

A historical and comparative analysis of the basic character of the Japanese planning system: Toward a drastic reform for decentralization and participation

Shun-ichi J. WATANABE
Tokyo University of Science, JAPAN

Received: July 2010

Final Acceptance: April 2011

Abstract:

One of the issues that are often discussed in Japan now is the reform of the current city planning system, which was originated 120 years ago. The general direction of the reform seems to head for 'decentralization' and 'participation' and many concrete proposals have been publicized till now. And yet there are a few comprehensive analyses of what are really the problems of the city planning system as a whole. This paper tries to clarify the total structure of these problems by discussing the basic character of the Japanese planning system through the following 6 concepts or keywords that are abstracted out of its history. The detailed discussions of each concepts will lead us to the reform direction which will be opposite direction of them, namely:

- (1) 'Centralized Style' against 'Decentralized Style';
- (2) 'Bureaucrat Initiative' against 'Citizen Initiative';
- (3) 'Expanding-City Image' against 'Shrinking-City Image';
- (4) 'Construction Orientation' against 'Management Orientation';
- (5) 'One-Tier System' against 'Two-Tier System'; and
- (6) 'Non-Professionalism' against 'Professionalism'

Keywords: *Planning system, decentralization, participation, Japan*

Introduction

Reform of planning system⁽¹⁾

Since the beginning of the 21st century, concerns and actual movements to reform the Japan's City Planning Act have risen remarkably among people outside the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (hereafter 'MLIT'), which is responsible for the nation's city planning administration. Nearly twenty concrete proposals have been made public by academic societies, civic groups, think-tanks and others (Watanabe and Arita 2010: 168-178). Such phenomena to try to change the basic rule of the traditional city planning are, as a whole, an epoch-making event in the entire history of the nation's modern planning era for nearly 120 years.

Many proposals emphasize the importance of '*machizukuri*' or community building, which is the people's activity to manage and enhance the physical (and often non-physical) environment of their own local community (Watanabe 2006, 2007). These proposals try to position *machizukuri* properly in the statutory planning system, which is traditionally based upon the centralization of planning powers in the hands of bureaucrats, not of citizens. So, the general trend of the reform direction seems to head toward the area often identified with such keywords as 'decentralization' and 'participation.' And yet most proposals seem to be mere collections of improvements of the individual problems of the existing system. What is lacking is a clear picture of the total structure of the problems as a whole.

In August 2009, the Democratic Party took control of the central government. It was practically the first shift of political power in the past 60 years, since the end of the war. As the new government emphasizes 'local autonomy (*chiiki shuken*),' it is quite probable that the city planning system, which is basically a local matter, may become an important national agenda and that the reform of the City Planning Act will be discussed and actually advanced further. And yet the Democrats' concept of 'local autonomy' so far has not been elaborated into more meaningful details as far as the planning system is concerned.⁽²⁾

All these present a challenge to planning theorists and planners, who should respond with a theoretical platform upon which all the reform discussions may be productively developed. In this context, the author tries to present such a hypothetical platform through a historical and comparative analysis of the basic character of the Japanese planning system.

Brief history

Before proceeding to the main subject, however, I would like to describe briefly the history of the Japanese planning system to those who may not be familiar with it. The modern planning system started with the Tokyo Urban Improvement Act of 1888, which tried to provide such urban infrastructures as streets and parks within the already urbanized areas of the capital city of Tokyo. Urban Improvement, in a word, was not a planning program by the current standard but an urban civil engineering program.

In 1919, the nation's first City Planning Act was enacted under the strong influence of modern Western planning. This Act introduced such planning techniques as Zoning for land use controls and Land Readjustment Program for urban and suburban development projects.⁽³⁾ This planning system was applied first to the six largest cities and then to many cities and towns all over Japan nearly for half a century. The 1919 Act was replaced by the City Planning Act of 1968, which is the current Act and is often called the 'New Act' as against the 'Old Act' of 1919.

It should be noted that city planning has been traditionally considered as a public service of the central government, not of the local government, and has been administered by the Home Ministry in the pre-war days, by the Ministry of Construction in the post-war 20th century days and by MLIT in the 21st century.

Content of this paper

In the following, I would like to discuss the basic character of the Japanese planning system by abstracting 6 concepts or keywords out of its history. These concepts are mutually independent variables and yet often work together in giving the Japanese planning system a unique, and more particularly, a problematic character. So, the reform direction should be toward the opposite direction of these keywords. It should be noted that these 6 problems are all rooted even in the Urban Improvement Program. It means that our contemporary reform efforts are, more or less, a fight against the 120-year-old tradition.

The following are these keywords of 'problems' against their opposites of 'reform direction':

- (1) Centralized Style' against 'Decentralized Style;
- (2) Bureaucrat Initiative' against 'Citizen Initiative;
- (3) Expanding-City Image' against 'Shrinking-City Image;
- (4) Construction Orientation' against 'Management Orientation;
- (5) One-Tier System' against 'Two-Tier System; and
- (6) Non-Professionalism' against 'Professionalism.

Centralized style

Concept of 'centralized style'

The 'Centralized Style' means that city planning powers are basically concentrated within the central government. This style of planning system has effectively not changed ever since the Urban Improvement Act of 1888.

In the Urban Improvement Program, all individual planning matters were decided by the national government's Tokyo Urban Improvement Committee. Under the Old Act system, each planning case was discussed by the City Planning Committee and then decided by the Home Minister, thus ostensibly receiving Cabinet approval. Under the New Act system, decision making power was basically granted to the prefectural governor, who was to act as the agent of the central government, not as the elected official. This rule was abandoned by the Decentralization Acts in 1999 and planning powers are now formally designated as administrative matters of the local government. And yet major planning decisions are still required to obtain the agreement of the upper-level government.

Reason for 'centralized style'

In Centralized Style, a set of standardized and detailed rules for the whole country are transmitted from the central to local governments, in a top-down fashion. The simple reason for this is efficiency. Centralized Style utilizes the benefits of 'mass production' of public service in order to meet vast needs at 'low administrative cost,' against a backdrop of insufficient resources, such as technology, finance and personnel.

This efficient method was able to demonstrate its power particularly in the pre-war days and the post-war rapid economic growth period. But in a wealthy and pluralist society, the principles of civil society call vociferously for decentralization of authority, and it is clear that Japan now stands at a crossroads.

Bureaucratic initiative

Concept and problems of 'bureaucratic initiative'

Since the Urban Improvement Program, it has been administrative bureaucracy, not discussion in assembly, which has actually made planning decision in city planning at the central or local government. Such control of leadership in the planning process by administrative bureaucracy is termed in this paper 'Bureaucratic Initiative.' Two examples are given as for the problems with Bureaucratic Initiative.

First, bureaucracy in Japan is characterized by 'rivalry' among central government ministries and departments, each of which strives to maintain influence in its own sphere, and this rivalry is transmitted on to the local governments. This is true with the land use controls of community spaces that are the focus of city planning. Broadly speaking, urban space is the sphere of influence of MLIT, which governs the City Planning Act, and rural space that of MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries), which governs the Agricultural Land Act etc., with no structure in place for overall planning and management of community spaces.

Second, the decision making authority in city planning rests firmly in the hands of the bureaucrats. As a result, the rules of the game of city planning are governed by a characteristically bureaucratic logic which often refuses to accept what the citizenry view as common sense. Thus, city planning distances itself from the citizenry, who in turn tend to gravitate towards *machizukuri*, which is people's free activity.

Centralized bureaucracy

The combination of Centralized Style and Bureaucratic Initiative results in a principle that might be termed the much stronger 'Centralized Bureaucracy.'

In this context, city planning is actually carried out this way. Nationwide standardized and pre-established rules are transmitted, virtually one-way, from the central to local governments in the form of notifications, standards, operational guidelines and procedures, etc. These are usually standardized for the whole country, but their measures are often designed to solve problems for Tokyo and other metropolitan areas, and are forced upon smaller local communities with much differing conditions.⁽⁴⁾ Three points must be mentioned below as problems with Centralized Bureaucracy.

First, the rules concerning the basics of people's living should be applied naturally to each municipality without difference in terms of fairness and impartiality. However, in the case of the Building Standards Act, what appears in principle to be 'nationwide uniformity' is in fact 'minimum nationwide uniformity,' and gives rise to a mechanical perverted equality. As a result, standardized community spaces are being built throughout the country. On the other hand, the concept of *machizukuri* prioritizes the diversity born from the creativity of the local citizenry. These local citizens who wish to have self determination about their own community spaces assert principles that are in opposition to nationwide uniformity.

Second, in Centralized Bureaucracy, the rules that are transmitted throughout the country are, in principle, 'pre-established.' This ignores the inherent variety of local situations and offers a standardized and simplified solution to the issues, affording the local government and people no opportunity to make changes. The rules are held to be upright, and there is

almost no room for the dialogue system to be introduced into the city planning decision-making process.

Third, in Centralized Bureaucracy, the flow of planning technology is one-way. There is almost no room of any 'alternative route,' whereby local ingenuity could be applied to local problems, and these solutions then relayed back to the nation as a whole in a form of information exchange. It is this structure that is responsible for the stagnation of technical advancement in the Japanese planning system, particularly as compared with the American case.⁽⁵⁾ This paper expects much of the *machizukuri* system as an 'alternative route,' as well as of the challenge from the local government.

Expanding-city Image

Concept of expanding-city image

The urban image towards which all efforts are directed as the goal of city planning, is a crucially important element in forming the character of a planning system. Modern Western planning been developed as a social technology to control relentlessly expanding cities that occurred as the result of the concentration of population and industry into urban areas. There is a strong belief that we can and should control city growth and so it is important to discuss what kind of urban images we are going to plan towards.

In Japan, however, the power of urban expansion was much stronger than that of planning for its control, thus resulting in a situation that may be described as 'strong urbanization' against 'weak planning.' When the planning means are weak, the planning ends may not be positively formulated. This is in sharp contrast to the historical reality in most of Western countries, where city planning has controlled urban development in accordance with the planned urban image to a considerable degree.

Japan's city planning has considered the existence of ever expanding cities as a given, and has worked to devise appropriate countermeasures to them. In other words, city planning has accepted expanding cities as a given condition and has developed planning technology on that premise. In this way the 'Expanding-City Image' has become the base of the Japanese planning system.

Planning for/by expanding-city image

Two points below will illustrate the character of Japan's planning that is carried out for, and is based upon, Expanding-City Image.

First, there is the decision making logic of plan-making. This starts from a forecast of the 'increase' in the future population. Then, calculations convert this into the numerical space required (housing units, floor areas, land areas, etc.), and the required spatial arrangements considered, and the various projects and regulations required to bring this to fruition set up. Thus, the 'increase' of populations, industries and urban areas is factored in unconditionally, and fails to become the subject of planning control. Further, various visions, proposals and plans have often been developed in the interests of growth itself. In particular during the period of rapid economic growth in the 1960s and 1970s, this style of planning was widely accepted as a powerful tool for socio-economic development.

Second, there is 'development profit' (profit generated by urban development).⁽⁶⁾ Modern city planning has attempted to resolve the issue of urban expansion by developing 'public recoupment of development profit' as a basic strategy.⁽⁷⁾ In the case of Japan, however, the strong influence of landowner sentiment has resulted in a very strong leaning towards the 'private recoupment of development profit.' In suburban development, the 'corporate recoupment of development profit' has often been the case, which enabled the corporate developer to provide private railways at the same time of suburban development, thus creating suburbs that are basically dependent upon mass transportation, not upon automobiles.

Additionally, the 'public-private recoupment of development profit' has been another traditional planning technique. The Land Readjustment Program counts the development profit related to land, and the Urban Redevelopment Program counts land and buildings together. Both techniques work in the social situation where Expanding-City Image is a reality. In other words, they will not work in the situation where population is decreasing and cities are not expanding, which is the case in the contemporary Japan.

Construction orientation

Concept of construction orientation

As we have observed, Japan's city planning began with the Urban Improvement Program, which was basically a construction technique of infrastructure provision in already built-up areas. Subsequently, the planning system has developed a variety of such techniques as Land Readjustment, Urban Redevelopment and New Town Programs. In reviewing this series of developments, we notice that 'projects' (*jigyo*) have carried much more weight than 'regulations' (*kisei*) or 'plans' (*keikaku*), and that at times they have exercised considerable autonomy beyond the control of regulations and plans.⁽⁸⁾ Whereas infrastructure projects ought originally to have been 'means,' they have become the 'ends' of almost all city planning. It is this kind of overwhelming superiority of construction projects that we term 'Construction Orientation.'

The motive power behind Construction Orientation is state subsidy. Even in the cash-strapped pre-war days, there was no shortage of examples of where land use controls were provided at the request of the Home Ministry, for the purposes of project promotion. The local government often accepted city planning in order to receive subsidies for urban infrastructure 'construction' projects, not land use 'regulations,' resulting in the situation that may be well described as 'strong projects' against 'weak regulations.' In fact, the concept that community space as a whole should be the subject of the master 'plan' was virtually absent until recently.

Problems of construction orientation

If Construction Orientation is examined in the context of the Plan-Do-See cycle,⁽⁹⁾ it is clear that the Do-phase alone is bloated, where Plan- and See-phases are compacted. There are two problems here.

First, the Plan-phase does exist, but it is merely the preparatory work for Do-phase and, often, the work of justification for it. Under these circumstances, there can be no concept of master planning that says 'the Plan-phase is the core function of city planning.' Also, once the Plan for a construction project

is decided, it becomes part of the vested interests of Do-phase, so that changes in order to respond to changing circumstances are not tolerated. In fact, many streets all over Japan were planned but are left unbuilt for many years.

Second, Construction Orientation rushes single-mindedly towards current and future construction projects but shows little interests in the See-phase (review, amend, appeal, etc.) of finished construction projects. This means that there is hardly any technical mechanism of learning from the past experience. We know that city planning is a discipline that always tries to rationalize present day actions with reference to some future point in time, and so it has a clear concept with regard to 'time.' In contrast, Construction Orientation holds that 'the future is a vested interest for the purposes of present construction, and current changes in circumstances are to be ignored and nothing is to be learned from past experience.' This way of thinking has a substantially different 'time view' from the authentic city planning. 'Strong projects' gives the impression of strongly warping the city planning's space-time.

Weak land use controls

As was discussed before, the other side of 'strong projects' is 'weak regulations.' The root reason for it, is that landowners who had political powers perceived land use controls as restrictions on their property rights and greatly opposed them. As a result, city planning tended generally to work for 'development' rather than 'conservation.' When the economy is strong, there are calls for 'deregulation for the purposes of land supply,' and in times of economic depression, the calls are for 'deregulation for the purposes of economic vitalization.' Thus, in times of both economic boom and bust, 'weak regulations' are demanded.

These 'weak regulations' are supported by the uniquely Japanese condition of the city planning and building codes. Since the days of the Old Act system, the Zoning system provided for by the City Planning Act has basically surrendered the handling of buildings to the building code. Thus, 'regulations for group of buildings' (*shudan kitei*), which are principally policy matters, and 'regulations for single buildings' (*tantai kitei*), which are technological matters are both non-separately prescribed in the Building Standard Act.⁽¹⁰⁾

As a result, firstly the contents of the 'regulations' are more 'building regulations' rather than 'land-use regulations.' This means that the regulation of such land as open space, parking or cemetery which has no buildings on it, is impossible. Secondly, the 'building regulations' aim to 'prevent the construction of poor quality buildings' in order to preserve minimum standards, and tend to block the potential of the citizenry, who want to create a physical environment above the bare minimum standard. Thirdly, the regulations are standardized nationwide and so any flexible and detailed control that matches the richly varied land use conditions of different areas cannot be realized. All these imply that effective land use controls would require the decentralization of the system itself.

This coupling of 'weak regulations' and 'strong projects' is the very Japanese phenomenon of 'infrastructure construction in already built-up areas.' Since the Urban Improvement Program, urban areas have been able to expand in a haphazard fashion, unrestricted by effective land use controls, resulting in

disorderly urban areas often with insufficient infrastructure. After the city is built this way and after the government secures sufficient funds, planning efforts start with construction of streets and other infrastructures in the name of 'City Planning Projects.' In other words, 'infrastructure construction in already built-up areas' can be understood as complementing 'weak regulation' in the past with 'strong projects' at present.

Single-tier system

Concept of single-tier system

Various planning techniques of modern city planning were created by different people in different places in Western Europe and North America in the late 19th century. In the early 20th century, however, they were organized into a legal and technological system of modern planning. Its basic structure is that firstly the plan (often called Master Plan) is set up, which serves then as the norm for regulations (most notably Zoning) and projects (including Land Readjustment, Urban Redevelopment, New Town Programs). Both of regulations and projects are often called implementation tools. So, individual planning decisions must go through the examination at the two tiers of the master plan and implementation tools. This is called the 'Two-Tier System.'

In comparison, the Japanese planning system is quite different. In the Urban Improvement Program, projects of streets and parks were decided individually, with no reference to the master plan; in the Old Act system, projects of Land Readjustment and regulations of Zoning were decided same way. All these mean that the Japanese system has basically taken a 'Single-Tier' approach.

The Old Act system established the 'City Planning Area' and the corresponding 'City Planning Map,' which showed all planned projects and regulations. This map, however, only displayed the 'results' of individual planning decisions but did not constitute a norm (master plan) that would be the 'cause' leading to the individual decisions from an overall standpoint. Until only recently, there was no systemization of the master plan.

The Municipal Master Plan⁽¹¹⁾ implemented in 1992 is not the subject of City Planning Decision; the City Planning Area Master Plan⁽¹²⁾ implemented in 2000 cannot, in fact, be considered as a leading standard for the deciding of individual projects and regulations. There have been many self-proclaimed 'Master Plans' but most of them are simply proposals of specific visions, and, in extreme cases, are nothing more than 'pie in the sky.'

How can city planning be conducted without a master plan? In the simplest terms, it can only have been that no inconvenience was perceived even without a master plan. In fact, it was probably the case that it was more convenient not to have a master plan. Undoubtedly, the special character of the Japanese city planning system must be at the heart of it. This point will be referred to in more detail later under 'Non-Professionalism.'

Problems of single-tier system

Single-Tier System has two meanings. Firstly it has 'no master plan'; secondly it has 'implementation tools only.' 'No master plan' leads us naturally to a serious question of how we can rationally make individual

planning decisions within the overall planning framework. The more serious problem, however, is the absence of the social mechanism where people participate, debate and decide the future vision of their own community space. This is a fatal problem when people want to participate in the planning process. As such participation is not required, there was little incentive for the local government to have the idea that one of the most important public services is the planning and management (i.e. thinking, building, protecting and remaking) of its community space as a whole.

The planning system with 'implementation tools only' means that various actors try to effect partial and fragmented 'improvement' to community spaces, often ending up with 'deterioration.' When more financial resources were available, many central-government ministries poured huge amount of subsidies directly to the local-government sections for developing community spaces in an uncoordinated way, each according to their own administrative aims. Thus, individual construction projects fell from above into the laps of local government authorities, which is closely related to Construction Orientation, discussed earlier. In other words, the structure is such that individual construction projects aim to deliver partial optimal solutions, all the while ignoring overall benefit. This is entirely the opposite idea to authentic city planning and is the basic problem of Single-Tier System.

Non-professionalism

Concept of non-professionalism

So far, we have discussed 5 elements that create the problems of the Japanese planning system. But what is the key concept that will relate all these elements into the entire structure of problems? My answer is, the absence of planning profession as a coherent and independent technical group of people, or, in another word, planning with 'Non-Professionalism.' This is quite contrary to Western countries, where city planning has been technically supported by a planning profession. There, it would be impossible to imagine a planning system without a planning profession. Now, let us consider the historical perspectives in more detail.

The first time professional matters were involved was at the birth of the Old Act of 1919. It was architects like Yasushi Kataoka, who were first involved in 'city planning,' which term came from Western countries and whose concept was not clear to any Japanese. Then civil engineers like Enzo Ohta got involved during the period of the Capital Reconstruction Program after the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. Each of these approached the as-yet-unknown field of 'city planning' each from their own disciplines of architecture and civil engineering. There are no signs of any serious discussion of a professional nature of city planning, completely distinct from either architecture or civil engineering.

In pre-war Japan, the work of city planning was almost completely left to career elite bureaucrats in the fields of architecture, civil engineering and administrative affairs. They belonged to the Home Ministry and worked at the central and prefectural City Planning Committees as the bases for their activities. Those from civil engineering developed expertise in Land Readjustment and Street Construction Programs, while those from architecture backgrounds focused most of their energies on the development of Building Regulations but did not have successful technical deployment

into land use controls. These Home Ministry bureaucrats possessed a fixed paradigm and technical level through '*Toshi Kenkyukai* (City Study Group)' and its journal '*Toshi Koron*,' and formed a loose group with a certain flavor of professionalism.

In the post-war era, however, this group disappeared with the dissolution of the Home Ministry. Then, planning technology was left up to a few central government, and many prefectural government bureaucrats, most of whom had received no specialist training. As a result, the professional flavor of the pre-war days disappeared completely and Centralized Bureaucracy with the logic of 'intra-departmental rivalry' took firm root.

Consequently, when viewed from outside, the field of city planning may appear to be a cohesive professional field, but closer inspection will reveal that it is divided into rival disciplines such as civil engineering and architecture, with each discipline having its own unique paradigm. There is a real lack of any professional logic of its own that covers city planning as a whole. In this sense, Japan is unique among the nations of the world in that it conducts city planning of Non-Professionalism.

Answering questions

With the above premise of Non-Professionalism, we can now answer the important questions of the character of the Japanese planning system. Following, two points are discussed.

First, how and why is city planning by Non-Professionalism possible? As we have seen already in the context of Centralized Bureaucracy, the processes of identifying and solving issues in city planning are all handled by central government bureaucrats, and pre-establish rules are transmitted throughout the country. All that local governments have to do is simply to follow these procedures and standards. So this system is both convenient and efficient for local governments that lack planning expertise. As far as they properly carry out procedures, such as coordination with upper-level government departments, then city planning administration will move ahead smoothly. In other words, the 'technical work' of city planning is changed into 'administrative work,' and it is this mechanism that enables Japan's planning system work upon Non-Professionalism.

Second, how and why is city planning possible without a master plan? As is generally known, the function of a master plan is to provide the overall future image of the 'good city.' As for the way we deal technically with the 'good city,' there are two different standpoints. The first is the standpoint of 'reductionism,' which holds that 'the whole can be reduced to the sum of its parts.' This theory aims to standardize the 'good parts' of the city in advance into objective figures, and to achieve the 'good city' from the sum of these parts. The second standpoint is 'holism,' which holds that the 'whole cannot be reduced to the sum of its parts.' Here, 'good parts' are not judged according to pre-established standards. Instead, they are judged by politicians or professionals only after consideration of the whole.

Thus, it is clear that the idea of the master plan is based upon the holistic approach and that its proper management is essential to planning profession. In contrast, it is evident that Japan's city planning is in the reductionism camp. This approach agrees with the system of Centralized

Bureaucracy in which each party seeks to secure 'parts' as their own spheres of authority. In that scenario, city planning without a master plan is held to be desirable.

Conclusions

In the discussion above, we have analyzed the structure of the problems of the Japanese planning system through 6 keywords. Now we have to identify the direction of its reform, which is toward the opposite direction of these keywords. Namely:

(1) From Centralized Style to 'Decentralized Style': This means that planning powers should be decentralized basically to the local government.

(2) From Bureaucrat Initiative to 'Citizen Initiative': This means that more chances that people can participate in the planning process should be provided at the local government level.

(3) From Expanding-City Image to 'Shrinking-City Image': This means that we should accept the nation's population decrease as the basis of the planning system.

(4) From Construction Orientation to 'Management Orientation': This means that the planning system should locate land use controls as the center of its implementation tools.

(5) From One-Tier System to 'Two-Tier System': This means that the planning system should be reformed with the master plan as its center.

(6) From Non-Professionalism to 'Professionalism': This means that a genuine profession dedicated to city planning as a distinct field of discipline should be established, which may necessitate, however, the basic character of city planning may be drastically changed as well.

References

- Harada, S. ed. (2001) **Nihon no Toshiho 1: Kozo to Tenkai** (Urban Law in Japan 1: Its Structure and Development (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press).
- Harada, S. ed. (2001) **Nihon no Toshiho 2: Shoso to Dotai** (Urban Law in Japan 2: Its Aspects and Evolution (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press).
- Meno, F. et al. (2009) **Jumin Shutai no Toshi Keikaku: Machizukuri eno Yakudatekata** (City Planning by Residents Initiative: How to Utilize Machizukuri) (Kyoto: Gakugei-Shuppansha).
- Minohara, K. ed. (2000) **Toshi Keikaku no Chosen: Atarashii Kokyosei wo Motomete** (Challenge of City Planning: Towards New Publicness)(Kyoto: Gakugei-Shuppansha).
- Watanabe, S.J. (1993) **'Toshi Keikaku' no Tanjo: Kokusai Hikaku kara Mita Nihon Kindai Toshi Keikaku** (The Birth of 'City Planning': Japan's Modern Urban Planning in International Comparison) (Tokyo: Kashiwa-Shobo).
- Watanabe, S.J. (2006) "Machizukuri in Japan: A Historical Perspective on Participatory Community-Building Initiatives," in Carola Hein and

Philippe Pelletier eds. **Cities, Autonomy, and Decentralization in Japan** (London: Routledge) 101-114.

Watanabe, S.J. (2007) "Toshi Keikaku vs Machizukuri: Emerging Paradigm of Civil Society in Japan, 1950-1980," in Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck eds. **Living Cities in Japan** (London: Routledge) 39-55.

Watanabe, S.J. and Arita, T. (2010) "Toshi Keikaku no Seido Kaikaku to 'Toshi Hogaku' eno Kitai (The Reform of the City Planning System and the Expectation to 'Urban Law')" **The Journal of Social Science** (Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo) 61, 3&4, 161-205.

Notes

- (1) This paper is mostly based upon Watanabe (1993) and Watanabe and Arita (2010: 182-201).
- (2) For the Democratic Party's Manifesto 2009, see <http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/manifesto/manifesto2009.pdf>
- (3) The Land Readjustment Program (*tochi kukaku seiri jigyo*) is a project technique which the Japanese planning system developed after the 1902 Lex Addickes of Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany.
- (4) The 1992 subdivision of Zoning classifications into 12 types is an example of this.
- (5) In the United States, where city planning is carried out by the municipality as the basic local government, various technical developments are tried by professionals and people at the local level. These experiences, as being quite tangible, are then relayed back to other communities in a form of technical exchange, thus planning techniques are advanced.
- (6) The British term of 'betterment.'
- (7) The Garden City theory is a good example.
- (8) As for the theoretical relationship among 'projects,' 'regulations' and 'plans,' see below '5-1. Concept of 'Single-Tier System.'
- (9) The 'Plan-Do-See cycle' model is adopted here as the theoretical framework to describe the process of plan-making, implementation and review-evaluation respectively.
- (10) *Shudan kitei* includes regulations of the use, location, size and shape of buildings in the City Planning Area, whereas *tantai kitei* those for the safety, hygiene and fire prevention in and outside the City Planning Area.
- (11) City Planning Act, Article 18-2
- (12) City Planning Act, Article 6-2