selected not only in classical and mainstream works but also in ones focusing on third world countries.

The beginning of public participation research started in the 1960s when S. Arnstein wrote the classic article "A Ladder of Citizen Participation" (Wondolleck, Manring, & Crowfoot, 1996). There were eight levels of participating degree, symbolizing three rugs of the ladder: the lower rungs of manipulative "non-participation", the middle rungs of "token participation", and the top rungs of "partnership", "delegated power" and "citizen control" (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein argued for the public's maximized right of participating based on democratic theories, and identified the substantial difference of to what extent people were involved. However, this categorization failed to distinguish public rights—as Yap argued, those could all be regarded as methods of meeting the public's needs (Yap, 1990). Moreover, Arnstein believed that more rights of public participation would lead to more efficacy, which was criticized by Dorcey and many other scholars, who raised arguments indicating that the efficacy was effected by an approach's adaption to external environment, signifying that the models were no longer linear ones but had turned into gears (Dorcey, 1994).

Kingston proposed a six-step ladder of public participation. There are six rungs from bottom to top, successively, with the lowest step representing no public participation: public right to know, informing the public, public right to object, public participation in defining interests, actors and determining agenda, public participation in assessing consequences and recommending solution, and public participation in final decision (Kingston, 1998). Similarly, Nobre developed a community participation ruler, in which four main degrees of community participation was shown (Liu, 2012).

Among early categorization research, Thornley discussed the revolutionary society and participation based on a political sociology framework (Thornley, 1977). The discussion included how the public would participate under the backgrounds of different social revolution theory, and brought insight to the effects of these participation, which is of great importance but unpractical in urban planning practice because of the unique but limited viewpoint.

Rydin and Pennington's, Webler and Tuler's research in recent years extended Dorcey's idea by setting their own rules of categorizing (Rydin and Pennington, 2000) (Webler & Tuler, 2006), but did not include any contents regarding "citizen control", thus failed to explain those who advocate and practice citizen autonomy planning. Michener referred to the benefit of participation as planner-centered and people-centered, which was succinct enough, but too crude to include the intermediate states.

This literature review is organized by a classification of various public participation methods based on Arnstein's ladder theory, Michener's dichotomy and Kingston's six-step ladder. According to the power distribution between public and government, the decision making power could be government controlled, jointly controlled and public controlled.

This literature review focuses on the contents and characteristics of the three approaches of power distribution, and review each one's representative theories.

1. Government controlled

In this approach, government conducts the urban planning process and holds the authority to make the final decision; public remains in a relatively subordinate role from goals setting to implementation. The main purpose is to promote communication between government and the public; the measures could include survey, information disclosure, consulting, etc. Government aims to gain a better understanding of the situation society is facing, and of the public demand, so that it can develop proper and practical planning proposals. This approach focuses on planning techniques—the government and the planning practitioners play a determinate role because they are professional and have the planning-related knowledge. Under this approach, social changes could be mild, while government's attitude toward public participation is usually prudent: public participation is not for changing any framework or the way agencies run, but for building up robust bridges between planners and people involved in the plan, government and mass public, authority and those without authority, to make the current relationship solid and secure. That is to say, public participates for abating social conflicts resulted from the lack of decision making right so that it stabilizes the society.

One of the representative theories is featured in the renowned Skeffington Report. The Skeffington Committee appointed in 1968 by the government of Great Britain looked at the ways of involving wider public in the formative stages of local development planning; the recommendations came with a commitment to public participation in planning, and were embodied in the Town and Country Planning Act of 1968 (Levin & Donnison, 1969). Main recommendations of the report include but are not limited to:

'People should be kept informed throughout the preparation of a structure or local plan for their area.'

'Representations should be considered continuously… there should be set pauses to give a positive opportunity for public reaction and participation… Where alternative courses are available, the authority should put them to the public and say which it prefers and why.'

'Local planning authorities should consider convening meetings in their area for the purpose of setting up community forums…'

'The public should be told what their representations have achieved or why they have not been accepted.'

'People should be encouraged to participate…' (The Skeffington Committee, 1968)

The most important recommendations are to convene community forums and to appoint community development officers to secure the involvement. This will urge local officials to deepen their understanding of community members' interest and stress, and the

community's social structure; inform the public of professional obstacles of urban planners and the of the complexity of a planning project. It helps to reduce potential backlashes and improve government's working efficiency.

Rosser referred to Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organization when discussing public participation—the latter established a grand network of community consulting. With each consulting project covering about 150,000 population, the network gave complete coverage of the Calcutta Metropolitan District. Social surveys were conducted, the result of which contributed to the preparation and implementation of each development proposal and plan (Rosser, 1970). This approach advocates for establishing a consensus in the society rather than eliminating social conflicts, it helps to gain public's support instead of backlashes. The network staff were not distributed to reallocate the authority but to take advantage of local resources and bring the scattered authority together to foster the proposed plan.

Similar with Arnstein's argument, Pun regards public participation as a way to promote the communications between planners and the public. His argument of limited public participation was formed in the 1980s when Hong Kong economy boosted into prosperity in a rapid pace. He argued that Hong Kong's public participation approaches, such as planning council consisted with citizens and public presentations, was inadequate, but also admitted the huge possibility that larger extent of public participation might have adverse impact on decision making efficiency. The fast growing city could not afford any delay in development projects, thus restricting public participation from enlarging and deepening was necessary. Government's authority to make the final decision should be kept under this circumstance. This de facto paternalism maintains a common value through decision making process, and gains legitimacy for government's planning practice.

2. Jointly controlled
This approach stands for a jointly decision making process in urban planning. It argues that urban planning proposals should be determined by both public and government; there should be common understanding on current situation, objects, urban design, even technical details, while all stakeholders have equal status with each other. There could be conflicts and disagreements, consultations, negotiations, at which point the government acts as a neutral arbiter and facilitate the negotiation. This approach sets its object as increasing the acceptability of a plan, and emphasizes the character of urban planning as a tool of governance. Urban planning can influence people's life; it does not work for a single group of people of a particular social class, but for a whole society—it is actually a contract based on different interest, a joint agreement. Substantially, it attempts to reduce the tension by game playing; the tension is usually resulted from interest conflict.

Advocate-processing planning suggests that planning process should have citizens participating, being heard and "well informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals, and be able to respond to them in the technical language of professional planners" (Davidoff, 1965). Professional planners work on behalf of different interest groups like lawyers representing clients; they advocate for their proposals, and disclose the

disadvantages of other plans, with planners' or clients' ideal. Planners provide information, analyze current situation, simulates the future, and design the plans. Advocating process provides the opportunity of fully conveying the opinions to all groups, hence once the plan is decided it becomes an agreement, or a de facto contract, the implementation will run with less backlash. Davidoff's approach guaranteed the public a positive and significant role to play, and could end government's monopoly in urban planning; it allows the society to adjust resource allocation in a legal framework, and prevents the conflicts from harming the society.

Our Common Future by WCED reported that enforcing the common interest needs the law, the community knowledge and support and access to information, while public participation 'is best secured by decentralizing the management of resources upon which local communities defend, and giving these communities an effective say over the use of these resources'. It will also require 'promoting citizens' initiatives, empowering people's organizations, and strengthening local democracy' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Agenda 21, also an official United Nations document, advocated the similar idea of promoting public participation. It looked 'the broadest public participation' as a prerequisite of realizing sustainable development, with 'mechanisms to facilitate the involvement of concerned individuals, groups and organizations in decision-making at all levels' (United Nations Sustainable Development, 1992). These two both emphasizes cooperation and communication, and requires broad engagement and public's right to take part in decision making. The object is to mobilize and integrate different parties to achieve the goal of sustainable development; planners should preserve ecology and natural resources while protecting stakeholders' interests at the same time.

Healey and Innes clearly demonstrated communicative planning theory in their works. Communicative planning searches for 'shared values' in planning practice, and takes many forms of which collaboration, persuasion, learning, mediation, negotiation and bargaining are essential ingredients (Healey, 1998). It seeks a multilateral cooperation mode formed with government, developers and planners, and shows greater respect to public's interests. The final result of the urban plan may not be an optimized one, but one that can satisfy all the involved parties; it encourages tolerance and pluralism, stresses the legitimacy of planning process and reduces potential interest conflicts.

3. People controlled
In people controlled approaches, public acts as the main conductor of the planning process and holds the ultimate decision making process without government's intervention. Many experts and scholars expressed their commendation and high expectation despite the fact that they had hardly seen any practice. People controlled planning process intends to meet public demand and achieve citizen autonomy.

A representative theory was raised by Goodman, who expressed his strong unsatisfactory on Davidoff's advocacy planning. In his book *After the Planners*, he discussed the example of Baltimore's highway construction and argued that it should be attributed to the weakness of

jointly-controlled planning approach. His solution is "liberation": Citizens should have the right to make urban plans and implement them; they act as users of the environment, who know how built environment should built, better than any other parties, thus they should be able to design by their own. (Goodman, 1972) The goal of participation is no longer (the planners') better understanding the public, but to create "a just output", and a change so that the public could be independent of planners. Goodman's advocacy was, in essence, to replace the supervision role of government under representative democracy with participators in a community level, thus, to integrate government and citizen society; citizens control the production and distribution of products and resources based on their demand with autonomous decision making process.

Friedmann and Weaver also criticized the government-controlled decision making process, and argued that autonomy would be the best method for public participation. (Friedmann & Weaver, 1979) In their argument, public's policy preference plays a more important role than planners' judgement does, while three demands of human should be met: the demand of fundamental materials for lives, of collective lifestyle and wellbeing, and of personal preference without the intervention of collective preference. The significance of planning is not the final result but the process of planning, which in fact should be "a process to control their own destiny", therefore the public gains social power through the planning process and change the social structure and the planning process revolutionarily, with their standard becoming the ultimate one, and the gap between planning professionals and non-professionals eliminating. This method is regarded as an attempt as a result of not being able to eliminate social conflicts.

Souza regarded "autonomy" as the main parameter for the evaluation of processes and strategies for positive social change when trying to contribute to operationalization of autonomy in urban planning and development (Souza, 2000). According to this idea, the plans' being decided by the public is a "most democratic" way for achieving social justice and improving citizen's life quality. Later, Kapp and Baltazar deepened the concept of "liberation" by identifying "autonomy" and "participation" as different concepts, and provided plausible thoughts on organizational arrangement in public participation process. They also believe that the collective power will help build the city and the community freely and achieve urbanization.

Appendix II. Tables and Figures

Appendix III. Works Cited

Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *American Instituteof Planners, 35*(4), 216-224.

Cai, D. (2009). Public Participation in Urban Planning. In D. Cai, *Public Participation: Constructing a Framework for the "Risk Society"* (pp. 133-179). Beijing: Law Press.

Damer and Hague. (1971). Public Participation in Planning: A Review. *The Town Planning Review, 42*(3), 217-232.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. *Journal of American Institute of Planners, 31*(4), 331-338.

Dorcey, A. H. (1994). *Public Involvement in Government Decision-making : Choosing the Right Model.* B.C. Round Table on the Environment and the Economy.

Friedmann, J., & Weaver, C. (1979). *Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning.* London.

Goodman, R. (1972). *After the Planners.* Simon and Schuster.

Healey, P. (1998). Collaborative Planning in a Stakeholder Society. *The Town Planning Review, 69*(1), 1-21.

Innes, J. (1999). Information in Communicative Planning. *American Planning Association, 64*(1), 52-63.

Kingston, R. (1998). Web Based GIS for Public Participation Decision Making in the UK. *National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis.* Santa Barbara, CA.

Levin, P., & Donnison, D. (1969). People and Planning. *Public Administration, 47*(4), 473-480.

Liu, W. (2012). Lecture on Public Participation in Public Policy. *Personal Collection of Wei Liu*.

Michener, V. J. (1998). The Participatory Approach: Contradiction and Co-option in Burkina Faso. *World Development, 26*(12), 2105-2118.

Rosser, C. (1970). Action Planning in Calcutta: The Problem of Community Participation. *Journal of Development Studies, 6*(4), 121-139.

Rydin and Pennington. (2000). Public Participation and Local Environmental Planning: the collective action problem and the potential of ciaial capital. *Local Environment, 5*(2), 153-169.

Souza, M. L. (2000). Urban Development on the Basis of Autonomy: a Politico-philosophical and Ethical Framework for Urban Planning and Management. *Ethics, Place & Environment, 3*(2), 187-201.

Sun, S. (2012). Public Participation in Urban Planning. *Urban Planning International*, 1-14. Retrieved 2015

Sun, S., & Yin, Y. (2004). The Evolution of the Basic Theories of Public Participation in Urban Planning in Western COuntries. *International Urban Planning, 15*(1).

The Skeffington Committee. (1968). *People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning (The Skeffington Committee Report).* Great Britain.

Thornley, A. (1977). Theoretical Perspectives on Planning Participation. *Progress in Planning, 7*, 1-57.

United Nations Sustainable Development. (1992). *United Nations Conference on Environment & Development.* Rio de Janerio, Brazil: United Nations. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf

Webler, T., & Tuler, S. (2006). Four Perspectives on Public Participation Process in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making: Combined Results from 10 Case Studies. *The Policy Studies Journal, 34*(4), 699-722.

Wondolleck, J. M., Manring, N. J., & Crowfoot, J. E. (1996). Teetering at the top of the ladder: the experience of citizen group participants in alternative dispute resolution processes. *Sociological Perspectives, 39*(2), 249-262.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future.* United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf

Yap, N. T. (1990). Round the Peg or Square the Hole? Populists, Technocrats and Environmental Assessment in Third World Countries. *Impact Assessement, 8*(1-2), 69-84. doi:10.1080/07349165.1990.9726029

Zhao, M. and Liu, J. (2010). Social claims and Institutional Guarantee in Public Participation of Urban Planning. *Urban Planning Forum*(3), 81-86.