

考試科目 Course	專業英文	學級	地政 (一般、在職)	日期 Date, Period	6月10日 第 1 節	試題編號 Course No.
----------------	------	----	---------------	-----------------------	----------------	--------------------

The following short essay is derived from Dowell Myers and Alicia Kitsuse's article(1999)-- "The Debate Over Future Density of Development: An Interpretive Review." Please use Chinese to answer two questions beneath after you have read it:

- 1) Describe the major arguments of this essay and give your comments on it. (50%)
- 2) What are the new urbanists' assertion and how should we achieve it if you agree with their vision? (50%)

In recent years, a social movement has taken root among urban planners, architects and developers. Known as "the new urbanism," this movement extols the virtues of development patterns from an earlier era—especially the 1920s or before—when neighborhoods and communities were built to accommodate humans in a pedestrian friendly manner. The movement expresses a comprehensive vision spanning physical development and social or economic goals. In his assessment, *The New Urbanism: Hope or Hype for American Communities?*, William Fulton identifies three core objectives of the new urbanist movement: strong citizen participation, affordable housing, social and economic diversity. Fulton claims the new urbanists' utopian social ideals can be discerned from their rhetoric. Also discernible is the adherents' palpable distaste for post-1950 automobile-oriented strip development, as much as for its visual clutter as for its low density, anti-pedestrian quality.

The new urbanism represents an historically rooted new vision of compact development. As such it seeks to reverse decades of post-war, sprawl-like development patterns. Fulton projects that the success or failure of the new urbanism will be spelled out over "years or even decades," comparing the amount of time it will take for the new urbanism to substantially alter the (sub)urban landscape to the 50 or so years it has taken for sprawl development to mature. He describes the movement as in its infancy, but does not specify a time period in which the movement would be likely to take off or suggest socio-economic trends that would likely affect accelerated adoption of the new urbanism.

The new urbanists draw their vision of present and future communities from the past. In a recent address, Robert Davis (1998) specifically links new urbanist design principles to city building principles that have been successfully applied for 5000 years. In this sense, the new urbanists are conservative. They believe in making cities conform to "human scale," adapting urban form to human—as opposed to technological—capacities. They cast suburban development as an aberration from centuries of development according to principles of proven effectiveness, arguing that

sprawl has been a fifty-year-long experiment in wretched excess that can be remedied by a return to timeless design principles, as embodied in new urbanist designs.

The restoration of community and the revitalization of the public realm are important components of the new urbanists' vision. The new urbanists emphasize the importance of community, which they claim to facilitate through architecture and urban design. The theory is that higher densities, pedestrianism, shared public spaces, and mixed uses that allow people to meet their needs for services right within their neighborhoods will encourage greater familiarity and bonding with one's neighbors, creating socially vibrant neighborhoods and a feeling of belonging to the place one lives. The new urbanists may be counting on this sense of belonging to restore a sense of civic purpose to society, reorienting people away from the narrow pursuit of individual ends and toward support of the greater public interest.

The essential challenge faced by new urbanism is how to turn the tide of development to resemble their vision. In Fulton's interpretation, the new urbanism pits advocates of a "utopian social ideal" against real estate developers and free marketeers, and other critics who regard the new urbanists as "nostalgia peddlers" and "social engineers unwilling to accept the real preferences of the American consumer." Nevertheless, many developers appear interested in the market possibilities of this new form of compact development.

According to Davis, the new urbanists are opposed to sprawl on an economic, environmental, social and aesthetic basis. Ratcheting up the arguments of compact development proponents, Davis paints a vivid picture of sprawl as an insatiable consumption apparatus, draining life from cities, devouring open space, siphoning precious time off to automobile travel, separating people from one another, and leaving a trail of washed-up neighborhoods and shopping centers in its wake. Commenting that "we have built a world of junk, a degraded environment," Davis appears offended not only by the aesthetics of sprawl, but by what he sees as its implicit endorsement of the disposability of the built environment.

Davis proclaims new urbanists' values of conservation of resources, social and ecological stability as achieved through the ecological principles of complexity and diversity, and long-term return on investment. Reading between the lines, however, one gets the sense that their highest value is the social experience of a vibrant public life, which they hope by their designs to create. Their main objective might be read as an attempt to rejuvenate civic society.

At the foundation of new urbanist philosophy is the assumption that there's a limit to man's capacity to be abstracted from nature, which is violated only at the peril of society. The new urbanists' overarching vision is that of man in harmonious balance with both the natural and built environment. The point of departure for their designs is the "human scale," the scale at which man is able to move comfortably through his environment without reliance on enabling technologies. The new urbanists argue that the balance between man and the environment is best achieved through cities which, in the words of Robert Davis, exhibit "strong centers and clear edges." Such cities will necessarily entail higher levels of density than are common today, in order to preserve nearby open space for common use and protect the diversity of plants and wildlife in large undeveloped areas.

The working values of the ULI members are no doubt somewhat different from their stated values, reflecting developers' need to attend to the bottom line. While the developers evince a growing environmental consciousness borne at least partly out of consumer demand for access to open space amenities, their commitment to promoting civic society and the experience of community substantially lags that of new urbanists. Overall, their objective appears to be to balance building what will sell against what will cause the fewest regulatory hassles and against what will constitute a project they can be proud of. In some cases, it's actually more difficult for them to build new urbanist projects because of red tape surrounding width of streets, setbacks, and so forth. (Changing such policies is a source of agreement between the new urbanists and developers.) In other cases, adherence to new urbanism design criteria may help developers to win regulatory approvals and help them gain entitlements for higher density development. (New urbanism assists with the political marketing of projects.) The biggest dispute seemed to arise over the classic issue of whether design and development can and should influence consumer preferences and behavior.

To date, most new urbanist projects have been new towns on the suburban periphery, but as Calthorpe and Davis note in their ULI addresses, infill projects are more in keeping with the movement's environmental philosophy and should be the primary focus of attention in the future. It's also harder to create the sense of community that's the hallmark of new urbanist projects when you have to start from scratch.

平均地權理論	來源 地政集	日期 Date. Period	6月10日 第一節	試題編 Course
--------	-----------	-----------------------	--------------	---------------

- 一、請就生產要素之差異性，申論對土地課徵土地增值稅之主張。(25分)
- 二、試述李嘉圖與馬克思之地租學說，並以此二學說闡述平均地權理論。(25分)
- 三、試評論「以公告土地現值取代公告地價課徵地價稅，以落實漲價歸公」之觀點。(25分)
- 四、試以中山先生平均地權思想，評述現行平均地權條例之規定。(25分)

一、試述在進行土地估價時，利用傳統的「市場比較法」、「收益還原法」、「重置成本法」與利用計量經濟學中的「唯價格法」，各具有什麼優劣？ 25%

二、試詳述不動產市場是否具有「資訊效率」？ 25%

三、若取消房屋稅，而加重地價稅，對土地利用會有什麼影響？ 25%

四、土地使用分区管制僅准許全市某一部分土地可以開發，因此產生出地租，但該等地租却在管制過程中消失不見，試述其故？ 25%