

市场的力量： 景观和经济

The Power of the Market: Landscape and Economics

翻译 Translated by / 孙一鹤 Robin SUN
校对 Proofread by / 田乐 Tina TIAN



西蒙·贝尔 Simon BELL
爱沙尼亚生命科学大学景观设计系教授、系主任
Professor and Head of Department of Landscape Architecture,
Estonian University of Life Sciences

前言

随着资本全球化，市场经济成为影响生活方方面面的主导性因素之一，它对景观的影响值得反思。市场经济与特定的 治模式或 治体制间没有必然联系，因而在很多方面它形成了一个调节社会各阶层商品 务交换的独立自我体系。当市场趋于通过价格体系进行操控，很多不能以货币形式进行量化的商品和 务，即可被称为“不具有市场成本和收益”。从景致的意义层面来说，景观所体现出的审美价值即属于该范畴。如果一片土地归特定的某人或某组织所有，但同时该景观——正如其定义，景观是一个可以为人们所感知的区域^[1]——又属于所有人，这就随即为我们带来了一个需要克 的潜在问题。土地可以被买卖，而买卖的重要原因之一是改变它的用途，在任何城市化区域中，农业用地被改作

开发用地的例子随处可见。因此，由市场引发的土地利用类型的变化会导致景观的改变，尽管景观设计师或规划师会参与到特定的开发中，但只有当市场具有一定的规范性或通过好的景观规划和设计获得额外的货币价值，这种改变才能得到保障。

值得反思的是，纵观历史，只有个别国家的小部分土地是经过规划或设计的，而在其他大部分区域，经济决策在任何市场经济中都扮演着重要角色。因此，期望景观设计师或规划师能在很大程度上影响景观变化是不现实的，除非他们密切参与到有助于确保货币价值得以实现的行动中来。然而，在货币经济之外存在着大范围的不具有市场成本和效益的事物，仍然影响着我们所有人。以货币形式来计算这些价值的尝试是充满困难且极具争议的，但是这代表了努力使货币经济所主宰的权力

摘要 / 经济，作为供求的中介，无疑是当今致使景观发生改变的最大动因之一。为了满足住房、商品和服务等需求——这些需求易受经济周期、社会失衡和时尚变换的影响——需要土地，需要资源，还需要人力，这些人经常离开生活所在地，前往他处工作。这就体现出了市场所具有的巨大力量。这种情况在先进成熟的资本主义经济中可能会更为平衡和规范，而在发展中的后社会主义或后计划经济条件下平衡性和规范性则相对较差，景观设计师不认同任何以货币形式来衡量审美或美感等无形事物的价值的行为，这也许是不言自明的。但在西方国家，市场和经济一直扮演着重要角色，只是人们可能尚未充分认识到这一点；景观可能具有价值，但是不一定能以货币的形式量化。通过市场来表现经济意味着——例如——土地利用类型从自然用地转为开发用地，这通常会产生负面效应，那么，这就忽略了一个要点：好的景观和好的景观设计会受到市场影响，也会反作用于市场。

关键词 / 市场经济；景观动态；非市场效益；产值

Abstract / It is indisputable that one of the biggest drivers of landscape change today is economics as a mediator of supply and demand. In order to satisfy demand for houses, goods and services, which are susceptible to economic cycles, social imbalances and the vagaries of fashion, land is needed, resources are needed and people are also needed, often in different places from where they live. Thus the market has great power. This is perhaps more balanced and regulated in advanced and mature capitalist economies and less so in developing post-socialist or post-planned economic conditions. It is also perhaps axiomatic that landscape architects consider any attempt to value such intangible things as aesthetics or beauty in monetary terms as undesirable. However, the market and economics has always played a role in Western countries, perhaps it is just not fully recognized; landscapes may have values but these are not always monetarized. When the assumption is that economics expressed through the market means land use change from natural to developed conditions, for example, and thus always a negative direction, this misses the point that good landscape and good landscape design can affect and be affected by the market.

Key words / Market Economy; Landscape Dynamics; Non-market Benefits; Property Values

Introduction

As globalised capitalism and the market economy becomes one of the dominating factors affecting all aspects of life everywhere, it is worth reflecting on its effects on the landscape. The market economy is not necessarily linked to specific political models or systems, so that in many ways it forms an independent and self-organized system mediating the exchange of goods and services at all levels of society. While the market tends to operate through the system of prices, many goods and services are not monetized and can be described as non-market costs and benefits. Landscape in the sense of scenery expressed as an aesthetic value tends to be one of these. If we consider the fact that land is owned by someone or some organization but that the landscape — in its definition as an area as perceived by people^[1] — belongs to us all, then immediately we have a potential problem to overcome. Land can be bought and sold and one of the main reasons for doing this is to change its use from, for example, agriculture to a developed state, as we see in any urbanizing region. So market driven land use change results in landscape change and while landscape architects or planners may be involved in a particular development, this is not guaranteed unless there is some regulation of the market or where there is added monetary value to be gained by good landscape planning and design.

It is worth reflecting on the fact that throughout history only a very small proportion of the surface area of a particular country has ever been planned or designed and that, for the most part, economic decisions have played a major role in any market economy. Thus it is unrealistic to expect that landscape architects or planners are ever going to affect major landscape changes on a significant scale unless their role is intimately involved in helping to generate value which can be monetised. There is, however, the wide range of non-market costs and benefits which lie outside the monetary economy but which nevertheless affect us all. Attempts to calculate value in monetary terms for these can be difficult and controversial but may represent one route to try to rebalance the power relations dominated by the monetary economy. For many people, landscape

architects included, any attempt to ascribe a value to aesthetic pleasure, beauty or scenery is seen as some sort of betrayal of higher values and that to reduce the purity of beauty to filthy dollars or euros is misguided. Colin Price, an economist who has studied landscape and economics, recalls how the famous landscape architect Dame Sylvia Crowe equated economists with philistines^[2].

One aspect which also needs to be considered is that many mature land markets are quite regulated through instruments such as planning and zoning laws. In markets which have emerged in countries undergoing transitions such as from socialist to capitalist systems there is often an overreaction to the straightjacket of planned economies and an over-compensation towards extreme unregulated liberal market conditions. In addition, a number of countries have clear land use change regulatory mechanisms but these are only weakly enforced due to the power of certain actors in the system^[3].

Market Dynamics and the Dynamic Landscape

One of the useful models for understanding the impact of external forces on a given environment is the so-called

1. 图为波兰华沙市郊地带一片农业用地中的自主开发住宅区。这类由住房需求引起的投机开发受规划框架的控制影响较小，且缺乏足够的交通及包括学校在内的 务设施配套建设。这类开发将导致城市的进一步扩张。© Miroslaw Grochowski
1. An area of housing development set by itself in an agricultural area on the outskirts of Warsaw in Poland. This type of speculative development driven by demand for housing but within a framework of weak planning controls is without adequate transport links or services such as schools. It leads to major sprawl. © Miroslaw Grochowski





2. 图为在苏格兰规划系统影响下涌现的一种典型的城郊住宅开发类型。住宅后方是一片广阔的林地，其作为规划获批条 之一，即开发商需为当地社区提供一种休闲资源——这是“开发收益”法规的一个案例。这片林地的出现同时提升了该区域的魅力，吸引购买者前来，并提升了房价。© Simon Bell
3. 英格兰默西地区森林鸟瞰图。这种原工业用地景观修复工程有助于增添区域魅力，吸引投资。© Mersey Forest
2. A typical suburban housing development built within a strong planning system in Scotland. The area of trees visible behind the houses is part of an extensive woodland which was given to the local community for their benefit as a recreational resource by the developer as part of the conditions of planning permission — this is an example of so-called “development gain”. The presence of the woodland also increases the attractiveness of the area for buyers and has an effect on house prices. © Simon Bell
3. An aerial view of the Mersey Community Forest in England where the kind of landscape restoration work on old industrial areas helps to make the region attractive to inward investment. © Mersey Forest

关系达到平衡的一种途径。对包括景观设计师在内的很多人而言，任何试图将美的享受、美感或美景标上价码的做法都是被更高尚的价值观所嗤之以鼻的，并认为肮脏的美元或欧元会玷污美的纯粹性——这些认知是错误的。曾对景观和经济有所研究的经济学家科林·布莱斯回忆道，著名的景观设计师戴姆·西尔维娅·克罗就曾将经济学者比作非利士人（俗人）^[2]。

需要注意的另一个方面是，通过诸如规划和分区法规等措施，很多成熟的土地市场已然非常规范。在那些正在经历例如从社会主义向资本主义体系转变的国家中，其市场通常会对计划经济束缚作出过度反应，也会对极端不规范的自由市场状况进行过度补偿。此外，一些国家已拥有明确关于更改土地利用类型方面的法律机制，但是由于体系中某些角色的力量，这些机制的执行力度较弱^[3]。

市场动态与动态景观

了解外部力量对既定环境影响的有效模型之一为DPSIR模型，即驱动力（Drivers）-压力（Pressure）

-状态（State）-影响（Impact）-响应（Response），该过程为一种周期模式^[4]。本质上，它可以被理解为通过对一个体系实施压力来驱动改变的一组因素。这些压力引起状态（在我们的案例中，“状态”指环境或景观）的改变，导致某种影响——比如生活品质——的产生，并需要一个响应。这个响应可能是策或法规响应，抑或为纠正已经出现的过错而做出的市场调节。其中，驱动力可以根据PESTLE因素进行分类，即 治（Political）、经济（Economic）、社会（Sociological）、技术（Technological）、法律（Legal）和环境（Environmental）因素^[5]。显然，这些因素之间相互关联，而经济因素对所有领域而言都是最为重要的因素之一。在此，经济因素可涵盖整个经济范畴，包括经济增长率，就业/失业率，诸如能源、石油及钢铁等原材料价格，利率和货币 策，汇率和通货膨胀率等。这些因素在不同国家也不尽相同，并受市场周期的影响。举例来说，房地产的繁荣与萧条对城市边缘地区有巨大影响，例如，导致以上地区的土地利用类型变更频率通常很高。既然我们谈到了市场经济及其力量，我们就需要思考其运行原理。作为一种供求中介，以及在竞争需求间稀有资源的有效配置者，传统经济学家也许将认为，基于土地的产品和 务的市场需求在某种程度上会对土地利用类型的变更造成影响。

因此景观改变是一个在纷繁复杂、交错相连的体系中由很多因素共同决定的整体结果，这个体系中的市场可能是规范的，也可能缺乏规范性。我们需要思考的一个方面是，是否在所有案例中景观改变都是一 坏事？随着城市化的稳定推进和人口从贫穷的（但当地很可能风景如画）农村地区向城市迁移以追寻更好的生活，这很容易令人们认为，城市扩张所到之处都是丑陋而退化之地，存在从卫生条 堪忧到棚屋住房、高犯罪率及普遍贫穷等诸多消极方面。同样，废弃的农村地区很可能人口日渐稀少，文化特性丧失，房屋变为废墟，珍贵的草地杂木丛生，这使得该地区的景观品质和多样性大打折扣。大规模市郊化令人们在交通上更为依赖汽车，这会导致景观破碎化，以及缺乏特征或特色的低密度开发的蔓延。在缺水地区开发休闲别墅和高尔夫球场等需要灌溉的项目是景观改变的另一种形式，专业人士认为这与可持续发展背道而驰^[6]。然而，这些显然全部都是由市场主导的响应，满足了人们想要生活在他们认为可以

DPSIR model: Drivers-Pressure-State-Impact-Response which operates in a cycle^[4]. In essence this is understood as a set of factors which drive change by applying pressures to a system. These pressures cause a change of state (in our case to the environment or landscape), which leads to some kind of impact on, for example, quality of life, and requires a response. The response may be a policy or regulatory response or else it might be a market adjustment to correct a failure which has arisen. The drivers can be classified as PESTLE Factors — Political, Economic, Sociological, Technological, Legal and Environmental factors^[5]. Clearly, these are interlinked and economic factors are one of the most important in all areas. Economic factors represent the wider economy so may include economic growth rates, levels of employment and unemployment, costs of raw materials such as energy, petrol and steel, interest rates and monetary policies, exchange rates and inflation rates. These may also vary from one country to another and are affected by market cycles which have led to, for example, property booms and busts which have massively affected the landscape in urban fringe areas, for example, where land-use dynamics are often greatest. As we are speaking about the market economy and its power, we need to think how this operates. As a mediator of supply and demand and the efficient allocation of scarce resources amongst competing wants, economists of the classical variety will probably argue that market demand for products and services dependant on land in some way is what affects land use change.

Thus landscape change is a result of a whole host of decisions made by many actors in a complex and interlinked system where the market may or may not be regulated. One aspect we need to think about is whether landscape change is a bad thing in all cases. With the steady advance of urbanisation and migration of people from impoverished (but possibly highly picturesque) rural areas to cities in search of a better life it is easy to argue that the resulting urban sprawl is an ugly and degrading place with many negative aspects ranging from inadequate sanitation to shanty housing, high crime levels and general poverty. Equally, in the abandoned

rural areas which may become depopulated and lose their cultural qualities, where houses become ruins and forests take over valuable meadows there is clearly a loss of landscape quality and diversity. Large-scale suburbanisation facilitated by high dependency on cars for transport can lead to landscape fragmentation and the spread of low density development lacking identity or character. The development of retirement villas and golf courses which need irrigation in areas with water shortages are another type of landscape change which professionals concerned with sustainability find unacceptable^[6]. Yet these are all clearly market driven responses to demands by people — to live in a place where they have a better quality of life as they see it. The landscape is a by-product of these activities and for the poorest it is a luxury way down on their list of priorities.

To take an alternative view of the above examples, it could also be argued that urban sprawl, low density development in leafy suburbs, luxury houses on large plots, safe neighbourhoods and well-maintained communal landscapes (designed by landscape architects perhaps) are what many people aspire to and work hard to achieve and that this landscape is attractive in its own way to a certain (large) market sector. Equally, Mediterranean villas with golf courses by the sea, year round sun and cheaper living costs provide a great quality of life for retired Northern Europeans and the enormous growth in this sector fed a



获得更高生活品质的地方的需求。景观是这些活动的副产品，而对于极度贫困者来说，景观是他们生活中最无关痛痒的一种奢侈品。

我们换一种角度来看上述这些例子，则会发现，随着城市的扩张，在林木茂密的郊区中的低密度开发，建造于大片土地上的豪华别墅，安全的社区及精心维护的公共景观（可能经由景观设计师设计）是很多人的渴望，也是他们努力工作想要实现的目标，景观以其独有的方式吸引着一类特定（而广大）的市场族群。同样，沿海而建的设有高尔夫球场的地中海别墅，常年阳光普照，生活成本低廉，为退休的北欧人提供了高品质生活，该领域的巨大增长（2008年经济危机前）曾为市场注入了一股强劲的力量。丽萨·泰维 和安蒂·米耶蒂的研究表明，一个具有吸引力的景观——四周绿荫环绕的住宅区域——在其他条 相同的情况下，会提升房地产价格^[7]。因而我们可以认为，开发商乐于提供具有吸引力的景观作为房屋配套设施的一部分。很多进一步研究得到了同样的结果，包括张彪等在北京的研究^[8]。实际上，开发商可以将高品质景观设计更好地纳入他们的方案之中，但是景观在对房屋及周边区域形成吸引力的同时，可能由于未在更大范围内考虑价格因素而导致更多的问题，比如对交通的影响、生态系统碎片化和对如公路和商业中心等其他基础设施的需求。

证明这一论点的困难之处在于任何经济模式中都有成本和收益，同时资产市场受供求关系支配，由于没有考虑到整体经济平衡，外部效应产生的很多不利影响则会由社会其他领域承担，或者遗留给下一代。因此，规范的市场更容易考虑到更大范围的利益。常见的一种解决方式是采用“开发收益”概念，当建造一个会引起土地价值显著增长的开发项目——住宅或商业类项目——时，作为获得许可的附加条 之一是开发商要提供一定的公共福利设施，比如公园、娱乐场地和大量绿地等。在英国，这一规定已由法律保障实施，并会带来真正意义上的改变，这就是现今为人所知的《社区基础设施征收费草案》（颁布于2012-DCLG）^[9]——尽管这些资金并不全部用于景观建设。

景观是投资和经济收益的催化剂

上文的讨论在聚焦于不规范市场对于景观的消极影响的同时，也关注景观如何帮助一个地区吸引公司进

驻，并拉动外来投资。英国、德国、美国和西欧等地已呈现经济衰退之势，很多景观或不断退化，或沦为棕地。这些地区对国际公司而言并不具有吸引力，哪怕为其提供拨款、减税等财 鼓励措施也不济于事。其中部分原因是这些公司所引进的技术人员希望在赏心悦目的环境中生活。随着主要工业的衰退，为了改善环境，英国提出围绕主要工业或原工业大都市群开发“社区森林”的项目。这些项目已经进行了20余年，通过种植树木等多种举措从实质上提高了环境品质^[10]。作为社区森林之一，默西地区出具的有关绿色基础设施的经济效益报告显示，通过运用一系列工具或测试以获取若干价值，经济增长和投资便是其中之一^[11]。

那些意在吸引不同收入形式的项目，比如通过旅游，也有机会运用景观获得经济回报。地中海海岸和古代文明奇迹的开发明显体现了这一点，不但如此，对原有的工业地区或城市边缘地带进行的景观修复项目也能获得成功。比如中国杭州西溪湿地项目，通过对湿地区域进行保护和重建，使其成为吸引游客的游览胜地，并由此创造收入和价值^[12]。

结论

本文仅对市场的力量，以及与景观相关的经济作用进行了浅谈。我虽然并非经济学家——曾对经济有过一定的学习（实际上师从科林·布莱斯）——但我本身并不反对用经济来衡量景观。在这个金钱至上的世界中，当开发商因缺乏对景观的敏感度，在追求短期利益所能带来的巨额利润的过程中忽略了景观的重要价值，那么就可能有必要向他们证明，在景色和审美感官层面而言，景观是一种商品，其价值应由人们来评定（而非由钱来衡量）——即便人们不能直接为之买单，也能享受到这种商品带来的益处。如果有证据能够表明通过资产市场，景观和货币价值之间具有直接相关性，那就更容易理解了。如果在不考虑外部因素的情况下，市场的一个或多个方面无法奏效，那么公共手段就会被用来规范市场，以保障公众利益。虽然土地归某个人所有，但景观属于我们所有人。如果我们拒绝参与，对于经济和市场的忽略将导致我们面临失去更多东西的风险。事实上，市场无处不在——每当我们为了欣赏美景而搬家或到风景秀美的名胜度假时，我们也就成为了市场的一部分。LAF

strong market at the time (before the 2008 crisis). Research by Liisa Tyrväinen and Antti Miettinen has demonstrated that an attractive landscape — greener surroundings to housing areas — has positive impacts on house prices^[7], all other things being equal, so one should think that developers would be motivated to provide attractive landscapes as part of the housing package. Many further studies have demonstrated similar effects, including one by Biao Zhang, et al in Beijing^[8]. The fact is that developers may well incorporate high quality landscape design into their schemes but this landscape, while attractive at the scale of the house and its immediate environments may cause wider problems not factored into the price at larger scales, such as the impact on traffic, ecosystem fragmentation and the need for other infrastructure such as roads and shopping centers.

The difficulty with this argument is that in any economic model there are costs as well as benefits and while the

property market is subject to the laws of supply and demand. Many disbenefits arise from externalities which are not factored into the full economic equation and are borne by other sectors of society or are deferred to future generations. Thus a regulated market is more likely to enable a wider range of interests to be taken into account. One approach commonly used is the concept of “development and gain”, when, as part of the permission given to construct a development — housing or commercial — which will result in a significant increase in the value of the land, conditions are placed on the developer to provide certain public amenities such as parks, play areas and plenty of green elements. In the UK there is legislation to ensure that this happens and it can make a real difference — it is now known as the *Community Infrastructure Levy* (announced in 2010-DCLG)^[9] — although not all of the funds go to landscape.

4. 杭州西溪湿地的景观保护在吸引观光客前来游览的同时，也促进了当地经济增长。© Hanjia Design Group, Hangzhou Landscape Architecture Design Institute
4. The preservation of a landscape of the Xixi Wetlands in Hangzhou has been used to draw tourists and increase the local economy. © Hanjia Design Group, Hangzhou Landscape Architecture Design Institute



Landscape as a Catalyst for Investment and Economic Gain

While the discussion above focuses on the negative effects of the unregulated market on landscape, the other side of the argument is how landscape can help to make an area attractive for companies to move to and so to catalyse inward investment. In places where industrial decline has been a feature, such as the UK, Germany, the USA, Eastern Europe and so on, many landscapes deteriorated or became dominated by brownfields. As places for international companies to invest they were not very attractive, even if financial incentives such as grants and tax breaks were provided. In part this is because companies may wish to attract skilled workers who want to live in an attractive environment. In the UK this was addressed by developing projects such as “Community Forests” around major industrial or former-industrial conurbations in order to improve the environment following the decline of major industries. These projects have been going for over 20 years and have substantially increased the environmental quality through tree planting among other activities^[10]. A report commissioned by one of the Community Forests, Mersey, on the economic benefits of green infrastructure used a number of tools or tests to capture a range of values, of which economic growth and investment was one^[11].

Projects aimed at attracting different forms of income such as from tourism are also opportunities for using landscape to generate economic gain. These may seem obvious such as exploiting the Mediterranean coastline or the wonders of ancient civilizations but even landscape restoration projects in former industrial areas or on urban fringes can be used successfully. One example in Hangzhou in China is the Xixi wetlands project used to preserve and restore a wetland area and also to make it attractive as a place for tourists to visit and so to generate income and value^[12].

Conclusions

This paper has merely scratched the surface of the area of the power of the market and the role of economics in

relation to the landscape. I am not an economist although I have studied it to some extent (under Colin Price in fact) and I am myself not against attempts to try to value it. Money talks and while there are developers insensitive enough to ignore important landscape values in the short term interest of making big bucks, it may be necessary to be able to demonstrate that landscape in its scenic or aesthetic sense is a good which is valued by people and that while they may not pay directly for it they do get benefits. If it can be shown that there are in fact direct ways of linking landscape to monetary values via the property market, then so much the better. If the market fails in one or more ways by not taking externalities into account then the public hand should be used to regulate the market and to ensure that public good is obtained. While the land is owned by someone landscape is owned by us all. By ignoring economics and the market we risk losing much more than if we refuse to engage with it. In fact there is no escape and we are part of the market for landscape every time we move house or take a holiday to a beautiful destination. **LAF**

REFERENCES

- [1] Council of Europe. (2000). European Landscape Convention.
- [2] Price, C. (2011). Valuing the view in Bell, S., Sarlov Herlin, I. and Stiles, R. (Eds). (2011). Exploring the boundaries of landscape architecture. Abingdon: Routledge.
- [3] Tosics, I. (2012). Sustainable Land Use in Peri-Urban Areas: Government, Planning and Financial Instruments. Nilsson, K., Pauleit, S., Bell, S., Aalbers, C., Nielsen, S. (Eds). Peri-urban futures: Scenarios and models for land use change in Europe. Berlin: Springer.
- [4] European Environment Agency (EEA). (2007). DPSIR Framework. Retrieved from http://root-devel.ew.eea.europa.eu/ia2dec/knowledge_base/Frameworks/doc101182.
- [5] CIPD. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/hr-resources/factsheets/pestle-analysis.aspx>.
- [6] Zasada, I., Alves, S., Müller, F. C., Pierr, A., Berges, R., Bell, S. (2010). International Retirement Migration in the Alicante Region, Spain: Process, Spatial Pattern and environmental Impacts. Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 53 (1): 125-141.
- [7] Tyrvaäinen, L., Miettinen, A. (2000). Property prices and urban forest amenities. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 39:205-223.
- [8] Zhang, B., Xie, G., Xia, B., Zhang, C. (2012). The Effects of Public Green Spaces on Residential Property Value in Beijing. Journal of Resources and Ecology, 3 (3): 243-252.
- [9] DCLG (Department of Communities and Local Government). (2010). Announcement of Community Infrastructure Levy. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/communities-to-share-in-the-advantages-of-development>.
- [10] England's Community Forests. Retrieved from <http://www.communityforest.org.uk/>.
- [11] Natural Economy Northwest. (2008). The economic benefits of Green Infrastructure: Developing key tests for evaluating the benefits of GreenInfrastructure. Retrieved from [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/nweeconomicbenefitsofgideveloping.pdf/\\$FILE/nweeconomicbenefitsofgideveloping.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/nweeconomicbenefitsofgideveloping.pdf/$FILE/nweeconomicbenefitsofgideveloping.pdf).
- [12] Spiekermann, M., He, Y., Yang, J., Burkhardt, I., Yan, F., Yi, X., Pauleit, S. (2012). Hangzhou: Fast Urbanisation and High Population Growth. Nilsson, K., Pauleit, S., Bell, S., Aalbers, C., Nielsen, S. (Eds). Peri-urban futures: Scenarios and models for land use change in Europe. Berlin: Springer.