

between having a desired facility and pedestrians (and vegetation) having less exposure to the sky at ground level.

The transfer of development rights from one site to another has been another tool that has been used to protect specific buildings and districts deemed worthy of maintaining in their present character yet being located where a property developer has the legal right to develop in a different manner. The incentive is to provide the developer with above legal rights in another location while buying out development rights in the original location at less than market value.

All incentives boil down to assisting property developers with financing in some form or another. Lowering taxes is one. Another used to meet urban design ends is through tax increment financing. It is not a legal technique in most countries. In the United States, however, it is available in a number of states. In California it was made possible by a 1962 amendment to the state's constitution. The amendment allows property developers working in a precinct of a municipality that has a plan supported by its citizens, to benefit directly from the increment in property taxes that accrue due to the improvements made by them within that area. This increase in tax revenue is ploughed back into further improving and/or maintaining the area well. The coordinating frame – the development plan and controls – for the continued development of the area can then be publicly funded (see the description of Glendale in Chapter 8).

Sticks

There are a number of specific disincentives that urban designers can use for shaping development. Their use is often problematic unless supported by evidence that can persuade the courts and/or administrative tribunals that they are justified. One of the major disincentives to carrying out a project is the financial cost of doing so in comparison to the financial return to be received. Such sticks may take the form of increased taxes, slowing down the approval process for projects not regarded as complying with design guidelines, for instance, and the direct payments of fees.

Many city centres are crowded with drivers in automobiles. The standard response is to create wider roads, more one-way streets and more parking facilities and/or to improve mass transit systems. An alternative that involves no physical design, but rather requires the direct payment of fees is in place in Singapore and in London. It is to charge people for driving into the central business district. In the City of London, the traffic moved at 16 kilometres per hour (10 miles per hour). In early 2003, a road levy of £5.00 was imposed in an effort to persuade people to use the metropolitan area's bus services and antiquated underground system. The goal was to reduce journey times within the City by 20% to 30%. Reports are that it has been at least partially successful.

A different tactic was used in Bellevue near Seattle to encourage workers in the central area of the city to use the bus system (see Chapter 9). It was to make parking more difficult. The number of parking spaces required per 1000 square feet