

A REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON THE IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF PROTECTION PLANS FOR HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CITIES

Hong Sun

Faculty of Civil Engineering & Architecture, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China.

Abstract: China’s large number of famous historical and cultural cities, towns and villages are solid carriers for the strategic decision-making of “vigorously promoting the construction of ecological civilization”. Since the 1980s, protection plans for historical and cultural cities have been implemented throughout the country. However, they often encounter breakthroughs at various spatial levels, and there is an urgent need to conduct extensive testing of the implementation of protection plans. However, the content system and standard system for the evaluation of the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities in my country are dually complex. Existing studies rely on empirical judgment and qualitative description in evaluation methods. In terms of evaluation standards, they not only lack objectivity measurement and resident feedback measurement, but also Lack of an operational model construction method. This article proposes that in the future, a theoretical system for the implementation evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans should be established based on the multi-criteria decision-making method to provide ideas for improving the systematicness and operability of the famous city evaluation system.

Keywords: Urban planning implementation evaluation; Historical and cultural city protection planning; Urban planning post-evaluation

1 EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTECTION PLAN FOR HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CITIES

Since the 1980s, the protection plan for historical and cultural cities (hereinafter referred to as the "Protection Plan") has been implemented in various parts of our country. However, the development of new areas in many famous historical and cultural cities (hereinafter referred to as "famous cities") is seriously inconsistent with the context of the historical urban areas. The population of historical urban areas has increased instead of falling under the evacuation strategy (for example, the population of the old city of Ruian City, Zhejiang Province was before the implementation of the protection plan. more than 3 times). Under the municipal facilities development plan, infrastructure such as drainage and fire prevention in the old city is still seriously lacking, and public feedback is generally poor. In terms of space control, large-scale old city renovation projects and new construction projects often exceed important control indicators in conservation planning, such as urban view corridor control and building height control, posing severe challenges to the overall protection of famous cities. Even within the construction control zones that have been clearly demarcated in many conservation plans, historic districts are still subject to large-scale constructive damage, sounding the alarm for their protection. In addition, although the rated cultural protection units have been protected to a certain extent, the remaining historical buildings that have protection value but have not been included in the historical and cultural heritage protection list have been seriously damaged. At the same time, there are quite different views on the protection of famous cities. Residents are less satisfied with neighborhoods where livelihood projects and original features are protected, but are more satisfied with neighborhoods that have undergone destructive old city renovations. There is a significant difference in preservation values. In some over-developed tourist cities, large-scale demolition and construction, the emergence of fake antiques, and unreasonable over-development have caused the disappearance of historical relics, and the loss of authenticity of historical buildings and neighborhoods is common. In view of the above phenomenon, this article raises the following questions: Have the "Historic and Cultural City Protection Plans" across the country been implemented since they were compiled and approved? How to scientifically evaluate the degree of its implementation? This will involve three more in-depth questions: What to evaluate? How to evaluate? What are the evaluation criteria? This article is based on these core issues.

Table 1 Comparison of existing domestic protection regulations assessment systems for famous historical and cultural cities and villages

Famous cities and villages	year (year)	type	Content system	Indicator system	Methodology	Model construction method
Xi'an	2013	National historical and cultural city	According to the "Notice"	Self-evaluation famous historical cultural cities Indicator system	Combining qualitative and quantitative evaluation method	According to administrative documents
Yongzhou	2013	Provincial historical cultural city	levelAccording to "Insurance Regulations"	thesubjective method	Qualitative method	none

Wuhan	2011	National historical and cultural city	including planning and implementation effect evaluation	Subjective law, but lack of public participation	Combination of objective qualitative and quantitative (AHP)	of expert consultation (goal method)	none
Ruian version	2010	Provincial historical cultural city	level Only the content of the regulations will be evaluated	mandatory subjective method	Qualitative method	none	none
Beijing Jingshan Eight Pieces	2013	historic district	including protective measures, Protection effects and public policies, etc.	Objective law and integration of public participation	Qualitative method	none	none
Fuzhou Three Lanes and Seven Alleys	2013	historic district	According to the "Insurance Regulations"	subjective method	Qualitative method	none	none
Cuiheng Village, Zhongshan City	2011	Historical cultural village	and Historical environmental benefits, social benefits, economic benefits, etc.	subjective method	Combining qualitative and quantitative	None, only intent framework	none

2 RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

2.1 Gradual Development of Post-protection Evaluation of Heritage

From the field of post-evaluation, foreign urban planning evaluation has developed from self-evaluation to post-evaluation, from focusing on planning preparation research to focusing on planning implementation research. Post-evaluation of heritage protection has gradually developed in recent years. Since the 1950s, rational questioning of planning has prompted the rise of academic research on planning evaluation. The early evaluation of urban master plans abroad was based on the self-evaluation of the planning plan itself (Ex-ante Evaluation). Representatives of its index systems are the evaluation index systems of New York and Seattle. After the 1950s, the evaluation of the urban planning implementation process and its effects (Post-hoc Evaluation) began to receive attention. By the 1990s, the content of planning evaluation had expanded from simple pre-planning evaluation to systematic, full-process, and quantitative post-planning evaluation. In recent decades, urban planning research in Europe has mostly focused on heritage protection and urban renewal based on the overall premise of population reduction and aging. Post-evaluation of heritage protection has also gradually developed.

However, in comparison with post-protection evaluations of urban heritage at home and abroad, differences in cultural background and urban characteristics make the evaluation of famous cities in China more complex than in foreign countries, and foreign systems cannot be directly applied. The national historical and cultural city protection system announced by our country in 1982 does not have a strict corresponding concept internationally [1]. In February 2005, the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines formally defined and recognized historic towns and town centers as one of four unique heritage types. However, there are differences between the "historic towns and town centers" of the world cultural heritage and my country's "famous historical and cultural cities" in terms of objects, value tendencies, evaluation standards, and research operations. The huge differences in cultural backgrounds and urban characteristics between China and the West make the evaluation of Chinese historical towns more complex than those of Western towns. At the same time, post-evaluation of heritage protection at home and abroad mostly stays at the level of physical buildings or historical blocks, and evaluation studies on overall urban protection are relatively rare. In recent years, Western research has shifted towards methodologies based on systems theory and traditional philosophy. Mackee and others are cautious about copying Western evaluation methods based on reductionism in Asian countries [2]. In local cities in developing countries with deep historical and cultural backgrounds, culturally sensitive urban development evaluation is particularly needed [3]. Therefore, it is necessary to recognize the particularity of China's historical towns, avoid applying Western evaluation standards, and establish a planning implementation evaluation system based on its own urban research.

2.2 Urban Planning Implementation Evaluation is in the Exploratory Stage

From the perspective of urban planning implementation evaluation, the development of master plan implementation evaluation is relatively mature, while the implementation evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans and the implementation evaluation of historical district protection plans are still in the exploratory stage. At present, domestic academic circles have conducted relatively in-depth research on the review of master plan implementation evaluation and the construction of a framework for implementation evaluation [4-8]. Elaborating on planning implementation evaluation methods from the perspectives of geography, public policy and dynamic maintenance

Research on technology and technology has also broadened the breadth of the field [9-12]. In practice, there are rich research results on master plan evaluation, such as in Yuyao, Guangzhou, Shanghai Lingang New City, Xiangtan, Nanjing, Bengbu, Jiaonan and other

cities [4, 13-18]. However, in domestic urban planning implementation evaluation research, there are relatively few post-planning evaluations at the meso level, and the evaluation objects are mostly implementation planning and urban design [19-20]. In the early days, the implementation evaluation related to historical and cultural cities was only part of the mandatory content of the overall planning implementation evaluation, that is, the implementation of the purple line control content was evaluated. The independence and systematic nature of this research direction have not yet been clarified.

2.3 The Evaluation System of Domestic Famous Cities Needs to be Improved

From the perspective of national needs, my country's characteristics of "emphasis on cultural preservation and light urban preservation" and "replacing law with literature" left over from the planned economy period have great inertia. The supporting standards, regulations, methods and empirical systems for the evaluation of domestic famous cities are in their infancy stage. In December 2010, the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development issued the "Notice on Carrying out Inspections on the Protection of National Historical and Cultural Cities and Chinese Historical and Cultural Towns and Villages" (hereinafter referred to as the "Notice"), focusing on inspecting the scope and number of protections for historical and cultural blocks and historical buildings, changes, the formulation and implementation of conservation plans, the evaluation of plan implementation, the formulation of local regulations and the use of national special subsidy funds. In February 2013, the Inspection Office of the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development raised key concerns in the "Letter on the Issuance of Comrade Wang Zaosheng's Concluding Speech at the 2012 Annual Work Summary and Training Meeting for Urban and Rural Planning Inspectors Dispatched by the Ministry" (hereinafter referred to as the "Speech"). The formulation and implementation of protection plans, the protection of the overall features of historical and cultural cities, the protection of the "Purple Line" range, the control of construction activities in core protection areas, and the protection of historical buildings. Since the issuance of the "Notice" in 2010, only Wuhan, Beijing, Xi'an, Yongzhou and Ruian have carried out implementation evaluation of the overall planning of famous cities. However, the relevant publicly published results are very limited. The existing literature consists of project texts and master's thesis, conference papers, newspapers and web page news. At the same time, the evaluation of the protection planning implementation of historical districts such as Jingshan Eight Pieces in Beijing and Sanfang Qixiang in Fuzhou, as well as the famous historical and cultural village Cuiheng Village in Zhongshan City, has gradually been carried out, providing an important reference for the protection implementation evaluation at the overall city level [21-23].

3 ANALYSIS OF CURRENT RESEARCH STATUS AND DEVELOPMENT DYNAMICS AT HOME AND ABROAD

In view of the three core questions of "What to evaluate? How to evaluate? What are the standards and measurements?", the construction of the evaluation system for the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities requires in-depth demonstration and analysis of its thinking methods, operating methods and measurement standard systems.

At present, there are relatively few domestic studies on the implementation and evaluation of protection plans for famous historical and cultural cities, including only those famous historical and cultural cities and villages such as Ruian in Wenzhou, Xi'an, Yongzhou, Wuhan, Beijing, Sanfang Qixiang in Fuzhou, and Cuiheng Village in Zhongshan City. Assessment work for conservation planning.

3.1 The Evaluation Content System Lacks a Basis for Formulating

The basis for formulating the evaluation content system is mixed and the system is weak. In 2011, Cuiheng Village in Zhongshan City formulated an implementation evaluation content system for famous villages based on the sustainable dimension; in 2013, Xi'an based on the "Notice", and Yongzhou and Fuzhou Sanfang Qixiang based on their respective "Guarantee Regulations". The content system of their respective evaluations. Wuhan's assessment content includes a relatively systematic evaluation of planning preparation and evaluation of plan implementation effects, but lacks content on planning implementation management and public satisfaction surveys. The eight historical districts of Jingshan in Beijing have constructed an independent system including protection measures, protection effects and public policies. At present, there is no comprehensive evaluation content system that can simultaneously cover the entire process, multi-level spatial and temporal dimensions of the protection of historical and cultural cities.

3.2 The Evaluation Method System Lacks Objective and Quantitative Methods

The evaluation method system is dominated by subjective methods of qualitative description and empirical judgment, and lacks objective and quantitative methods. The goal achievement method and the indicator quantitative evaluation method are commonly used evaluation methods in the current formal and systematic overall planning implementation evaluation. The evaluation method based on goal achievement was first adopted by the Yuyao master plan effect evaluation index system. Whether the implementation of the plan can correspond to the planning goals is the key to determining the degree of its implementation [4]. In the evaluation of the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities in my country, Yongzhou City, Ruian City (2010 version of the evaluation), as well as Beijing Jingshan Bapian and Fuzhou Sanfang Qixiang historical blocks all adopted the qualitative goal achievement method. Xi'an and Wuhan have adopted a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, but the quantitative method mainly involves simple weighting of quantitative indicators. At present, there are no cases that use more rigorous mathematical statistical methods, such as weighted product method (WPW), analytic hierarchy process (AHP), etc.

3.3 The Evaluation Standard System Lacks Objectivity and Feedback Criteria

The evaluation standard system is dominated by subjective qualitative criteria and lacks objective criteria and feedback criteria. There are many contents and standards for famous city evaluation, and its essence is a multi-criteria evaluation system. In terms of theory, the Sino-Singapore Eco-City master plan evaluation index system established earlier in my country itself includes the completion rate of plan implementation, focusing on the implementation and effectiveness of the plan [24]. In terms of policy, in 2009, in accordance with the requirements of the "Evaluation Methods for the Implementation of Urban Master Plans (Trial)" issued by the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development, the main contents of the evaluation of the implementation of urban master plans include consistency, implementation, execution, and coordination. indicators such as sex. However, the implementation objects of these top-down policy documents are mainly planning administrative departments, and their evaluation criteria emphasize subjectivity and lack objective criteria and feedback criteria for public participation. In terms of practice, some cities in my country have established preliminary evaluation systems for the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities. Among them, Xi'an adopts the national historical and cultural city protection assessment standards, but this standard is a typical self-evaluation indicator system; Yongzhou, Ruian, Fuzhou Sanfangqixiang, Zhongshan City Cuiheng Village, etc. adopt subjective criteria, that is, based on goal achievement The method leaves the assessor to qualitatively describe the current implementation situation; Wuhan adopts a combination of subjective method and objective method, but lacks a feedback survey of residents based on citizen participation. Only the eight historical districts of Jingshan in Beijing combine subjectivity, objectivity criteria, and public participation at the same time. Among them, its objectivity criterion takes into account the authenticity measurement criteria such as the separation of households, the situation of indigenous people, and the situation of gentrification.

At the same time, multi-criteria evaluation and feedback evaluation criteria based on objectivity criteria are evaluation trends in heritage protection at home and abroad. However, there is a lack of implementation evaluation that adds feedback criteria to multi-criteria evaluation. Since the 1970s, foreign urban planning evaluation has developed into planning evaluation based on value judgment and its value-based quantitative indicators, such as land use intensity, public land openness, citizens' voluntary participation in community activities, community security, crime rate, The proportion of self-owned housing, etc., pays more attention to the fairness and rationality of planning [24]. Chan et al. evaluated the implementation of development rights transfer on architectural heritage protection from three aspects: policy, community and project, covering multiple sustainable aspects such as environment, economy and society [25]. In 2014, Kovacs et al. evaluated the protection status of 64 historic districts in Ontario, Canada, through townscape surveys, stakeholder interviews, resident questionnaires, historical real estate transaction evaluations, and archive analysis. It also included subjectivity and objectivity. and feedback criteria [26]. Based on the criterion of objectivity, Amit-Cohen conducted a qualitative evaluation of the linkage effect between urban planning and heritage protection from aspects such as land use, market advertising, land use changes, architectural style changes, gentrification, and leisure space distribution [27]. Monteiro investigated people's evaluation of heritage through residents' perceptions, emphasizing the correlation between spatiotemporal changes and perceptions [28]. In summary, the foreign evaluation criterion system for heritage protection has gradually developed into a comprehensive multi-criteria system of subjective criteria, objective criteria, and residents' perception evaluation. However, there are different opinions on the specific content selection of its subjective, objective, feedback and other criteria, the interrelationship between its multi-dimensional criteria lacks organic connection and synthesis, and the selection of evaluation methods for each criterion lacks rigorous demonstration.

3.4 The Construction of the Evaluation System Lacks a Rigorous Multi-criteria Quantitative Calculation Method

Judging from the construction of the famous city evaluation system, domestic research has not yet adopted rigorous multi-criteria mathematical calculation methods. The trade-off between complexity and simplicity is the key to the construction of a multi-criteria evaluation system. In domestic practice, only Wuhan has explicitly proposed using the expert consultation method to construct an evaluation system. However, the indicator system and weight distribution for the evaluation of famous cities in Wuhan rely on expert judgment and require further scientific demonstration and theoretical support. Abroad, the current more representative multi-criteria sustainability evaluation system at the meso level is the sustainable diachronic evaluation of built environment quality (BEQUEST multidimensional evaluation model) established by Mitchell et al., and the driving-pressure-state-influence-feedback (DPSIR) system, etc.[29]. However, the former's model index system is too large and comprehensive, making it difficult to apply in actual evaluations; while the latter, although superior in its flexibility, has been criticized for oversimplifying the relationship between the environment and humans.

Mac kee therefore established a decision-making approach to the conservation of non-secular built heritage based on Buddhist systematic philosophy, significantly simplifying the selection process between alternatives. However, the method based on system theory emphasizes the importance of the goal, is prone to losing a lot of details and information, and can only provide macro decisions [2, 3 0]. In 2009, Dutta et al. used the multi-criteria decision-making method (Multi-Criteria Decision-Making, MCDM) to evaluate the conservation of historic buildings [31]. MCDM also includes three dimensions: evaluation content system, method system and standard system. The complexity of any one of these dimensions will seriously restrict its feasibility in practical applications. Therefore, Wang et al. used the fuzzy set method to improve MCDM in the urban renewal decision-making method, which significantly simplified the renewal goals in the decision-making framework. However, the benefit-opportunity-cost-risk (BOCR) used in the later decision-making was too much. The criterion model is not suitable for planning implementation evaluation [32].

These trends reflect the current two research orientations of the academic community in the game between comprehensiveness and simplicity in the field of multi-criteria evaluation systems: the application of system theory method and fuzzy set method.

4 IDEAS FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS

In summary, the current academic community urgently needs to establish a comprehensive and concise evaluation content system, evaluation index system, evaluation method system and empirical system for the implementation of protection planning for historical and cultural cities. Based on the general plan evaluation, this system should be combined with public feedback surveys to develop into a multi-dimensional qualitative system of standards including normativeness, coordination, compliance, implementation, execution, satisfaction, and authenticity. To evaluate the preparation status, implementation of planning goals, planning implementation effects, planning implementation management and other fields. However, when the evaluation system for the implementation of protection planning for historical and cultural cities involves the above complex evaluation content and criterion system and its subordinate factor system, this decision-making method will face a large number of complex factors, which will bring heavy calculations. However, the current evaluation system for the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities is mostly based on empiricism, which seriously affects the scientific nature of the evaluation system. Therefore, in future research, the author plans to first study MCD M and establish a set of comprehensive multi-criteria decision-making methods with strong feasibility before establishing the implementation evaluation system model of historical and cultural city protection planning in order to seek to deal with its complex sexual simplification method.

4.1 The Significance of Implementing the Evaluation of Protection Plans for Historical and Cultural Cities

In practice, the development of implementation evaluation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities is of great significance to the preparation and implementation of protection plans. First, achieve refined management of planning preparation and implementation. Through this study, a scientific evaluation system and evaluation method will be established to conduct multi-faceted evaluation of the implementation of the "Historic and Cultural City Protection Plan" at different levels such as historical and cultural cities, historical urban areas, historical blocks and historical buildings. It can not only supervise and inspect the protection plan At the same time, it can also timely analyze the problems encountered in the implementation of the plan and propose countermeasures, provide a basis for dynamic adjustment and modification of the plan, and enrich and improve urban planning theories and methods. Secondly, realize the balance of urban game. Through the evaluation of the implementation of famous city protection plans, we can provide a solid data platform to explore the guarantee mechanisms and strategies for the implementation of famous city protection plans, and seek new breakthroughs between development and protection. Furthermore, coordinate the interest relationships in complex social projects, form a benign social collaboration mechanism, and avoid and eliminate technological alienation generated during the implementation of conservation planning. The protection of historical and cultural cities often faces conflicting interests and alienation of values among diverse social groups. In order to avoid the technological alienation that may be brought about by the protection planning of historical and cultural cities (such as the gentrification and isolation of historical and cultural resources caused by destructive renewal, and the difficulties in people's livelihood and public acceptance caused by negative protection, etc.), there is an urgent need to Evaluate the current plan implementation status, explore stakeholder participation models through systematic evaluation, and coordinate interest relationships in complex social projects.

4.2 Establish an Evaluation System for Protection Planning of Historical and Cultural Cities

Theoretically, establishing an implementation evaluation system for the protection of historical and cultural cities is of great significance to the development of urban planning implementation evaluation. On the one hand, the independence of the implementation evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans needs to be clarified in the study. Compared with the general planning implementation evaluation, the evaluation of the implementation of the protection plan for historical and cultural cities has its particularity and differences, and the evaluation method of the overall plan cannot be directly applied. The reason is, on the one hand, the differences in the planning system itself; on the other hand, it is the obstacle to the quantitative evaluation of the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities. Therefore, based on the particularity of the protection of famous cities, a specialized planning implementation evaluation system and method ideas should be built, and urban planning methods and theories should be improved. This study helps to change the characteristics of "emphasis on cultural preservation and neglect of urban preservation" inherited from the planned economy period in the field of heritage protection in my country. Studying the implementation evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans as an independent system can elevate the post-evaluation research of heritage protection from the focus on physical protection of buildings to the urban level.

4.3 The Role of Establishing an Evaluation System

The establishment of an evaluation system has a guiding role in the establishment and improvement of the evaluation system for the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities. First of all, although some scholars have conducted research on the implementation evaluation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities and historic districts, compared with the results of the implementation evaluation theory of master plans, the relevant results are still very limited. Its indicator system, evaluation methods and evaluation criteria must be analyzed and clarified. Therefore, the systematicness and completeness of the implementation

evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans urgently need to be strengthened. Second, as key dimensions in the pressure-state-feedback (PSR) model, objectivity criteria and feedback criteria help to comprehensively measure the implementation of plans. The addition of criteria such as satisfaction and authenticity is a critical complement to existing subjective criteria. Finally, as of 2014, there were 125 national-level historical and cultural cities, 252 famous historical and cultural towns, and 276 famous villages in the country. These historical and cultural cities, towns and villages are large in number and widely distributed, but there are no standards and guidelines for their evaluation. Therefore, empirical-based research will have a typical demonstration role and improve the feasibility and operability of the model through the optimization of model construction.

5 CONCLUSION

In summary, from the perspective of the post-evaluation field, the direction of urban planning implementation evaluation, and national needs, the implementation evaluation of historical and cultural city protection plans should be based on the relevant results of the general plan implementation evaluation, establish a planning implementation evaluation system for its own urban research, and establish a plan implementation evaluation system related to famous cities. Evaluate supporting standards, regulations, methods and empirical systems to avoid the historical problems of "emphasis on cultural preservation and under-emphasis on urban preservation" and "replacing law with literature". However, from the analysis of the current research status and development trends at home and abroad, the foreign evaluation criterion system for heritage protection has gradually developed into a comprehensive multi-criteria system of subjective criteria, objective criteria, and residents' perception evaluation. At the same time, the specific content selection of its subjective, objective, feedback and other criteria lacks organic connection and synthesis, and the selection of the evaluation methods of each criterion lacks rigorous demonstration. The trade-off between complexity and simplicity using rigorous multi-criteria mathematical calculation methods is the key to the construction of a multi-criteria evaluation system. Therefore, there is an urgent need in the academic community to establish a comprehensive and concise evaluation content system, evaluation index system, evaluation method system and empirical system for the implementation of protection plans for historical and cultural cities based on the systematic theory method or the fuzzy set method, in order to improve the systematicness of the famous city evaluation system. and provide ideas for operability. The establishment of this framework is helpful in practice to achieve the refined management of planning preparation and implementation and the balance of urban games, thereby coordinating the interest relationships in complex social projects, avoiding and eliminating technological alienation; in theory, it can clarify the historical and cultural cities The independence, systematicness and completeness of the evaluation of the implementation of conservation plans will help change the characteristics of "emphasis on cultural preservation and neglect of urban preservation" inherited from the planned economy period in the field of heritage protection in my country. Finally, this framework can guide the establishment and improvement of the implementation evaluation system of historical and cultural city protection plans, and provide standards and guidelines for implementation evaluation of a large number of widely distributed historical and cultural cities, towns and villages.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zeng Shuhuai, Meng Chao. Assessment of Chinese historical towns under the standards for World Heritage application. *Shanghai Urban Planning*, 2009 (6): 129-132.
- [2] Mac Kee, J. *Conserving Cultural Built Heritage in South and Southeast Asia: A Conceptual Framework for the Conservation of Non-secular Built Heritage Based on the Philosophical and Cultural Experiences of the Region*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2009 .
- [3] Guo Zhan. "Xi'an Declaration"-New Guidelines for Environmental Protection of Cultural Heritage. *Chinese Cultural Heritage*, 2005 (6): 6-7.
- [4] Li Wangming. *Research on evaluation of urban master planning implementation*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang University Press, 2007.
- [5] Lai Shigang. Review of research on urban planning implementation effect evaluation. *Planner*, 2010, 26 (3): 10-13.
- [6] Sun Shiwen, Zhou Yu. Theory and methods of urban planning implementation evaluation. *Urban Planning Transactions*, 2003 (3): 15-20.
- [7] Xing Gurui. Research on the evaluation framework of urban master planning implementation effects. *Urban Issues*, 2013, 215(6): 23-27.
- [8] Wei Mengkun. Discussion on the content of urban master planning implementation evaluation. *Urban Development Research*, 2010, 17(4): 54-58.
- [9] Hong Wuyang, et al. Research on evaluation methods for the implementation of overall land use planning. *Land and Resources Science and Technology Management*, 2013, 30(5): 68-73.
- [10] Li Hong, Deng Hongdi, Wang Heng. Design concept of land use planning implementation evaluation system. *Land and Resources Science and Technology Management*, 2013, 30(3): 127-131.
- [11] Ouyang Peng. Preliminary study on urban planning evaluation models and methods from the perspective of public policy. *Urban Planning*, 2008, 32(12): 22-28.

- [12] He Lingcong. Research on evaluation methods and mechanisms of urban master planning implementation based on dynamic maintenance. *Planner*, 2013, 29(6): 18-23.
- [13] Tian Li, Lu Chuanting, Shen Tiyan. Theoretical and empirical research on the implementation evaluation of urban master planning-taking Guangzhou master plan (2001-2010) as an example. *Urban Planning Journal*, 2008, 177 (5): 90-100.
- [14] Luo Tai, Xu Jingyun, Hu Lili. Planning implementation evaluation and development suggestions for Lingang New City. *Shanghai Urban Planning*, 2009, 87 (4): 39-42.
- [15] He Yin, He Lewen. Practice and Enlightenment of Xiangtan Urban Master Planning Implementation Evaluation. *Chinese and Foreign Architecture*, 2013 (11): 65-67.
- [16] Cheng Maoji, Wang Bo. Evaluation of the implementation of Nanjing's urban master plan and related thoughts. *Modern Urban Research*, 2011 (4): 88-96.
- [17] Zhao Min, Wang Jun, Liu Feng. About the system construction of urban master plan implementation evaluation—taking Bengbu city master plan implementation evaluation as an example. *Shanghai Urban Planning*, 2013 (3): 18-22.
- [18] Yin Hongling, Chen Youchuan, Zhang Junmin. Thoughts on improving urban master planning preparation caused by planning implementation evaluation—taking the implementation evaluation of "Jiaonan City Master Plan (2004-2020)" as an example. *Planner*, 2012, 28(9):112-115.
- [19] Jian Fengmin, Wu Jiang. Research on the connotation and methods of post-implementation evaluation of residential area planning. *Shanghai Urban Planning*, 2006, 68(3): 46-51.
- [20] Sun Shiwen, Zhang Meiliang. Preliminary study on urban design implementation evaluation-taking the urban design of Jing'an Temple area in Shanghai as an example. *Urban Planning* 2007, 31 (4): 42-47.
- [21] Wei Fan. Enlightenment and reflections on the implementation evaluation of the protection plan of the Three Lanes and Seven Alleys Historical and Cultural Districts in Fuzhou. *Fujian Architecture*, 2013 (5): 4-5.
- [22] Gu Wenyue. Research on the implementation evaluation of Wuhan's historical and cultural city protection plan. Wuhan: Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 2012.
- [23] Li Jing. Research on the Implementation Evaluation of Cuiheng Historical and Cultural Village Protection Plan. Guangzhou: South China University of Technology, 2011.
- [24] Song Yan, Chen Yanping. *Urban Planning Assessment Guidelines*. Beijing: China Construction Industry Press, 2012.
- [25] Chan, EHW, J. Hou. Developing a Framework to Appraise the Critical Success Factors of Transfer Development Rights (TDRs) for Built Heritage Conservation. *Habitat International*, 2015, 46(0): 35-43.
- [26] Kovacs, JF, K. Jonas Galvin, R. Shipley. *Assessing the Success of Heritage Conservation Districts: Insights from Ontario, Canada. Cities*.
- [27] Amit-Cohen, I. Synergy between Urban Planning, Conservation of the Cultural Built Heritage and Functional Changes in the Old Urban Center—The Case of Tel Aviv. *Land Use Policy*, 2005, 22(4): 291-300.
- [28] Monteiro, V., M. Painho, E. Vaz. Is the Heritage Really Important? A Theoretical Framework for Heritage Reputation Using Citizen Sensing. *Habitat International*, 2015, 45, Part 2(0): 156-162.
- [29] Brandon, PS, Lombardi, PL *Evaluating Sustainable Development in the Built environment*. 2nded. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- [30] Sun Shiwen. On the evaluation and research of urban planning implementation. //Sun Shiwen, Sang Jin. The 54th issue of "Urban Planning Review". Shanghai: Tongji University Press, 2012.
- [31] Dutta, M. and Z. Husain. An application of Multi-criteria Decision Making to Built heritage. The Case of Calcutta. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 2009, 10(2): 237-243.
- [32] Wang, W. M. , et al. An Integrated Decision Making Model for District Revitalization and Regeneration Project Selection. *Decision Support Systems*, 2013, 54(2): 1092-1103.