

Large language model empowered participatory urban planning

Zhilun Zhou^a, Yuming Lin^{a,*}, Yong Li^{a,*}

^a*Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*

Abstract

Participatory urban planning is the mainstream of modern urban planning and involves the active engagement of different stakeholders. However, the traditional participatory paradigm encounters challenges in time and manpower, while the generative planning tools fail to provide adjustable and inclusive solutions. This research introduces an innovative urban planning approach integrating Large Language Models (LLMs) within the participatory process. The framework, based on the crafted LLM agent, consists of role-play, collaborative generation, and feedback iteration, solving a community-level land-use task catering to 1000 distinct interests. Empirical experiments in diverse urban communities exhibit LLM's adaptability and effectiveness across varied planning scenarios. The results were evaluated on four metrics, surpassing human experts in satisfaction and inclusion, and rivaling state-of-the-art reinforcement learning methods in service and ecology. Further analysis shows the advantage of LLM agents in providing adjustable and inclusive solutions with natural language reasoning and strong scalability. While implementing the recent advancements in emulating human behavior for planning, this work envisions both planners and citizens benefiting from low-cost, efficient LLM agents, which is crucial for enhancing participation and realizing participatory urban planning.

Keywords: Participatory planning, Large Language Model, agent-based simulation, generative model, land-use planning

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: linyuming9@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn (Yuming Lin), liyong07@tsinghua.edu.cn (Yong Li)

1. Introduction

Participatory Urban Planning (PUP) is a process of collaborative decision-making that involves the active engagement of different stakeholders to tackle complex spatial challenges and achieve sustainable urban development [1, 2, 3]. This inclusive approach aims to incorporate diverse perspectives and promote a sense of ownership among community members in planning and decision-making processes, making it one of the most commonly used methods in current urban community planning [4].

The traditional participatory urban planning method requires extensive experience, consideration of multiple interests, and often a case-by-case examination of unique community problems. Therefore, it demands significant time and manpower and heavily relies on experienced urban planners [5]. As cities continue to grow and the need for urban renewal steadily increases, the limitations of traditional urban planning methods become more apparent, prompting the exploration of innovative methodologies that can enhance their efficiency and effectiveness [6].

Various generative urban planning techniques have been proposed in the literature, such as evolutionary algorithms [7], Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) [8], Variational Autoencoder (VAE) [9], or Reinforcement Learning (RL) [10, 11]. While these methods have shown promise in generating planning solutions, they usually take objective optimization goals and lose sight of the nuanced demands of residents, which may harm the interests of vulnerable groups and is usually hard to adjust. The inherent limitations of these generative methods highlight the need for an approach that encapsulates human-centric considerations.

Large Language Models (LLMs) have emerged as a promising solution to these challenges. These advanced natural language processing models, such as GPT-3, are capable of understanding and generating human-like text for various tasks [12]. They are trained on colossal datasets, which makes them highly versatile in language understanding abilities and is a useful tool for content creation. Therefore, it is possible to generate an urban planning scheme using natural language interaction with the LLM, fulfilling the human-centric considerations easily. Another significant advantage of LLMs is that they can create human-like agents, which can mirror the interests and demands of people with simple role-play prompts [13]. Based on the role settings, LLM agents can carry out complex reasoning and interactions [14], and even run a virtual town with events like birth party and mayor election [15].

This unique ability makes them effective representatives of diverse stakeholders in virtual scenario discussions and contributes to a comprehensive and inclusive decision-making process in a virtual way.

Integrating LLM into participatory urban planning processes introduces a new approach that allows the governor and planners to simulate the entire process before actual planning activities begin. Besides the ability to generate reasonable planning based on their wealth of knowledge, LLM agents can serve as virtual representatives of diverse stakeholders, pre-planning simulations provide a mechanism to explore potential public engagement and resident feedback, providing valuable insights and references. The possible planning solutions can also be generated in a discussion loop with proper design. The ability to anticipate and address potential needs and challenges in a simulated environment can save significant time and manpower, highlight the interest of under-representative vulnerable populations, and enhance the robustness of subsequent planning stages before the participatory process starts.

In conclusion, our study introduces a novel urban planning approach leveraging the capabilities of LLM within the participatory urban planning paradigm. The findings demonstrate that LLM can generate coherent urban planning schemes when provided with appropriate prompts. Moreover, integrating LLM into the participatory planning workflow, encompassing role-play, collaborative generation, and feedback iteration, enhances inclusivity and decision-making efficiency. Empirical experiments in two communities reveal that LLM surpasses human experts in need-agnostic service and ecology metrics, and achieves optimal results in need-aware satisfaction and inclusion metrics. Detailed analysis underscores that the LLM model effectively addresses the limitations inherent in generative methods by considering individual needs and delivering transparent, easily adaptable outcomes. Subsequent sections will delve into discussions concerning related works, method design, experimental settings, and the evidenced results that substantiate the efficacy of our framework.

2. Related work

2.1. Participatory planning

Participatory Planning has evolved as a pivotal approach in urban planning, emphasizing community engagement in the decision-making process [3]. Tracing the evolution of participatory planning from its early roots, seminal

works by Arnstein [1] and Forester [2] underscore the fundamental principles of citizen involvement in planning processes.

Although scholars emphasize the imperative of deliberative democracy and the empowerment of marginalized voices, the practical application of these theories encounters formidable challenges in translating principles into actionable practices. An empirical study by Monno and Khakee [16] indicates that planners often lean towards restricting participation to mere information and consultation, lacking assurance that concerns will be genuinely considered. Professionals may express nominal support in the abstract but harbor reservations about citizens' qualifications, citing a perceived lack of commitment, competence, or foresight in their interests [17]. In the context of rural Indonesia, Akbar et al. [18] illustrate a procedure heavily reliant on local elites, resulting in limited representativeness and the exclusion of marginalized groups, including the disabled and impoverished. As a summary, Abas et al. [19] point out the five main challenges for public participation, including cost, lack of skilled facilitators, low efficiency, low interest to participate, and language barriers.

Fortunately, interactive dashboards, Augmented Reality (AR), Virtual Reality (VR), and Artificial Intelligence (AI) can help the practice of participatory democracy. Online participatory tools featuring data and figures give participants an accessible platform to articulate their views and engage in real-time discussions, thereby alleviating impediments to information dissemination [20, 21]. Moreover, lots of digital participatory planning practices show AR and VR can offer immersive and inclusive environments, facilitating diverse stakeholder participation and effectively addressing challenges related to travel costs, language barriers, and professional thresholds [22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. Du et al. [27] contend that AI can be helpful in participant selection, identifying domain experts, and weighing opinions, thereby easing the burden on facilitators and promoting efficiency. Additionally, AI chatbots, as demonstrated in an experiment in Afghanistan [28], prove effective in encouraging people to share opinions, achieving response rates comparable to human facilitators.

However, despite the promising potential of technological innovations to enhance citizen engagement, there remains a significant gap in truly transforming group processes and outcomes [27]. The limited familiarity and a dearth of consistency and transparency restrain the more substantial integration of AI methods [29]. The ongoing progress in natural language processing holds the promise of addressing these challenges and unlocking the full po-

tential of technological interventions in participatory processes.

2.2. Multi-agent collaboration with large language models

There has been an adequate study showing that LLM can serve as an emulated role-play tool [13]. Many studies accompanying the recent advancement of LLM now focus on multi-agent collaboration with LLMs, where different roles will be assigned to LLM agents. Then, these agents will cooperate to solve a complex task together.

Specifically, LLM agents are usually assigned roles based on distinct expert knowledge in the role-play part. For example, solving operations research problems needs roles like terminology interpreter, modeling expert, programmer, and evaluator [30], while developing software may need product manager, architect, project manager, engineer, and QA engineer [31]. Moreover, some studies craft LLM agents with adaptive roles when solving the problem [32]. To enable LLM agents to act in specific roles, researchers usually carefully design prompts to guide agents' behavior and provide expert knowledge needed by prompting or external knowledge bases.

After the role-play, collaboration mechanisms are designed to enable the cooperation of different agents. Such a mechanism can be the form of a pipeline, where different agents sequentially finish part of the task [31, 30, 33], or group discussion, where several agents communicate with each other to reach an agreement [34, 35], or the hybrid of them [32].

Multi-agent collaboration with LLMs has shown considerable success in many domains, including operations research [30], text quality evaluation [36], solving math problems [37], and software development [31]. However, none of the existing studies have applied LLMs to simulate citizens in urban planning scenarios. Moreover, most existing works only incorporate a few LLM agents, which cannot be directly applied to participatory planning where a community may contain a dozen thousand residents.

3. Methods

3.1. LLM and the overall framework

As indicated by prior research, LLMs exhibit remarkable natural language comprehension across diverse domains. Therefore, a straightforward approach involves framing planning challenges in natural language and using the multi-modal capabilities of the large language model to interpret planning instructions and generate design. Besides, the expansive scope of

natural language makes LLM valuable participants as they can assume a quasi-human agent role. By crafting prompt templates aligning with specific roles, LLM agents can emulate professional planners or local residents, obviating the need for intricate manual design of internal mechanisms. While the exact mechanisms underpinning LLMs’ capabilities remain partially understood, their extensive textual and real-world knowledge empowers them to make contextually rational decisions, rendering them efficacious participants in participatory processes.

To systematically reveal the latent capabilities of LLM agents, we have formulated a participatory planning framework harnessing the generative prowess of LLM, as depicted in Figure 1. This framework adheres to conventional participatory planning, incorporating simplifications for enhanced representational clarity. It encompasses three primary modules: role-playing, collaborative generation, and feedback iteration.




Figure 1: The framework of our proposed participatory planning method.

3.2. Role-playing

In leveraging the role-playing capability of LLM, we craft diverse agents to emulate distinct real participants, equipping them with fundamental attributes and pertinent knowledge (Figure 1A). Adopting the prevalent organizational structure of planning teams, we designate a chief planner (CP)

responsible for overarching planning considerations, alongside several sub-community planners (SP) tasked with in-depth exploration of regional challenges. The transformation of all planning actions into natural language enables both CP and SP to formulate a planning scheme independently. For the residents, we emulate their foundational attributes to generate reliable agents aligning with their respective profiles.

It is essential to highlight the adaptability and flexibility of all agents, allowing for seamless adjustment and extension of functionalities through straightforward natural language commands. For conciseness, the present framework excludes other stakeholders like government officials or estate developers; nevertheless, their integration can be accommodated effortlessly. Additionally, the interaction with agents occurs exclusively in natural language, facilitating the substitution of these agents with real individuals and ensuring a smooth transition between the simulated environment and real-world scenarios.

3.3. Collaborative generation

Building upon these LLM agents, we initiate collaborative planning generation, using community-level land-use redevelopment as an illustrative case for generality (Figure 1B). The collaborative generation process involves distinct key steps. Initially, the CP agent, leveraging its intrinsic professional knowledge and multimodal capabilities, crafts a proposal for community land use with the allocation for each plot. Subsequently, this proposal undergoes iterative discussions facilitated within the participatory planning framework, engaging resident agents with diverse attributes and vested interests. Then, the discussion results are relayed to the CP agent for a new proposal.

Note that the discussions for each plot are moderated by an SP agent, who solicits opinions and opposition from resident agents in the respective areas. These discussions encompass not only the rebuttals of existing proposals but also involve residents engaging in mutual discussions, disputes, and persuasion based on divergent interests. Despite the SP agent overseeing the entire discussion, their primary role is summarizing and organizing the ultimate result derived from the residents. The outcome is subsequently fed back to the CP agent, guiding corresponding revisions to ensure the substantive inclusion of resident perspectives. Therefore, our framework transcends tokenism consultative participation, embodying substantive content controlled by the citizen members.

3.4. Feedback iteration

The feedback iteration component, illustrated in Figure 1C, is designed to address the deficiencies in the planning scheme, exemplified by the predetermined number of land-sue. Following the revision of the proposal based on resident perspectives, unintended violations of crucial planning directives may occur, such as insufficient allocation of hospitals. These violations are conveyed to the CP through natural language templates, ensuring attention to these constraints in subsequent solution discussions. This approach is intuitive, considering the planner must balance planning constraints with the residents’ demands.

3.5. Output

The primary and most tangible outcome of our model is participatory-generated land-use planning. The final plan represents a novel generative approach to urban planning, offering valuable references for practical planning initiatives. A notable advantage of this generative model is its capacity to swiftly produce numerous plans autonomously, and the underlying rationale of the generated plan can be carefully examined, which is hard for other generative methods.

Additionally, the LLM agents engendered in this process are also noteworthy outputs. Operating on natural language and adaptable in practical applications, both planner and resident agents can be seamlessly integrated into existing participatory planning processes. Planners can experiment by proposing planning solutions and assessing the sentiments and objections of resident agents, facilitating efficient collection of essential feedback before the onset of the participatory process. Similarly, residents keen on participatory planning can initiate communication with planner agents to efficiently grasp planning knowledge, enhancing their ability to articulate interests and concerns effectively within the participatory planning process.

4. Experiment

4.1. Study area

The experimental study was carried out in two representative communities, Huilongguan (HLG) and Dahongmen (DHM), which serve as distinct representations of urban models in Beijing (see Fig. 2). HLG, situated 33km north of Beijing’s city center, was originally a satellite town and has now

integrated into the Beijing metropolis within the 6th Ring Road. Characterized by extensive high-rise residential complexes, HLG has evolved into one of the most densely populated communities in Beijing. However, the surrounding infrastructure is inadequate, and limited employment opportunities necessitate many residents to commute for remote work, making HLG a typical commuter town.

Conversely, DHM, located in south Beijing, represents a different urban landscape. The name "Dahongmen" or "Big Red Gate" originally referred to a gate in the Imperial Garden dating back to the 16th century. With a long history of residency and the Liangshui River traversing its expanse, Dahongmen was historically the largest clothing wholesale trading center in North China. Over time, the area has experienced unplanned and haphazard development, resulting in a scattered urban layout that intertwines residential spaces with commerce, warehousing, logistics, and rental compounds. Apart from the disordered landscapes, some informal settlement areas lacking sufficient infrastructure have been preserved, rendering the area susceptible to flooding and other risks.




Figure 2: The satellite image and area division of two communities, Huilongguan (HLG) and Dahongmen (DHM).

The choice of communities considers their diverse socio-economic profiles, demographic compositions, and complexities in urban planning. Key information about these two areas, derived from the census yearbook [38], is presented in Table 1. HLG, being a relatively recent community, demonstrates a predominantly youthful resident demographic, with a significant

48.88% holding a Bachelor’s degree or higher. In contrast, DHM has a higher proportion (24.23%) of elderly residents aged over 60, introducing distinct preferences and motivations in participatory urban planning. By selecting communities with diverse resident profiles, our experiment aimed to capture a broad spectrum of participatory urban planning scenarios, fostering a comprehensive understanding of the LLM’s effectiveness in diverse contexts.

Table 1: The basic information of two real-world datasets.

Community	Area	#Residents	Age≥60	Bachelor’s degree	#Plots	#Vacant Plots
HLG	3.74 km ²	85,041	16.38%	48.88%	63	42
DHM	5.17 km ²	73,130	24.23%	31.54%	70	42

4.2. Initial conditions and planning requirements

We replicate the initial conditions of the HLG and DHM communities using OpenStreetMap data. To simplify the complex spatial setting, we partitioned the areas into plots based on roads and existing land-use conditions by expert input. Following common scenarios in actual urban redevelopment, we retain the residency and major green land plots and treat another land-use plot as vacant spaces. Both HLG and DHM consist of 42 vacant plots that can be re-zoned into eight different functionalities, including school, hospital, clinic, business, office, recreation, park and green space. The proposed LLM framework simulates the roles of CP, SP, and residents in the participatory diagram to redevelop the areas.

To ensure that the communities are realistic and well-planned, we established some basic requirements. For both communities, a minimum number of plots are mandated to ensure adequate infrastructure coverage: 6 plots for schools, 6 for recreation areas, 4 for businesses, 4 for clinics, and 1 for parks and green spaces. Reflecting the need for job opportunities in HLG, the minimum number of office plots is 6, while in DHM is 2. Addressing the needs of the aging population, a minimum of 2 hospital plots are required in HLG, compared to 1 in DHM.

To align with reality, the background of participants is considered. We created 1,000 resident agents for each community, balancing the actual population and simulation capabilities. The agent profiles, encompassing gender, age, family size, and education, are sampled from statistical distributions. It is noteworthy that the agent number surpasses 1% of the actual population in both communities, aligning with the standard used in yearly censuses

and exceeding the typical consideration in participatory planning. We also intentionally included four vulnerable groups by creating additional agents: families with children, families with patients, elderly individuals living alone, and rental migrants. For each community, one CP agent and four SP agents were created.

4.3. Evaluation metric

To evaluate the performance of our framework, we employed two categories of metrics: need-agnostic and need-aware. Need-agnostic metrics are aggregated indicators providing an overview of the entire community, focusing on service and ecology without individual need. For service, the minimum distance $d(m, j)$ for the agent m to access the j th type of plots P^j is calculated as:

$$d(m, j) = \min\{\text{EucDis}(L_m, P_1^j), \dots, \text{EucDis}(L_m, P_{k_j}^j)\},$$

where L_m represents the home location of agent m , and the k_j is the total number of plots of type j . Subsequently, the Service metric is defined as:

$$\text{Service} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{m=1}^{n_m} \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mathbb{1}[d(m, j) < 500],$$

where n_m denotes the number of agents and n_j is the number of land use types. The Service metric signifies the proportion of accessible services within a 500m radius, ranging from 0 to 1.

On the other hand, the Ecology Service Range (ESR) is defined as the union of buffers extending 300m from each park and open space P_k^{park} , represented as:

$$\text{ESR} = \text{Union}\{\text{Buffer}(P_1^{park}, 300), \dots, \text{Buffer}(P_k^{park}, 300)\},$$

subsequently, the Ecology metric is defined as:

$$\text{Ecology} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{m=1}^{n_m} \mathbb{1}[L_i \in \text{ESR}],$$

where Ecology signifies the proportion of agents covered by the ecological service range, ranging from 0 to 1. The two need-agnostic metrics effectively encapsulate the concept of a 15-minute life circle [39], ensuring that basic

community services are reachable within 15 minutes by walking or cycling. It's noteworthy that the flexibility of metric selection allows for further extensions in real-world scenarios.

However, the Service and Ecology metrics do not consider the various needs of residents with different profiles. Therefore, we further introduce two need-aware metrics Satisfaction and Inclusion. At the forefront of participatory planning, the paramount consideration lies in meticulously examining residents' feedback and opinions. Within our simulated environment, each resident agent m can report a set of land-use types comprising 3-5 deemed most urgently needed, denoted as J_m . We define the satisfaction level for agent m as a need-aware metric:

$$S_m = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mathbb{1}[d(m, j) < 500], \quad j \in J_m,$$

where $d(m, j)$ represents the minimum distance for the m th agent to access the j th type of plots. The overall satisfaction metric is then calculated as:

$$\text{Satisfaction} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{m=1}^{n_m} S_m,$$

with n_m denoting the total number of agents. The Satisfaction metric quantifies the extent to which each agent's needs are fulfilled, ranging from 0 to 1. In parallel, we introduce an Inclusion metric to safeguard the interests of marginalized groups V in a similar way:

$$S_v = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mathbb{1}[d(v, j) < 500], \quad j \in J_v, \quad v \in V,$$

$$\text{Inclusion} = \frac{1}{n_v} \sum_{v=1}^{n_v} S_v.$$

The Inclusion measures whether the planning process adequately addresses the requirements of marginalized groups, contributing to a more equitable and inclusive urban development strategy. We combine the need-agnostic Service and Ecology, and need-aware Satisfaction and Inclusion to measure the performance of the algorithm, aiming to in line with the core aspirations of participatory planning and taking care of the satisfaction of all stakeholders.

4.4. Baseline

To evaluate our framework of participatory urban planning environments, we selected six methods as baselines for comparison: the random method, the centralized method, the decentralized method, the Geometric Set Cover Algorithms (GSCA), the Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL), and the result from human designers. Specifically:

- Random: Each plot will be randomly assigned a functionality ensuring the minimum requirement.
- Centralized: For each functionality, the probability of assigning a new plot is inversely proportional to the distance to the community center.
- Decentralized: For each functionality, the probability of assigning a new plot is proportional to the distance to the same type of plot.
- GSCA: For each functionality, solve the geometric-set-coverage-like problem by maximizing the coverage of the given facility type.
- Human Expert: Recruit professional human designers to accomplish the planning tasks from the same initial condition.
- DRL: Using the deep reinforcement learning method by Zheng et al. [10] to maximize the metric Service and Ecology.

The implementation of baseline methods follows established procedures outlined in the literature [10]. A team of 8 professional planners from the UK and China, with a minimum of 3 years of experience in urban planning, was recruited for the study. The results generated by human designers were transformed in ArcGIS format, enabling the subsequent computation of relevant metrics.

5. Results

Table 2 presents the outcomes of the experiments conducted in the HLG and DHM communities, comparing them with the baseline methods. Instances where the CP Agent generated proposals without engaging in participatory planning discussions are labeled as "Ours w/o discuss." Generally, our method outperformed most rule-based and human-designed solutions in

Table 2: Performance comparison with baselines on two datasets. The best results are presented in bold, and the second-best results are underlined.

Model	HLG				DHM			
	Service	Ecology	Satisfaction	Inclusion	Service	Ecology	Satisfaction	Inclusion
Random	0.491	0.505	0.708	0.698	0.690	0.664	0.691	0.701
Centralized	0.654	0.364	0.578	0.560	0.562	0.393	0.526	0.539
Decentralized	0.709	0.455	0.678	0.691	<u>0.743</u>	0.518	0.694	0.703
GSCA	0.682	0.439	0.653	0.657	<u>0.584</u>	0.464	0.605	0.616
Human Expert	0.713	0.586	0.692	0.714	0.633	0.723	0.750	0.755
RL	0.773	0.747	0.708	0.716	0.671	0.880	0.576	0.597
Ours w/o discuss	0.75	<u>0.746</u>	<u>0.735</u>	<u>0.719</u>	0.729	<u>0.755</u>	<u>0.756</u>	<u>0.777</u>
Ours	<u>0.756</u>	0.714	0.784	0.764	0.760	0.739	0.784	0.794

need-agnostic metrics while showing a slight gap compared to RL. Besides, our method notably surpassed in need-aware metrics.

In the HLG experiment, our method achieved a Service metric score of 0.756, denoting that residents can access 75.6% of necessary facilities within a 500m radius, ranking second only to RL’s 0.773. On the Ecology metric, our initial proposal received a score of 0.746, indicating that 74.6% of residential areas fall within the 300m service range of green spaces, closely approaching RL’s 0.747. However, after participatory discussions, the Ecology score decreased to 0.714, but still surpassed the human expert’s score of 0.586. Considering that increasing facilities may reduce green spaces, a potential trade-off between Service and Ecology may exist. Similar observations were made in DHM, where our approach achieved the top score of 0.760 on the Service metric after discussions with residents, while the Ecology score slightly decreased from 0.755 to 0.739, not reaching RL’s 0.880. Despite the potential trade-off, our approach demonstrated need-agnostic metrics second only to RL, surpassing human designers.

Conversely, our approach unequivocally achieved the first position in need-aware metrics. In HLG, our final solution obtained a Satisfaction score of 0.784, signifying that 78.4% of residents’ diverse needs were satisfied. The Inclusion score was 0.764, indicating that 76.4% of vulnerable groups’ needs were satisfied, remaining the highest among all solutions. In DHM, our solution similarly excelled with scores of 0.784 and 0.794, indicating optimal fulfillment of each resident agent’s specific needs. Notably, RL, which performed well on need-agnostic metrics, did not excel in need-aware metrics, falling short of the results by human planners based on experience. Overall, discussions with resident agents significantly enhanced performance in Satisfaction and Inclusion, substantiating the substantive incorporation of residents’ opinions across experiments.

5.1. Analysis of the role-play

As LLM operates on natural language, a comprehensive examination of the inputs and outputs of each module allows us to verify their alignment with the intended functionality. Figure 3 illustrates examples where each resident agent generates distinct land-use planning demands based on their profiles, along with easily understandable justifications. As expected, the elderly living alone may prioritize their physical health, seeking proximity to the clinic. Workers may prefer nearby office spaces, and patients may desire proximity to hospitals and clinics. While these considerations might appear to be common sense, it is crucial to highlight that addressing such specific demands has been challenging for previous methods. Acquiring these highly individualized requirements typically involves extensive interviews, and the process at the scale of 1000 is impractical since surpasses the capacity of human planners. Our results demonstrate that LLM agents can effectively comprehend human profiles and appropriately role-play based on their backgrounds, catering to individual-level demands and joining the participatory process.




Figure 3: Dialogue of asking residents' needs of facilities. Different residents have different needs corresponding to their profiles and special backgrounds.

5.2. Analysis of the collaborative generation

Beyond the successful role-play in our framework, we facilitate participatory planning through SPs guiding pertinent resident agents in discussions.

Drawing inspiration from the paradigm of focus groups in participatory planning, we partition the entire community into four distinct sub-communities based on the main road network. Resident agents participate in corresponding discussion groups according to the addresses assigned to them. Figure 4 illustrates the discussion process, where an SP solicits opinions from each resident and implements corresponding modifications. The aforementioned role-play guides each resident agent to assess their surroundings and provide preferences, *e.g.*, "As an office worker, I value having a nearby park or recreation area where I can unwind after work". In this scenario. SP agents learn from these demands and adjust the planning scheme accordingly.






Figure 4: An example dialogue of a sub-community planner discussing with residents and revising the plan.

Figure 5 shows the substantive change resulting from these discussions, with the initial planning scheme on the left and modifications proposed by each sub-community in bold boxes on the right. Overall, CP generates a reasonably sound initial plan, and participatory discussions refine and enhance this outcome. The hierarchical sub-community structure enables resident agents to concentrate more effectively on areas directly related to their interests and guarantees substantive inclusion of concerns in the planning process.

In the case of HLG (Figure 5(b)), the revisions predominantly focused on the primary east-west streets. SP agents adjusted land-use types based on residents' needs, such as transforming Area 4 from commercial to educational.



(a) HLG



(b) DHM

Figure 5: The modification of the planning after revising by each sub-community planner and the reasons given by planners. Change are marked in bold solid lines.

This adjustment adheres to planning basic principles, as Area 4 is situated within a residential area with limited commercial value but close to a park. Sub-Community 2 lacks an internal school, justifying the reason given by the SP agent, "Given its size and proximity to a park and residential areas, it could serve well as a school, fulfilling a frequently mentioned need among residents, especially those with children."

Furthermore, SP agents learn to make corresponding adjustments after changes in other sub-communities. For instance, following the transformation of commercial areas into other uses in Sub-Communities 2 and 3 (Area 4 and 15), there is no accessible commercial space in Sub-Community 1. Consequently, Area 12 is transformed from open space to commercial land, "[...] addresses the need for more business opportunities and commercial activities within the community". Similar adjustments can also be observed in DHM (see Figure 5(a)), where the major hospital relocates across sub-communities. This suggests that our designed discussion mechanism allows feedback across different levels, achieving a globally optimal outcome.

Figure 6 illustrates the overall improvement in metrics following the successive transformations of the four sub-communities corresponding to HLG and DHM. It can be observed that, with the gradual progression of modifications, need-aware metrics show a noticeable enhancement, while need-agnostic metrics fluctuate. This trend is unsurprising since participatory adjustments primarily consider individual needs. Simultaneously, we observe that these refinements have a minimal impact on need-agnostic metrics, suggesting rational adjustments on the initial planning can significantly improve satisfaction and inclusion without undermining facilities coverage. This underscores the importance of the participatory method.

5.3. Analysis of the feedback iteration

As previously analyzed, the plan adjusted by SP may not completely fulfill planning requirements. Consequently, specific modifications are essential to rectify these deficiencies. Figure 7 illustrates that the plan undergoes a fixed mechanism check and evaluation. Violations of requirements are translated into a natural language template, prompting CP to make corresponding adjustments. The CP agent will address conflicting portions, considering the overall plan and the characteristics of each plot, as highlighted by black boxes.

The revision reveals that the CP agent possesses a nuanced understanding of the community's characteristics. It underscores, for instance, that




Figure 6: The metrics after the revision of each sub-community. 0 indicates the initial plan by the chief planner, and 4 indicates the plan after revising 4 sub-communities, i.e., the final plan.




Figure 7: An example of feedback mechanism.

”Area 42 [...] could benefit from additional office space for local employment opportunities,” aligning with the context of HLG being a high-density area with insufficient job opportunities.

6. Discussion

In conclusion, our research introduces a novel urban planning approach that integrates role-playing, collaborative generation, and feedback iteration using LLM agents in the participatory paradigm. Through empirical experiments in two distinct communities HLG and DHM, we demonstrate that our LLM-powered model performs exceptionally well, ranking second only to RL in service (0.756 and 0.760) and ecology (0.714 and 0.739) metrics, while achieving optimal results in satisfaction (0.784 and 0.784) and inclusion (0.764 and 0.794). Our findings highlight the capacity of LLM to generate coherent urban planning schemes, with a detailed analysis emphasizing its ability to address individual needs, incorporate opinions substantively, and deliver outcomes that are transparent and adaptable. The main contributions made are listed below:

- **Innovative LLM-powered participatory framework:** We propose a novel participatory framework that leverages the capacity of LLM, showcasing the potential of LLMs in generating coherent and participatory planning schemes.
- **Adaptability in diverse urban contexts:** We conduct empirical experiments in two diverse urban communities, demonstrating the adaptability and effectiveness of the LLM-powered model across varied urban planning scenarios.
- **Compelling performance outcomes:** The research yields compelling performance outcomes, showcasing that the LLM-powered model achieves more competitive results than human experts and is comparable to the newest RL method.

It is also noteworthy that, as a newly emerging generative model, planners and residents can benefit from LLM agents. For planners, the resident agents played by LLM, though not necessarily mirroring the real world, sufficiently reflect potential needs and possible challenges. Especially this form

of role-playing, devoid of time-consuming iterative discussions, offers a convenient means for participatory discussion and presents a simple emulation from tokenism consultative steps to citizen-controlled collaboration [1]. For residents, the planner agent played by LLM theoretically possesses vast planning knowledge from experts, as we have seen in the online health consultation [40]. Furthermore, the planner agent can transparently and interactively elucidate all motivations and reasons behind the planning decisions in natural language, simultaneously eliminating potential biases and conflicts of interest. Therefore, LLMs-empowered agents form a low-cost, highly efficient approach crucial in enhancing participation in planning and rebuilding trust between residents and professionals.

We must acknowledge the numerous simplifications regarding planning elements involved throughout the process. Factors such as ownership, development costs, higher-level planning, or community visions were omitted in this study, potentially leading to a deviation from practical planning scenarios. However, the immense scalability of LLM based on natural language allows these shortcomings to be addressed through new prompts without compromising the effectiveness and interpretability of our framework. Similarly, the extent to which LLM agents can authentically emulate humans remains a question awaiting further advancements in computer technology. We must also note that our objective is not to replace real humans with LLM agents, and we acknowledge citizen engagement is paramount within the participatory planning framework. Our anticipation is that LLM agents, serving as planning support systems, can generate potential opinions, provide professional knowledge, assist in citizen participation, ultimately foster trust between citizens and professionals, and facilitate the realization of participatory urban planning.

References

- [1] S. R. Arnstein, A ladder of citizen participation, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (4) (1969) 216–224. [doi:10.1080/01944366908977225](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225).
- [2] J. Forester, Planning in the face of power, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48 (1) (1982) 67–80. [doi:10.1080/01944368208976167](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944368208976167).

- [3] J. Forester, *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*, Mit Press, MIT Press, 1999.
URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=ywJXreTLoBcC>
- [4] X. Li, F. Zhang, E. C. man Hui, W. Lang, Collaborative workshop and community participation: A new approach to urban regeneration in china, *Cities* 102 (2020) 102743. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2020.102743.
- [5] A. F. Erik Eriksson, J. Syssner, Opening the black box of participatory planning: a study of how planners handle citizens' input, *European Planning Studies* 30 (6) (2022) 994–1012. doi:10.1080/09654313.2021.1895974.
- [6] L. Tian, J. Liu, Y. Liang, Y. Wu, A participatory e-planning model in the urban renewal of china: Implications of technologies in facilitating planning participation, *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 50 (2) (2023) 299–315. doi:10.1177/23998083221111163.
- [7] R. Koenig, Y. Miao, A. Aichinger, K. Knecht, K. Konieva, Integrating urban analysis, generative design, and evolutionary optimization for solving urban design problems, *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 47 (6) (2020) 997–1013. doi:10.1177/2399808319894986.
- [8] S. J. Quan, Urban-gan: An artificial intelligence-aided computation system for plural urban design, *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 49 (9) (2022) 2500–2515. doi:10.1177/23998083221100550.
- [9] D. Wang, K. Liu, P. Johnson, L. Sun, B. Du, Y. Fu, Deep human-guided conditional variational generative modeling for automated urban planning, in: *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 2021, pp. 679–688. doi:10.1109/ICDM51629.2021.00079.
- [10] Y. Zheng, Y. Lin, L. Zhao, T. Wu, D. Jin, Y. Li, Spatial planning of urban communities via deep reinforcement learning, *Nature Computational Science* 3 (9) (2023) 748–762. doi:10.1038/s43588-023-00503-5.

- [11] K. Qian, L. Mao, X. Liang, Y. Ding, J. Gao, X. Wei, Z. Guo, J. Li, Ai agent as urban planner: Steering stakeholder dynamics in urban planning via consensus-based multi-agent reinforcement learning (2023). [arXiv:2310.16772](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.16772).
- [12] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, D. Amodei, [Language models are few-shot learners](#), in: H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, H. Lin (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 1877–1901.
URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf
- [13] M. Shanahan, K. McDonell, L. Reynolds, Role play with large language models, *Nature* 623 (7987) (2023) 493–498. [doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8).
- [14] T. Hagendorff, S. Fabi, M. Kosinski, Human-like intuitive behavior and reasoning biases emerged in large language models but disappeared in chatgpt, *Nature Computational Science* 3 (10) (2023) 833–838. [doi:10.1038/s43588-023-00527-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-023-00527-x).
- [15] J. S. Park, J. O’Brien, C. J. Cai, M. R. Morris, P. Liang, M. S. Bernstein, Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior, in: *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology, UIST ’23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, p. 22. [doi:10.1145/3586183.3606763](https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606763).
- [16] V. Monno, A. Khakee, Tokenism or political activism? some reflections on participatory planning, *International Planning Studies* 17 (1) (2012) 85–101. [doi:10.1080/13563475.2011.638181](https://doi.org/10.1080/13563475.2011.638181).
- [17] J. Åström, Participatory urban planning: What would make planners trust the citizens?, *Urban Planning* 5 (2) (2020) 84–93. [doi:10.17645/up.v5i2.3021](https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v5i2.3021).

- [18] J. M. Aulia Akbar, Johannes Flacke, M. F. A. M. van Maarseveen, Participatory planning practice in rural indonesia: A sustainable development goals-based evaluation, *Community Development* 51 (3) (2020) 243–260. [doi:10.1080/15575330.2020.1765822](https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1765822).
- [19] A. Abas, K. Arifin, M. A. M. Ali, M. Khairil, A systematic literature review on public participation in decision-making for local authority planning: A decade of progress and challenges, *Environmental Development* 46 (2023) 100853. [doi:10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100853](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100853).
- [20] N. Afzalan, B. Muller, Online participatory technologies: Opportunities and challenges for enriching participatory planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 84 (2) (2018) 162–177. [doi:10.1080/01944363.2018.1434010](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2018.1434010).
- [21] O. Lock, T. Bednarz, S. Z. Leao, C. Pettit, A review and reframing of participatory urban dashboards, *City, Culture and Society* 20 (2020) 100294. [doi:10.1016/j.ccs.2019.100294](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2019.100294).
- [22] L. Jiang, M. Masullo, L. Maffei, F. Meng, M. Vorländer, A demonstrator tool of web-based virtual reality for participatory evaluation of urban sound environment, *Landscape and Urban Planning* 170 (2018) 276–282. [doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.09.007).
- [23] S. M. Saßmannshausen, J. Radtke, N. Bohn, H. Hussein, D. Randall, V. Pipek, Citizen-centered design in urban planning: How augmented reality can be used in citizen participation processes, in: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference, DIS '21*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021, p. 250–265. [doi:10.1145/3461778.3462130](https://doi.org/10.1145/3461778.3462130).
- [24] T. Chassin, J. Ingensand, S. Christophe, G. Touya, Experiencing virtual geographic environment in urban 3d participatory e-planning: A user perspective, *Landscape and Urban Planning* 224 (2022) 104432. [doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104432](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104432).
- [25] E. Nasr-Azadani, D. Wardrop, R. Brooks, Is the rapid development of visualization techniques enhancing the quality of public participation in natural resource policy and management? a systematic review,

- Landscape and Urban Planning 228 (2022) 104586. [doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104586](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104586).
- [26] S. Ahmadi Oloonabadi, P. Baran, Augmented reality participatory platform: A novel digital participatory planning tool to engage under-resourced communities in improving neighborhood walkability, *Cities* 141 (2023) 104441. [doi:10.1016/j.cities.2023.104441](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104441).
- [27] J. Du, X. Ye, P. Jankowski, T. W. Sanchez, G. Mai, Artificial intelligence enabled participatory planning: a review, *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 0 (0) (2023) 1–28. [doi:10.1080/12265934.2023.2262427](https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2023.2262427).
- [28] J. Haqbeen, S. Sahab, T. Ito, P. Rizzi, Using decision support system to enable crowd identify neighborhood issues and its solutions for policy makers: An online experiment at kabul municipal level, *Sustainability* 13 (10) (2021). [doi:10.3390/su13105453](https://doi.org/10.3390/su13105453).
- [29] O. Lock, M. Bain, C. Pettit, Towards the collaborative development of machine learning techniques in planning support systems – a sydney example, *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 48 (3) (2021) 484–502. [doi:10.1177/2399808320939974](https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808320939974).
- [30] Anonymous, [Chain-of-experts: When LLMs meet complex operations research problems](#), in: *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HobyL1B9CZ>
- [31] S. Hong, M. Zhuge, J. Chen, X. Zheng, Y. Cheng, C. Zhang, J. Wang, Z. Wang, S. K. S. Yau, Z. Lin, L. Zhou, C. Ran, L. Xiao, C. Wu, J. Schmidhuber, Metagpt: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework (2023). [arXiv:2308.00352](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00352).
- [32] W. Chen, Y. Su, J. Zuo, C. Yang, C. Yuan, C.-M. Chan, H. Yu, Y. Lu, Y.-H. Hung, C. Qian, Y. Qin, X. Cong, R. Xie, Z. Liu, M. Sun, J. Zhou, Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors (2023). [arXiv:2308.10848](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.10848).
- [33] J. Yu, R. He, R. Ying, Thought propagation: An analogical approach to complex reasoning with large language models (2023). [arXiv:2310.03965](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03965).

- [34] Q. Wu, G. Bansal, J. Zhang, Y. Wu, B. Li, E. Zhu, L. Jiang, X. Zhang, S. Zhang, J. Liu, A. H. Awadallah, R. W. White, D. Burger, C. Wang, Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation (2023). [arXiv:2308.08155](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.08155).
- [35] J. Zhang, X. Xu, S. Deng, Exploring collaboration mechanisms for llm agents: A social psychology view (2023). [arXiv:2310.02124](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.02124).
- [36] C.-M. Chan, W. Chen, Y. Su, J. Yu, W. Xue, S. Zhang, J. Fu, Z. Liu, Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate (2023). [arXiv:2308.07201](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07201).
- [37] G. Li, H. A. A. K. Hammoud, H. Itani, D. Khizbullin, B. Ghanem, CAMEL: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society, in: Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023.
URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3IyL2XWDkG>
- [38] Beijing Municipal Bureau of Statistics, Survey Office of the National Bureau of Statistics in Beijing, [Beijing Population Census Yearbook: 2020](#), China Statistics Press, 2022.
URL <https://nj.tjj.beijing.gov.cn/tjnj/rkpc-2020/indexch.htm>
- [39] C. Moreno, Z. Allam, D. Chabaud, C. Gall, F. Pratlong, Introducing the "15-minute city": Sustainability, resilience and place identity in future post-pandemic cities, *Smart Cities* 4 (1) (2021) 93–111. [doi:10.3390/smartcities4010006](https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities4010006).
- [40] A. Howard, W. Hope, A. Gerada, Chatgpt and antimicrobial advice: the end of the consulting infection doctor?, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 23 (4) (2023) 405–406. [doi:10.1016/S1473-3099\(23\)00113-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00113-5).