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INTRODUCTION
Project Description

Introduction:

This project, with people’s redevelopment approach, is an alternative to the tabula-rasa approach used by the government for development and urban renewal in Hong Kong. People’s approach means searching new methods to form a new society where local residents can have more control of their way of living and habitat in different aspects. The case represented here is a Tin Shui Wai New Town in Hong Kong, also famously known as The City of Sadness. The town was fully developed in the 90s from a village with water bund for fish husbandry. Original residents are resettled. A place where its history is lost and totally forgotten. The existing inhabitants are resettled here originally from places all around Hong Kong. Their original connection to their habitat and community network are lost. Due to the disastrous planning of the government, sense of isolation brought about by urban design, lack of local economy, lack of community connection and facilities, Tin Shui Wai became famous for high percentage of family violence, child abuse, commit suicide cases, etc. since 2004.

Hong Kong government’s approach to land development is always relocating underprivileged people further and further away from the city centre by providing them public housing in the New Territories, the northern edge of Hong Kong. Urban renewal in city centre for gentrification of old district is also happening more and more intensively since 2000. More social conflicts revealed between local residents and government due to redevelopment of the inhabited land. Lots of public protests also happen because of huge social spending on large infrastructure and new developments in the New Territories which required the resettlements of existing farming village communities.

Design Assignment: Utopia as design strategy

Heterotopia, People’s Utopia is the New Utopia

In the future scenario 5 years from now, the Hong Kong government decided to help gentrify the whole Hong Kong cities, so decided to demolish all the public housing in Hong Kong and relocate the underprivileged people to “Hong Kong Land” in Mainland China. Tin Shui Wai New Town will be developed once again trying to get rid of the negative image with the gentrification approach of the government to private housing estates. The Right to the City is questioned. Who own the city? Who has the right to the city?

In the process of demolition of Tin Shui Wai, protestors occupy the deconstruction site and start their own version of redevelopment. People should be protected to live in their original living place. People should have the right to make decision on their living environment. This project touches on a lot of important aspects happening in Hong Kong, including urban renewal, resident’s right to the land, resettlement, self-building, etc. What is the people’s approach to redevelopment? How to empower the people? A people’s version of redevelopment will be the centre of the project.

This is a housing project, by researching the transformation of housing typology in Hong Kong and co-housing projects in Europe. A new typology, Co-(Shop)housing is developed. By combining the characteristics of the South-east Asian Shophouse typology and that of the cohousing neighborhood typology, a new housing typology which fits the culture with the introduction of community decision making in the building and maintainence process is being introduced.

Motivation:

Due to the recent occupy movements in Hong Kong, I am inspired by the self-organizing approach which is totally voluntary and bottom-up. As a person from Hong Kong, more problems revealed after Hong Kong return to China. More unfair and injustice without the consideration on the opinion of the general public can be seen in land development, urban redevelopment, large infrastructure investment, etc. and more severe poverty problem. There are many reasons to the injustice need different parties to cooperate to act against it. As an architect, I would like to help thinking of ways to empower people to have more control on (re)development and help people to re-inhabit places according to their own will instead of being assigned to a place which determine their lives.
Location: Tin Shui Wai New Town in New Territories, Hong Kong
Problem Definition

1. Demographical: New immigrants with different background and skills

The population of Hong Kong is formed mainly by new immigrants from Mainland China in different years. But recent new immigrants have different educational and political background causing huge social conflicts. Importing immigrants from mainland China is also one of the social engineering tools used by the Mainland Chinese government.

Tin Shui Wai population is mainly consisted of low-income family with new immigrant members. Discrimination and labels by the society is very commonly seen. New immigrants usually came from the village or smaller cities. They have farming or manufacturing skills which cannot be utilized in Hong Kong. High level of unemployment can be found among new immigrants in Tin Shui Wai.

2. Economical: From manufacturing to Service Industry

Hong Kong has transformed from a manufacturing economy in the 50s to 80s to financial, service and tourism based economy nowadays. The shift in economy leads to mismatch of skilled workers and skills required. Without protection and proper re-training schemes, low-skilled workers became unemployed, getting poor and old. New immigrants with farming and manufacturing skills also don’t have opportunities in employment.

Tin Shui Wai does not have local economy for the town to be self-sustaining. Low-skilled workers, like many elderly people and new immigrants in Tin Shui Wai does not have choice to work, either travelling for a long time for low-paid jobs in the city centre or became unemployed.

3. Political: From laissez-faire to even more imbalanced reliance on land development

The Hong Kong government always promote “large market, small government” approach. The situation get much worse after Hong Kong has returned to China. Political decisions are made mostly about financial benefits without social concerns. All past chief executives are businessmen except Mr. Donald Tsang. The main source of income come from land selling. Urban Renewal projects and large infrastructure projects are happening intensively which ensured the financial benefits of the four main land developer but the public concerns about the right to the land has be raised.

In Tin Shui Wai, the whole urban development process was top-down, decided by the government and cooperating land developers. Previous and existing residents are different people, both parties did not have the chance to give their opinion or contribute in the decision making and development process.

4. Social Welfare: Not for redistributing income but for the rich helping the poor

The social welfare system is not a complete one. “Our welfare system does not exist to iron out inequalities. It does not exist to redistribute income. Our welfare programmes have a different purpose. They exist because this community believes that we have a duty to provide a safety net to protect the vulnerable and the disadvantaged members of society, the unfortunate minority who, through no fault of their own, are left behind by the growing prosperity enjoyed by the rest of Hong Kong.” stated by Chris Patten in Policy Address 1996. The main system is Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme (CSSA) for all Hong Kong permanent residence living below poverty line. The incomplete welfare system only differentiate insignificant subsidies for elderly, disabled, unemployed and poor youth, which cannot support their living. The undifferentiating welfare system did not help people according to their real needs and created a collective poverty population.
Timeline of Population growth and Spatial changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1950</td>
<td>2.2 million</td>
<td>+1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1980</td>
<td>5.1 million</td>
<td>+2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1997</td>
<td>6.5 million</td>
<td>+0.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2014</td>
<td>7.2 million</td>
<td>+0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2047</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>+1.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Government Population Strategy**

- 1946-1950 Chinese Communist Revolution
- 01/10/1949 Establishment of the People's Republic of China
- 04/11/1980 Termination of Touch Based Policy
- 10/1974 Introduction of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance
- 19/12/1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration
- 11/1974 Introduction of Basic Law
- 01/07/1997 Establishment of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
- 04/2011 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 08/2013 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong
- 01/2014 Total No. of New Immigrants since 1997: ~2.75 million
- 2014-2047 Total no. of immigrants: ~0.1 million

**Local Government Population Strategy**

- 04/1945 Sino-British Joint Declaration
- 07/1946 Introduction of Basic Law
- 08/1973 Establishment of Land Development Co.
- 09/1988 Establishment of Land Development Co.
- 10/1997 85,000 Housing Programme to build 85,000 flats per year in 10 years
- 11/2011 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 12/2013 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong
- 01/2014 Total No. of New Immigrants since 1997: ~2.75 million
- 2014-2047 Total no. of immigrants: ~0.1 million

**Timeline of Spatial and Economic Changes**

- 1945-1950 Intermediary trade-dominant Period
- 1950-1974 Manufacture-dominant Period
- 1975-1997 Financial Industry-dominant Period
- 1998-2014 Service Industry-dominant Period
- 2015-2047 High-end Industry-dominant Period

**Key Events**

- 25/12/1953 Shek Kip Mei Shantytown Fire
- 1966-1976 Cultural Revolution
- 1972-1974 10-year Housing Programme to house 1.8 million people in 10 years
- 1978 Introduction of New Town Development
- 1988 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 1997 85,000 Housing Programme to build 85,000 flats per year in 10 years
- 2014 Individual Visit Scheme
- 2017 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong

**Economic Zones**

- Hong Kong-China Common Economy Zone
- Express Rail Link to Nansa

**Urban Renewal**

- Urban Renewal
- 28/07/2013 Start of Individual Visit Scheme

**Local Government Spatial Strategy**

- 2014-2047 Demolition of Public Housing and New Towns moving the poor to mainland

**National Government Population Strategy**

- 1946-1950 Chinese Communist Revolution
- 01/10/1949 Establishment of the People's Republic of China
- 04/11/1980 Termination of Touch Based Policy
- 10/1974 Introduction of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance
- 19/12/1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration
- 11/1974 Introduction of Basic Law
- 01/07/1997 Establishment of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
- 04/2011 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 08/2013 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong
- 01/2014 Total No. of New Immigrants since 1997: ~2.75 million
- 2014-2047 Total no. of immigrants: ~0.1 million

**Local Government Population Strategy**

- 04/1945 Sino-British Joint Declaration
- 07/1946 Introduction of Basic Law
- 08/1973 Establishment of Land Development Co.
- 09/1988 Establishment of Land Development Co.
- 10/1997 85,000 Housing Programme to build 85,000 flats per year in 10 years
- 11/2011 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 12/2013 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong
- 01/2014 Total No. of New Immigrants since 1997: ~2.75 million
- 2014-2047 Total no. of immigrants: ~0.1 million

**Timeline of Spatial and Economic Changes**

- 1945-1950 Intermediary trade-dominant Period
- 1950-1974 Manufacture-dominant Period
- 1975-1997 Financial Industry-dominant Period
- 1998-2014 Service Industry-dominant Period
- 2015-2047 High-end Industry-dominant Period

**Key Events**

- 25/12/1953 Shek Kip Mei Shantytown Fire
- 1966-1976 Cultural Revolution
- 1972-1974 10-year Housing Programme to house 1.8 million people in 10 years
- 1978 Introduction of New Town Development
- 1988 Establishment of Urban Renewal Authority
- 1997 85,000 Housing Programme to build 85,000 flats per year in 10 years
- 2014 Individual Visit Scheme
- 2017 Proposal for Hong Kong Land in Nansa, Guangdong

**Urban Renewal**

- Urban Renewal
- 28/07/2013 Start of Individual Visit Scheme

**Local Government Spatial Strategy**

- 2014-2047 Demolition of Public Housing and New Towns moving the poor to mainland
In Tin Shui Wai, most of the people get CSSA subsidies. They include elderly, disabled, low-income family, new immigrants, poor children, etc. Lack of employment in Tin Shui Wai and being far from city centre promotes the reliance of Tin Shui Wai residents on government subsidies.

5. Social: Poverty and Social conflicts

Hong Kong wealth gap is getting much wider, the most serious among all cities with developed economy. Poverty population is getting larger and larger each year but the Hong Kong government has no concrete strategy to deal with the unequal distribution of income. There are also social stigma concerning laziness and inability from the society which always promote independency and working hard. The poor are usually blamed on taking social resources for granted.

People in Tin Shui Wai are usually being labeled as “low-income family, new immigrant family or unemployed”. Without real understanding and concern about the core problem of the poverty population, discrimination and social labels are put on the burdens of the victims, Tin Shui Wai residents.

6. Spatial: Poverty population are concentrated and isolated

In Hong Kong, poor population was concentrated at the edge of city centre in the past. Through the development of public housing and the New Towns by the Hong Kong colonial government. Most of the people are relocated in much further away from the city centre in the New Territories. New Towns were supposed to be self-sustainable community neighborhood, but usually not the case. Most of the residents still need to go a long way to work in the city centre because of the lack of local economy. Recent New Town Proposals are in balance with sustainability without relationship with the surrounding natural environment.

Tin Shui Wai is famous for its poor urban planning, creating sense of isolation and difficulty to use public space and create community relationship. When people first moved in Tin Shui Wai, insufficient community and welfare facilities were very serious problems. Tin Shui Wai is also very far from the city centre of Hong Kong which costs a lot in traffic for local residents to work in city centre. Besides, Tin Shui Wai, itself original is a water village, surrounded by lots of villages with fish ponds and green area. The surroundings lost connection with Tin Shui Wai.
**Problem Statement**

*Hong Kong people does not have the right to make political, economic, social, cultural and spatial decisions in favor for their living. The Hong Kong government act against the people.*

The government is not allied with the Hong Kong people but the businessmen. The ruins of welfare state is the distorted top-down political system, social welfare system barely survive and became insignificant. People are not protected by law or the government to defend their homeland. Hong Kong people does not have the right of decision making in policies and to choose the chief executive to work for the sake of Hong Kong people.

Hong Kong Chief Executive CY Leung said: ‘Democracy would see poorer people dominate Hong Kong vote’

*(Interview with the International New York Times, Oct 21, 2014)*

**Research Question**

*Main Research Question:*

*How can the underprivileged community be empowered to initiate and self-organize the (re)development of their neighborhood to enable their Right to the City?*

**Sub-Research Questions:*

- What are the characteristics of Tin Shui Wai community? What are the natural landscape resources in the surroundings? What skills do local residents has? How can local residents utilize their surroundings and their skills to redevelop Tin Shui Wai society and neighborhood?
- What are the materials that Tin Shui Wai residents can used to rebuild? Can they reuse and recycle used built materials? Can they use traditional skills and old materials for new construction?
- What are the theories can be used to support the underprivileged’s right to control their environment? What are the theoretical framework developed about self-organized redevelopment project can be applied in Tin Shui Wai community?
- What are the political, social and economic structure to empower the underprivileged local residents? What kind of framework enable the participatory process can organized from bottom up in Tin Shui Wai neighborhood?
- What are the spatial strategies that can be developed with the society framework? What kind of architecture and urban planning can be developed from Tin Shui Wai community?
Relevance

1. Social Relevance:

Tin Shui Wai residents suffer from the poor urban planning of the government affecting their employment, daily life and community development. The Hong Kong government does not have any concrete solutions to improve the neighborhood. At the same time, many urban renewal projects and development of infrastructure are intensively happening in Hong Kong. People in Hong Kong do not have the right to decide against government decisions. Land development should be based on people's need. Bottom-up self-organizing strategies can empower local residents in Hong Kong to rethink how to develop their neighborhood based on their need but not government's wants.

Architectural approach with community participation helps to empower residents to make decisions in flavor for their living. Co-housing is one of the example started in Denmark and grows in popularity in Sweden, the Netherlands, UK and US. When combined with vernacular South-east Asian shophouse typology, new housing typology can be developed.

2. Political Relevance:

There should be legal protection to local residents to their homeland. Protection as well as Local residents' Redevelopment Policy should be developed to enable people to change their living environment according to their own will. Self-build regulations should be implemented. Self-initiative projects by local residents should be promoted by the government to develop their neighborhood. "Residents plan and develop, Government helps providing infrastructure" should be the final goal.

3. Scientific Relevance:

There are many theories about participatory approach, but a lot less about actual implementation to specifically to empower the underprivileged people to initiate, self-organize and utilize skills and materials to (re)develop their society and neighborhood. This project aims at providing spatial strategies, building materials and techniques used as a manual guide to people for actual realization of a community neighborhood by themselves.
**Methodology**

1. **Situation Research Phase**

Firstly the ruins of welfare state are identified, including the failure in policies and realization in spatial reality. Demographical, economic, political, social and spatial contribution and effects on each other will be gathered and analyzed. Conclusions are drawn from the analysis identifying the core failure of the ruins of welfare state.

2. **Theoretical Research Phase**

Brief utopia idea is developed. Different utopian theories from various scholars are gathered and for relating and comparing to the brief utopian idea. Background of utopian theories are also considered and analyzed. Initial utopia is developed based on analyzing the theories. Position and utopian theory will be developed.

3. **Design Research Phase**

This phase will be developed hand-in-hand with the utopian theory development. Using future scenarios, involving different actors, developing scenarios of their response and finally the utopian scenarios. Design Concept, urban and architectural design that matches the scenarios will be developed at the same time until the end of the project.
**Theoretical Framework - Position Paper**

**Heterotopia as the New Utopia**

People’s design approach as the right to the city
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“Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.” 1  
— Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*

Abstract

Modern Cities have always been created by the state with the help of urbanists and architects in a top-down approach using their Utopian visions. But this way also aroused a lot of criticism. This year, the theme of my design studio, Design as Politics, is New Utopia on the Ruins of Welfare State. In this position paper, I will explain the importance of Utopia as a discourse, in form of Heterotopia, a New Utopia that allow everyone to dream and create their own Utopia. In this way, the lost connection of Utopia with the society will be established

Keywords: Utopia, Heterotopia, Right to the City

Introduction

Nowadays, architects do not talk about utopia anymore. Utopia was once a popular term among architects of Technology Futurism where people have extraordinary imagination about what technology can improve our lives in the future. And then it comes to a stage where architects criticize on utopia and saying that there is no Utopia anymore and even further creating dystopia saying how technology future is de-humanizing us and destroying our future. It was true that technology has made our lives more convenient. But it is also true that technology has become so dominating in parallel with the over-expansion of advanced capitalism. Now is the time for us to reflect and think about the future again.

So what is New Utopia? I believes that the answer lies in Heterotopia. Our space nowadays are so dominated by bureaucracy and institution of large corporate and the state. Housing, schools, hospitals, offices, etc. all exert a kind of control of different parties on us revealed in spatial quality. The totalitarian force to ‘normalize’ and homogenize everything has stimulated the rebellious force among the people. Different heterogeneous groups are formed based on wealth, age, occupation, race, country, etc. The underprivileged groups are forming a great power which call for change. There are recent revolutions around the world especially Occupy Movements which change the use of public space. This is the people who are asking for their right to the use of space. The informal activities and events change the original function of the space. The re-definition of the use of space by the people I believe is the New Utopia in architecture - Heterotopia.
1. Realization of Utopia lies in Heterotopia

Rem Koolhaas claimed that “Architecture can’t do anything that the culture doesn’t”. We all complain that we are confronted by urban environments that are completely similar. We say we want to create beauty, identity, quality, singularity. And yet, maybe in truth these cities that we have are desired. Maybe their very characterlessness provides the best context for living.” Heterotopia is being both real and unreal, real in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction to the position that I occupy.” Heterotopia is being both real and unreal, real in virtuality and unreal in reality. Heterotopia is the mirror where a placeless place is shown. “Heterotopia is the other spaces which is more ‘real’, “something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found in the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality.” Heterotopia being a more ‘real’ space than Utopia can exert its effects in reality. That is the important function that Foucault talked about. “…their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. This later type would be the Heterotopia, not of illustration, but of compensation.” Therefore, Heterotopia can tackle the weakness of Utopia by creating a ‘virtual-reality’ to let us act on the reality towards our dream if things are not going the right way.

2. Heterotopia giving new meaning to reality

There are anti-Utopians saying that Utopia doesn’t exist anymore. Colin Rowe said the standardization of architecture is the “rapid devaluation of its ideal content. The intensity of its social vision became dissipated. The building became no longer a subversive proposition about a possible Utopian future. It became instead the decoration of a certainly non-Utopian present.” Whereas, Manfredo Tafuri said that “intellectual work which has the courage to recognize itself as capitalist science and to function accordingly is objectively separate from the background, regressive role of purely ideological work. From now on synthesis is impossible. Utopia itself marks out the successive stages of its own extinction’. ‘Ideology is useless to capitalist development.” Both architects actually criticize on the loss of Utopia in front of capitalism. Utopia became either misused or useless. Both Rowe and Tafuri suggested being abstain by emptying the content of the architecture to protect it from contamination of capitalism. But then that means authentic Utopia in shaping the reality is more important in this case since the meaning of Utopia is distorted without its original function.

It is true that architecture is corrupted by capitalism and there should be redemption of architecture but not by emptying out but by giving it a New Utopia with real human nature. Being abstain is not enough to voice out because you do not have a provocative image or statement or vision that you want to bring about. It is very difficult to convince people why capitalist nature is not good enough. A new meaning of architecture should be given once again by its people and society. And architects are the ones who do the coordination and reveal people’s wishes into architecture.

According to Foucault, “… Heterotopia can change in function and meaning over time, based on the particular “synchrony” of the culture in which they are found.” The example of moving cemetery from next to the church in the city centre to the suburbs, leads to spatial change based on the change of thought in people’s general mindset. Architecture needs to evolve with people and society. When architecture doesn’t mean anything or only as a tool for capitalism or other purposes, it loses it true meaning to the society but should be vice versa. Architects has the responsibility to keep track on the society and help to evoke a right future where everyone desires.
3. Heterotopia allow the right of everyone

Foucault distinguishes space as Utopia, reality and Heterotopia while Lefebvre define spaces as conceived, perceived and lived. Heterotopia can be understood as the lived space or space of representation by Lefebvre. What Foucault sees as Heterotopia is the counter-sites, where the alternative reality that can happen, it is also a juxtaposition point where allow in one real place several different spaces; whereas, what Lefebvre sees as the space of representation is the space in between, the space linking the conceived and the perceived, reality and representation space. According to Lefebvre, space of representation is “space that is directly lived, a space that stretches across the images and symbols that accompany it, the space of “inhabitants” and “users”.” It is a space where imagination want to change the dominated physical space to form systems of non-verbal symbols and signs. It is also the “terrain for the generation of “counter-spaces,” spaces of resistance to the dominate order arising precisely from their subordinate, peripheral or marginalized positioning.” Therefore both Lefebvre and Foucault see other spaces in here Heterotopia as a space for reaction, contrast and alternative to reality.

Lefebvre took one step further by proposing the “Right to the City”, a “demand ... (for) a transformed and renewed access to urban life”. On top of this idea, he argued “for le droit a la difference, “Right to Difference”, against the increasing forces of homogenization, fragmentation, and hierarchically organized power that defined the specific geography of capitalism.” It coincide with what Foucault defined as deviants in the Heterotopia of deviation. Lefebvre thought it is necessary for the deviants to take action for “Urban Revolution”. It is the right of the inhabitants to work together, and engage in managing the urban spaces by ourselves. This is highly related to nowadays situation where Occupy Movements are happening around the globe since the Heterotopia of deviation is threatened and engulfed intensely by the dominating power and space.

David Harvey also brought about the concept of “Dialectical Utopia” which can be understood as Lefebvre’s Heterotopia. As Harvey illustrated, “Lefebvre’s concept of Heterotopia is foundational for the defining of revolutionary trajectories. This is the meaning that people want in their daily lives creating Heterotopic spaces all over the place. “Lefebvre’s theory of a revolutionary movement is the spontaneous coming together in a moment of “irruption; “when disparate Heterotopic groups suddenly see, if only for a fleeting moment, the possibilities of collective action to create something radically different.” Heterotopia is the space where allow everyone to dream and experiment it in reality. Space can be anywhere, the important component is people’s quest. So the New Utopia is no longer an optimistic extensive of the future like the Techo-Utopia, and not one dream for all, but more similar to Morris’ Utopia, criticizing the present and creating new alternatives, further appearing as Heterotopia where everyone can test out and develop their own space in reality.

Jane Jacobs also criticized the “scientific mind” shared among 20th century modernist urban planners. The urban planning at that time failed to recognized the significance of people’s perception of their environment which she considered as the most important thing in creating lively neighbourhoods. Different parties in society have different wishes. It is not anymore individual architect’s own vision to the future regardless of time and people’s interaction with space. Everyone needs to be considered. But there needs to be a coordinator who collect but not manipulate those thoughts. This is the true mission of architects nowadays to change our role not only as designers but also to reach out and listen to the people; designing with people and allow the design to be open for people to inhabit, change and redevelop, etc. People, together with architects, should be the co-creator of any constructed space.

Conclusion

Utopia is the purpose of action. It is actually a vision that you should have whenever you do anything. It is extremely important to have a goal in mind so you know where you are heading. But realization is very important as well. Therefore, one should not stop at the stage of dreaming but relating the vision to the reality. But it is not a time where technology, futurist or modernist Utopia dominates anymore. It is also not anymore the time for individual dictator, architect or urbanist to try to manipulate the future of all people. That’s why we need Heterotopia. Heterotopia allow the imagined world to be implemented in the real world. It is the in-between, the compensation of Utopia, leading to a New Utopia. Heterotopia is also a user-determined space, where the function of a space is not given by institutions or authorities anymore, but users re-define the space when they come together and integrate the spaces, forming their own Heterotopia which varies in different user groups. Architects and urbanists are the ones who try to understand, mediate and help people to build their Heterotopia. New Utopia now means not one to all and not homogeneous but heterogeneous Utopia, giving new meaning to our space, architecture and our world.
1. Political and Social Policy Timeline

Hong Kong was a British Colony since 1842. Population doubles since 1945 due to the influx of immigrants. The new immigrants first stay in wooden house areas within the city centre. The British government start to resettle the people to the New Territories since 1960s until 1990s. Over 50% of the Hong Kong population lives in public housing.

Hong Kong is returned to China from Britain. Public expenditure is then from spending most money on public housing to spending money on connection to China. Building bridges and high-speed railway to connect Hong Kong with Shenzhen develops towards an one-hour life circle. Planning to have a “Hong Kong Land” in mainland China while developing three New Towns in Hong Kong as “Common Economic Zone” with mainland China for future investment, proposing “Double Mobility” as population strategy to migrant Hong Kong people to mainland while migrant mainlanders to Hong Kong.

1953 Start of Social Housing for Resettling people after immigration influx during Chinese Civil War

1990s: Highly concentrated New Town Residential Development
Private Housing : Public Housing = 6 : 4
1997 Political Shift: Hong Kong returns to China from Britain

2020s Proposal: Dispersed and smaller Private Residential Development

2020s Proposal: “Double mobility” as population strategy

“Hong Kong Land” in Nansa, China

“Common Economic Zone” with 3 New Towns with only 6% Public Housing

Common Economic Zone of Hong Kong and Mainland China

Large Infrastructure Development Axis
2. Conflicts between Hong Kong people and the government

The change of direction of public expenditure leads to the conflicts between Hong Kong people and the government. The building of high-speed railway needs to redevelop the farmlands where residents want to stay in their own village but forced to move. Urban renewal of old districts into newly private residential buildings also forced the residents to leave while the original residents propose a “Dumpbell Proposal” to balance redevelopment while they can stay. But it was not accepted by the government. All the acts and policies of the government which did not respond to the need of the people. Discontent accumulated leads to the outburst of Umbrella Movement happened in Sept 2014 for democracy, for the right to choose the chief executive.
3. Tin Shui Wai as City of Misery

Tin Shui Wai is originally a fishing village with rich natural resources and nice natural environment. Tin Shui Wai is a New Town developed in the 90s. It is famous of family tragedy since the murder case in 2004, known as City of Misery/Town of Sadness. Tin Shui Wai has high concentration of poverty population due to the high percentage of public housing in the area since public housing is only for the poor.

Moreover, the urban planning at the beginning is also mostly residential area without industrial or economic area. Nearly 20% of the residents take social security while some have to travel a long way to work in the city centre or take risk to vendor in order to make a living.

Nowadays, Tin Shui Wai becomes the Ruins of the previous British Government and an existing problem society in Hong Kong.

Site Analysis: Tin Shui Wai New Town

Tin Shui Wai in Hong Kong
Large Poverty Population without local Economy

Tin Shui Wai as Town of Sadness/City of Misery

Tin Shui Wai surroundings

Risking to be caught to make a living by vending

Collective Poor

- 14.9% new immigrants (11.5% in HK)
- 20.5% Under 15 (13.7% in HK)
- 18.3% taking CSSA (13.3% in HK)
- 7.3% Divorced (6.5% in HK)
- 9.1% Unemployed (3.3% in HK)
- 27% Lower Secondary Education Level (19% in HK)
Shophouse

Shophouse is a typical Southeast Asia Vernacular Architecture which is originated from Southern China when people migrate and adapt to new places. The shophouse can be understood directly from the name as a work-live integrated housing typology where usually small business runs on ground level with residential units on upper level. Variations can be all levels of one shophouse turns into one shop and all levels are residential only for later generations. Shophouse is usually built together as a complex along a street with 3 to 6 storey. The intimacy of the low-rise shophouse with the ground and chances to meet neighborhoods on streets turning the front public street into a common space for the neighborhood. This kind of building complex together with their occupied spaces allow the formation of neighborhood community.

1. Shophouse

1.1 Public-Common Space Overlapped

Due to the easy reachability to customers, Shophouse is located right in front of the street, actually created a part of the street in front, a public corridor on ground floor with cover on top. Since the back facade of the shophouses is closely packed with that of other shophouses and there are not enough space in individual units, the front street is occupied as extended living space where you can see and meet with neighbors creating an informal Common Space in Public Space.

1.2 Economic Independency

Shophouse is useful as first settlement at a place. The ground floor unit has half of the area acting as shop while the back is for living. The ground floor unit owner can have a small business like bakery, rice shop, snack kiosk, hairdressor, etc. which support the living of the family, bringing economic independence.

1.3 Live-work unit

There is no clear division between Living and Working space on ground floor level. Owner of the unit can decide how to divide the space. But basically it is usually “shop in front, living at the back” which creates the live-work unit. The ground floor is a shop usually while the upper floors are for residential.
Housing Typology

2. Hong Kong Public Housing

Public Housing Typology starts from an H-shaped with individual living units for family with shared toilets and kitchen. The H-shaped actually formed two open courtyard space at each of the building having common space on ground with upper common corridor where living units extend to where neighbors can see each other and have a view to the courtyard. The later versions becomes two H-shaped and two ring-shaped forming two closed courtyards still having common space on ground and common corridor with courtyard view. The latest versions of public housing becomes Trident, Concord and Harmony. They all has highly efficient vertical core but in different shapes together with common corridor on the inside trying to maximize the view to the outside from individual units.

2.1 50s H-Block

H-block has relatively small individual living space with shared kitchens and toilets on every floor. Although individual space is scarce, there are two common courtyard created by the H-shape with common corridor with view towards the common space.

2.2 60s-70s Twin Tower Block

Twin Tower Block developed into enclosed common space on ground with common corridor looking towards the common ground. Residents can also see what their neighbors are doing in their living rooms when they walk through the corridor. Individual units has their own kitchens and toilets.

2.3 80s-90s Trident & Harmony Block

Latest public housing typology have totally different approach than the previous ones. Having an efficient vertical circulation core at the middle, with enclosed common corridor, residents can quickly go to individual private units without viewing into neighbor’d private living space. Each of the individual units are a little bit larger than before with individual necessary facilities like kitchen & toilets. Private spaces have been improved but common spaces are deteriorated.
Harmony Block

The transformation of public housing started from a building complex which has small living units and sharing facilities but allow social interaction on different levels to become small-footprint efficient 40-storey high-rise with better living qualities in individual living units but losing common spaces for social interaction on common corridor and on ground. These giant building block isolates people into individual units without the chance to interact with neighbors. Thus neighborhood community cannot be formed without chances and places to meet. The better minimum living standard is only on the physical aspect but downgrading in terms of social and cultural values.

3.1 Efficient Tower Block

Each Public Housing Tower has a vertical circulation core with shortest common corridor like a cross shape towards individual residential units.

The whole tower has 40-storey. But residents can reach the ground level just in a few minutes.

3.2 Maximize Individual Private Spaces

Each floor has 16 living units. Each living unit has its own facilities, individual kitchen and toilet. Unlike the shared common facilities in the public housing in the 60s, more private facilities and space in each unit becomes larger.

3.3 Minimize Shared Common Spaces

In order to maximize the living conditions in each of the individual living units, more facades are left to individual units, maximizing the light and view of each flat, but remove the view of the common corridor, leaving it as a narrow dark horizontal space only for circulation, unlike a common space for meeting and chatting with neighbors in the past.
Housing Typology

4. Co-housing - Common House

Co-housing is a kind of intentional community made up of private living units with all necessary supported by community shared facilities. Common House is the important building of the neighborhood community which houses all the shared facilities including common kitchen and dining hall, laundry and recreation facilities, etc. It is important because in typical housing units the community portions is lacking. We want our privacy at home and all necessary facilities but we normally do not have places to meet neighborhood freely. In this kind of co-housing, the Common House acts as the main intentional community meeting place for the neighborhood where people living there having dinner together every day and have community meeting occasionally and do recreational activities together.

4.1 Individual living units

Each living unit is separated from other living units having its own apartment and open space of their own allow privacy.

4.2 Common shared facilities

Several living units shared one common house which houses the most important dining hall and common kitchen, as well as living necessity like laundry and sewing rooms. Since residents share facilities in the common house, they do not need to have the same facilities at home, this saves space and money.

The Dining Hall becomes a very important social space of the community where residents gather every night, every week or every month.

The open space around the Common House also allows the extension of the programmes from the Common House, usually kid’s playground and sitting area.

4.3 Democratic Decision Making

The Dining Hall also acts as the community meeting place for discussion and voting for everything decision the community need to make. Every decision has to be approved by each member of the community. So it is not only a social space but also a political place.

The Cohousing community act as a basic unit of political body, practicing democracy in everyday life.
Deconstruction to Reconstruction

1. Deconstruction Method

Deconstruction is done by diamond saw cutting concrete wall and floor. Cutting the existing building into elements which are no more than 13 tons since the maximum loading of a normal crane is 20 tons. Elements are cut in a way that every piece can be lifted by a crane down on the ground.
Deconstruction to Reconstruction

2. Deconstruction Procedure

Deconstruction is done carefully by taking down reused elements piece by piece. Starting from the top floor and each of the unit are being deconstructed step by step as shown as below.

Deconstruction procedure per floor using one harmony block unit as example:

1. Take away doors and electrical appliances
2. Cut out and take away partition walls
3. Install temporary support for floor slab
4. Cut out and take away floor slabs
5. Install temporary fixture on structural walls tie with floor slabs
6. Cut out and take away structural wall
7. Repeat step 1-6 for the next level
**Toolbox Element List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Slab</th>
<th>Structural Wall</th>
<th>Partition Wall</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Prefab. Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
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| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
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| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
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| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
Deconstruction to Reconstruction

3. Deconstruction Toolbox

From Harmony Block, there is a list of elements that can be reused. All the elements because of the limit in loading weight of the crane, needs to be cut down into maximum with 20 tons. All the elements in fact has 13 tons maximum. Elements are sorted into structural walls, Partition walls, Floor slabs, Doors and Prefabricated materials. The overview of the elements can be seen from the element list. Each element is listed with its name and quantity per floor, dimension, volume and weight in tons. Thus the number of elements can be conveniently reused as much as possible per floor during the design process.
Name: FS01
Quantity per floor: 8
Sizes: 8.2x10.7m2/7.2/2.5m0.16m
Volume: 5.16m3
Weight: 11.98tons
Deconstruction to Reconstruction

4. Reconstruction Method & Procedure

Certain parts of the original structure are reused. Mostly of the individual unit elements are reused into new live-work units while one-third of the original vertical core is reused into common house. The reconstruction procedure is shown below.

Reconstruction procedure using one new shophouse unit as example:

1. Construct new floor and foundation with insulation to prevent heat absorption from ground
2. Put reused structural wall in place fixed with new bolts
3. Construction new column and beam extending to form sun shading eave for ground floor and new benches on balcony for next floor
4. Put reused floor slab in place fixed with bolts again and grout to new beam and column
5. Put reused partition wall in place fixed with bolts again with addition of adjustable grille on top for natural cross ventilation within the unit, as well as additional insulation layer on the inside
6. Repeat step 1-5 for the next two level
7. Install green roof on top of the concrete roof for natural cooling to prevent overheating of concrete during the day
Future Scenario

Tin Shui Wai New Town has the negative fame as City of Misery / Town of Sadness. In 2017, the Hong Kong government wants the get rid of the bad image thus proposed the Redevelopment Plan of Tin Shui Wai by tabula rasa, taking down the whole place with all the public housing units, turning it into new private residential area which opens up as “Common Economic Zone” for mainland investments.

2017  Resettling original residents to “Hong Kong Land” in China

The Redevelopment Plan of the Hong Kong government starts from the resettlement of the original residents. Having the plan of building a “Hong Kong Land” in China, it can be used as replacement flats for original residents in Tin Shui Wai New Town. In turn, Hong Kong residents in Tin Shui Wai will be moved back to China.

2020  Demolition starts

Demolition starts in 2020 after resettlement of all the residents. However, some of the original residents and young protestors come to occupy the demolition site. And they make their own plan to redevelop the area according to their own needs.
Umbrella Movement extends to Tin Shui Wai in 2020

Over 100,000 protestors occupied Tin Shui Wai Demolition Site
Organization, Finance and Actors

Organization

The Hong Kong Umbrella Movement was a bottom-up organization which realize the people’s organization without higher authority like government body. People volunteer to do different things according to their interest and ability, like emergency or art & craft.

Similar to the umbrella movement, people also self-organize into long term teams and short term teams.

Short term teams are deconstruction, reconstruction, logistics teams, etc. These teams have the immediate function in the redevelopment process.

Long term teams covers political, economic and social aspects, including Workers and Neighborhood Associations as well as Right to the City Association. Together they form the Tin Shui Wai New Commons Association.

Actors

Some of the occupants are original residents coming back from “Hong Kong Land” in China. They are not satisfied being resettled to China having to leave their relatives and friends in Hong Kong. And they wanted to claim their right to get back and stay in their original living place.

Some of the occupants are young protestors from the Umbrella Movement, wanted to claim their Right to the City and help the underprivileged people to redevelop the area together.

Finance

Occupants form Civic Bank which raise funds and receive donations from outside world. Since the bank belongs to everyone in the Tin Shui Wai redevelopment project, everyone can decide together how to use the money.

They also work with NGOs and social enterprises to develop social fund. Money is used directly on projects.
Organization, Finance and Actors

HK Umbrella Movement Organization

TSW Short Term Organization

TSW Long Term Organization

Civic Version of Public-Private Partnership:
Residents-Social Enterprise Partnership
Spatial Strategy

Design Concept

In order to let residents being more independent in terms of economic, political and social aspects, co-shophousing neighborhoods with new shophouses and new common houses are formed. The new neighborhood also has direct connection from private units to common and public spaces, to bring people closer together.

Architectural Strategy

Learning from Shophouse, Vernicular Architecture in Hong Kong, which contain both work and living in one unit and also extend their living space to public space to turn it into common space with neighbors.

(Re-)Development Phasing

There are 3 five-year plans. In each phase, there are urban and architectural developments which will be explained in later pages. People’s organization will start with short term reconstruction teams into long term neighborhood teams to maintain the neighborhood after reconstruction.
(Re-)Development Phasing

2020-2025: Phase I

2025-2030: Phase II

2030-2035: Phase III

Organization

Urban

Architecture
**Urban Strategy**

2015  **Existing North Tin Shui Wai**

The existing condition is that there are 58 building housing tower blocks in Tin Shui Wai. All of them are 40-storey high which separates from the ground level and open space.

2020-2025  **Phase I Redevelopment**

Phase I Redevelopment starts from the north central park, the middle plot. Demolishing tower blocks in the central plot and building eight new neighborhoods.

Part of the existing main street, tramway and pathway will be reused. School and Community Buildings will be remained and change the use as public buildings for other purposes.

2025-2030  **Phase II Redevelopment**

Phase II is the further deconstruction of the tower blocks on the side of the central plot. New production centres like agriculture and fishery are developed in the northern edge. New main streets and tramway are formed.

2030-2035  **Phase III Redevelopment**

Phase III redevelop the remaining tower blocks in to new neighborhoods. New side streets are formed.
Urban Strategy

2015

Reused School & Community Buildings into Public Buildings

2020-2025: Phase I

Reused Pathway

Reused School & Community Buildings into Public Buildings

2025-2030: Phase II

New Main Street

New Agriculture Area

New Fishponds

New Tramway

2030-2035: Phase III

New Neighborhood

New Side Street

Reused Tramway

Reused Main Street
Neighborhood Formation: Buildings & Public Space

NEW COURTYARD

REUSED LANDSCAPE
PARK FACILITIES

NEW SIDE STREET

TRANSITION
ENTRANCE

NEW MAIN STREET

NEW PLAZA

NEW SHOPHOUSE

NEW COMMON HOUSE

NEW SHOPHOUSE-COMMON HOUSE
NEIGHBORHOOD

New Public Building

New Plaza

New Main Street

New Side Street

New Neighborhood
Neighborhood Formation: Common-Private-Public Connection
New Shophouse Typology

Shophouse is a basic survival housing typology which provide living space as well as working space for economic independency. The New Shophouse wanted to bring back this kind of living where work is part of home allowing people to do small business to earn a living.

Basic Living Unit

One shophouse unit is for one person to live in. It includes the working area on one side and living area on the other side.

Internal rooms and facilities are arranged on one side leaving the other side open to be more flexible space.

Cohousing Unit

By removal of non-structural service wall on the reused wall, living space or working space can be combined.

It can turn into coliving units or coworking units, or even coworking coliving units.

Variations

Further more, for more democracy in the choices of living units, there are three different types of living units for residents to choose from, which will be explained later.
New Shophouse Reuse of Materials

Reuse ~75% material elements at the wing

FS01  x  2

FS01 A  x  2

SW01  x  2

SW01A  x  2

SW05  x  1

SW05A  x  1

~95% Building elements from reused materials
New Shophouse Basic Typology

- Open Workspace/Waiting area (10m²)
- Home Office/Internal workspace (8m²)
- Living/Dining area + Open Kitchen (12m²)
- 1-person Bedroom (6.2m²)
- Toilet + Bathroom (3.4m²)
- Pantry/Storage (3m²)
- Common Corridor
- Public Corridor
New Shophouse Internal Space
New Shophouse Coliving & Coworking

Shared Working Space (20m²)

Home Office/ Internal workspace (8m²)

Open Workspace/ Waiting area (20m²)

2-person Bedroom (10.2m²)

Living/Dining area + Open Kitchen (24m²)

Shared Living Space (24m²)

Public Corridor

Co-Workspace

Co-Live Space

Individual Open Workspace/ Waiting area (10m²)

Removal of Non-structural Service Wall

Individual Open Workspace/ Waiting area (10m²)

Shared Living Space (24m²)

Individual Living Dining area (12m²)

Removal of Non-structural Service Wall

Individual Living Dining area (12m²)

Shared Working Space (20m²)
New Shophouse Variations

New Shophouse further allow easier individual adaptations of residents by providing three choices before building.

2020-2025   Phase I Redevelopment

Phase I is the deconstruction phase together with the building phase. Maximum, medium and minimum resident built living unit choices are provided.

2025-2030   Phase II Redevelopment

Adaptation occurs at this stage. Minimum resident built is the single living unit which has all the structural wall, partitions and technology set up for the residents where they can already move in when it is built. Medium resident built means structural wall and basic facilities like toilets and kitchens are there enclosed with external wall with ventilation. Residents can move in and start to live there and decide their own partitions. Maximum resident built is that only structural walls and locations of piles are set where residents can decide their own facade and internal partitions.

2030-2035   Phase III Redevelopment

Further development means the building is able to transform. Extensions of living space and workspace as balcony area is made possible. Interchangeable combination of living units can also happen between neighbors depends on their own conditions.
New Shophouse Minimum Resident Built

- Single living Unit
- Living area + Kitchen 10m2
- 1-person Bedroom 6.2m2
- Bathroom 3.4m2
- Casual Working/Waiting area 12m2
- Pantry/Storage 3m2
- Artist’s Home
- Cafe owner’s Home
- Retailer’s Home
- Home office
- Workshop 9.52m2
- Storage 9.52m2
- Shopfront 12m2
New Shophouse Medium Resident Built

- Single working Unit
- Single working Unit
- Single working Unit

- 4.95
- Single living Unit
- Single living Unit
- Single living Unit

- Open Plan Studio
- Half-open Partition
- Change external partition

- Consultant's Home
- Doctor's Home
- Designer's Home

PRODUCED BY AN AUTODESK EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT
New Shophouse Maximum Resident Built

- Single working Unit
  - 4.95
- Open Plan Studio
- Reverse Live-work
- Change external partition
- Hairstylist’s Home
- Architect’s Home
- Chef’s Home

PRODUCED BY AN AUTODESK EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT
New Shophouse Phase III Transformation

Single

Couple

Couple with different businesses

Single Parent with kid

Teenage kid move out

Retired

Extensions of Workspace

Extensions of Living Space
New Shophouse Reconstruction

- Reused Structural Wall
- Reused Floor Slab
- New Foundation & Floor Slab
- New Column & Beam
- Reused Tress Slab

- Reused Partition Wall
- Reused Door
- New Partition Wall and Windows
- Reused Window

- Adjustable Ventilation Grille on top of Partition Wall
- Ventilation Grille opened on mid-structural wall

- Cross Ventilation via Grille
- Cross Ventilation via Window
- Cross Ventilation via corridor

- Green Roof allows cooling effect, prevent solar heat gain
- Solar Panels on roof for energy generation
- Corridor Cover
- Sunshading Louvers
- Insulation from Thermal Mass avoid heat absorption

- Hong Kong Optimum Tilt of Solar Panels by Month

- Hong Kong Climate graph
New Common House

In cohousing neighborhood, Common House is a very important common sharing social space.

The New Common House with reuse of materials, forming co-living and co-working areas for working together and meeting, chatting with each other.

It is attached to the living units acting as the main vertical circulation core connecting the every floors and units.

By reusing the circulation core from the existing public housing, new beam and column structure is built around the core to provide more open and flexible space for use.

The ground floor houses the social programmes, the dining hall and common kitchen with kid’s area and relax room allowing the activities to extend to the courtyard space.

The first floor houses the supporting programmes for living necessity, such as laundry, sewing room and workshop space as well as hobby rooms.

The second floor houses the coworking space, which is new to new common house, but very important for this cohousing neighborhood as a place to work together.

The top floor is the roof garden together with more hobby rooms and guest room and storage.

Reuse ~40% material elements at the circ. core
+ ~15% at other parts of the floor
New Common House Reuse of materials

~70% Building elements from reused materials

FSC02 x 1
FSC02A x 1
FSC03 x 2*
FSC04 x 1*
FSC05 x 2
FSC06 x 2
SWC01 x 2*
SWC02 x 2*
SWC03 x 2
SWC04 x 4
SWC06 x 2
SWC06A x 2
SW05A x 1
SW05A x 1

* = changed
New Common House Circulation
**New Common House Programmes**

- Cloakroom (7m²)
- Kid's Playroom (16m²)
- Dining Hall (72m²)
- Relax/TV Room (16m²)
- Toilet (7m²)
- Kid's Playroom (16m²)
- Common Kitchen (16m²)
- Laundry (7m²)
- Workshop Space (47m²)

**Programme Hierarchy (Supporting programmes on first floor)**

- Toilet (7m²)
- Common Kitchen (16m²)
- Relax/TV Room (16m²)
- Laundry (7m²)
- Storage (5m²)
- Fitness Room (16m²)
- Workshop Space (47m²)

**Programme Hierarchy (Social programmes on ground floor)**

- Sewing Room (7m²)
- Toilet (5m²)
- Hobby Room (16m²)
New Common House Programmes

Programme Hierarchy (Work programmes on second floor)

Utility Room (7m²)
Pantry (5m²)
Library (16m²)
Co-working space (47m²)

Tool Library (7m²)
Toilet (5m²)
Meeting Room (16m²)

Music Room (7m²)
Guest Room (8.5m²)
Photo Dark-room (5m²)
Outdoor Sitting (8.5m²)
Rooftop Garden (47m²)

Programme Hierarchy (Extra programmes on top floor)

Garden Storage (7m²)
Bathroom (5m²)
Guest Room (8.5m²)
Outdoor Sitting (8.5m²)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-working Space</td>
<td>47.22m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantry</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Darkroom</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening Storage</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooft Garden</td>
<td>47.22m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor area</td>
<td>8.52m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest room</td>
<td>8.52m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Kitchen</td>
<td>16.38m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>72.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Relax Room</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid’s room</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Library</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Space</td>
<td>47.22m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness room</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>5.04m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game/Hobby room</td>
<td>16.06m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak room</td>
<td>7.14m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Co-housing Neighborhood Common House Comparison**

New Common House

Bondebjerget, Denmark

Trudeslund, Denmark
Neighborhood Surrounding Space

The Cohousing Neighborhood with the combination of shophouses and common house as basic typology.

Public-Private Connection

The working area of the shophouses are connected to the public corridor which face and connect to the public streets. This allows shops which need customers to be easily reachable.

Common-Private Connection

The living side of the shophouses are connected to the common corridor which face and connects with the common courtyard. This allows residents to see what’s happening in the common open space and see their neighbors when they come out from their home.

Public-Common Connection

Each of the courtyards are not enclosed common space which allow only the residents living there to use. The courtyards are open and connects with the street. It transitions from a common space into a public space and the transition space can be used for the extension of activities from the courtyard or the street, acting as a small square.

Streets

The new streets are people-oriented streets instead of car-oriented streets. Tramway are kept as public transport keeping the cars from the neighborhood.

Main Streets

The main streets are the existing two parallel streets which cutting across the area from east to west. Two new main streets are introduced cutting across the area in a cross meeting at the central square and reaching directly to the northern and southern edge of the area.

The Main Streets are 12m wide having a middle zone, but instead of having cars going through, now people are the main characters. Any social, cultural and political human activities can happen, including vending, performance, protests, discussions, etc.

Side Streets

All other streets between the neighborhoods are side streets. The side streets are 7m wide allow extension of shops or activities. It is a narrower street and quieter space.
Transition space between courtyard and street allowing expansion of activities
New Main Streets: 12m wide with middle zone for social/cultural/political/economic activities
New Shophouses - Street Front
Neighborhood Relationship and Connection
Neighborhood Typology
Neighborhood Comparison

Existing Shophouse

Harmony Block

New Shophouse
Life in a Day in the New Utopia of Happiness
1. The relationship between research and design

The research in the first phase was started with the social welfare situation in Hong Kong as a post-welfare state city. The political, economic, social and spatial aspects are being analyzed. Coincidently, it was the period when “Umbrella Movement” was happening in Hong Kong. Hong Kong people was demanding democracy. The research was trying to incorporate as well this demand of the people in the research. The social welfare system is supposed to do good for the people whose voice should be listened clearly. So the research actually started from analyzing the past social welfare system by the British government and their ambition. And then Hong Kong is transferred from British to Chinese government in 1997. Everything including the political and welfare system is supposed to be unchanged for the first 50 years. But economic, political and social situations are changing gradually in this 17 years towards policies which deviate much further from people’s need. Because of the mismatch of the government policy and people’s need. There was the outburst of “Umbrella Movement” and on-going protests.

Since my intention is to design for people, seeing this unsynchronized government development policy, my design is to focus on empowering people to build and develop their own neighborhood by themselves when things are not going well. My design is the reconstruction of the Tin Shui Wai New Town in Hong Kong where large poverty population gathered. They have better minimum living standard but losing the community bonding and the chance to run their own small business.

Conclusion

New Utopia comes to life?

My New Utopia is actually not a real utopia that can hardly reachable. It is a Heterotopia, like a non-existing place in reality, inspired from the Umbrella Movement that people self-organize themselves into different work. Of course this is a short term organization but it can really comes into life. And Co-housing neighborhoods that starts from Denmark and Scandinavian countries proves that it can actually work. People initiate the building process and help to maintain it in the long run.

Only because of Hong Kong people are used to accept what is given to us and accept the choices we have. But of course we can have other choices which people have not think of before. It is the matter of time and openness of the culture, if cohousing can be introduced to Hong Kong. At the same time, Hong Kong people need to realize and cherish the shophouse vernacular architecture and make it better. Most importantly, the government policy need to help to make it work.

What have I learnt? What can I do further?

Understanding more about the political and social situation in Hong Kong, knowing that land and housing situation is severe. The policy is not up to date and cannot solve people’s need. There is an urge to tackle the housing problems especially.

There are discussion on better land use, developing New Towns, turning industrial buildings into residential buildings, going back to live in the farmland. All of the above needs to researched and investigated.

Co-housing is possible but maybe too realistic in Hong Kong situation where a lot of restrictions are there. But it can be an utopian image that reminds me can be better for the people and go step by step towards it.

Reflections
My design is trying to solve these problems by looking at past lifestyle. Learning from vernacular shophouse typology, the New shop-house complex are built as a neighborhood incorporating work and live in a unit, which connect closely with common spaces and public spaces, allowing intentional and unintentional meeting in the community. New common house is also introduced into the neighborhood for more intentional community gathering place. This is a neighborhood typology for co-living and co-working. This is a design for economic, political and social independency of both individual and community in response to the distorted political and welfare system of the government.

2. The relationship between the theme of the graduation lab and the subject/case study chosen by the student within this framework (location/object)

The theme of Design as Politics this year is “New Utopia on the Ruins of Welfare State”. The case study I have chosen is the Tin Shui Wai New Town in Hong Kong. It is a New Town designed and built by the British government, the social housing in the area is provided as part of the social welfare system of British welfare state to the poverty population in Hong Kong.

Tin Shui Wai New Town is famous as the City of Misery/ Town of Sadness because of its problem family tragedies. People are living poorly in Tin Shui Wai but also isolated. The ruins is Tin Shui Wai New Town itself and also the problems it arises. Because of the design problems, like high concentration of residential buildings because of zoning, without local economy since no economic zone was planned within the New Town, large open space far away and wide car road separating residential areas. It puts more burden on the already poor population.

Poor doesn’t mean sad but in Tin Shui Wai the answer is yes. I imagined a New Town that people can live happily even if they are poor. My New Utopia is a Utopia of the Commons. It is a place where people have the right to make decisions in favor for their living. It is a place where people can have their own little business and do things they like and sell those stuff and earn a living. People can freely vendor on the streets. People can see and meet with neighbors and other people intentional or unintentionally running into each other. People doesn’t have to worry about not having jobs in the labour market because they can already work at home. And they are living together with other people in a neighborhood not isolated in individual units in 40-storey high residential buildings.

Within the studio framework, the case study based on the studio theme becomes the “New Utopia of the Commons on the Ruins of Tin Shui Wai New Town”. Ruins means Tin Shui Wai New Town but also means physical ruins. The rebuilding of the neighborhood requires the reuse of the old elements in the typical social housing typology - harmony block, which is the important part in my design.

The framework of the studio helps to define the project very clearly. The “New Utopia of the Commons” is built on and from the “Ruins of Tin Shui Wai New Town”. It shows that by building similar architectural elements can allow people to having a much better living style in terms of social coherence and economic independency.
3. The relationship between the methodical line of approach of the graduation lab and the method chosen by the student in this framework

From my understanding, the methodical approach of the studio is using future scenario as research and design method. It is the visionary approach to design. Having the imagined better future in mind drives the design towards it. Therefore, the New Utopian scenario from the research results is very important for the design process. It acts as a guideline for the kind of life I imagine the people will have.

In the “New Utopia of the Commons”, the future scenario is having streets with shops and vendors and people freely move through and interact, small courtyards spaces where people can have community garden and playground, large public spaces to be occupied freely and having public discussion and performance. It is a kind of life having a lot of common spaces and public spaces, spaces and room for discussion and expression. This kind of neighborhood encourage social interaction thus allow neighborhood community formation. The Future Scenario acts as a design tool in mind guiding through the design process.

The design results end up with individual work-live units together with community common house with courtyard and common corridor as common spaces and public corridor and street as public spaces in each neighborhood. This kind of co-living and co-working housing complex is first imagined already in the future scenario from the research results.

4. The relationship between the project and the wider social context

The project is the rebuilding of the Tin Shui Wai New Town using similar architectural elements but different design strategy to make a better place for people to live. It act as a critic and alternative solution to the social housing problem in Hong Kong. It helps to rethink what kind of living style we do want and not want. Do we want to continue living on our own or living together with the other people and forming neighborhood community? Do we want to work far away from home or just work at home or nearby?

What the poverty population wants are not only money given by the government and let them think they are losers getting social subsidy. What everyone wants are not the life you live just on your own isolated from the others without community support. This project is showing a kind of life which provides not only better minimum living standard but also spaces to work at home and chances to meet and work together with neighbors.

There are two main focus in the design project. First is the People’s opposition towards government’s control. People’s lives are determined by how the government is treating the people. People does not have the right to make decisions for themselves. In this project, people can make decision on how they want to make a living, how they can want to socialize with others, making decisions for themselves and others, working together, etc. By cooperating with each other, together they are more independent and have more freedom from the government’s control.
Reflections

4. The relationship between the project and the wider social context (Continued)

Second is the reuse of demolition materials. It started with an imagination to reconstruction of problematic neighborhood. We are building a lot throughout the years and many buildings become vacant or turns out to be problems because of poor design or other reasons. We have to think of ways to deal with them. Many think of adaptive reuse of the buildings. In this project, there are reuse of buildings in urban level, reuse of landscape and facilities in plot level, reuse of building elements in architectural level. Besides demolition and building new, this introduce a new way to look at redevelopment. Reconstruction is possible if we try.

Rebuilding may be the future direction of development. Co-working and co-living may be the way we can have democracy together in daily life. I hope this project act as a showcase which maybe cannot solve the demand of democracy in Hong Kong in that big scale, but can start from our everyday life to strength the community bonding and work independently with small businesses, by doing it together to have more autonomy on decision making in economic, political and social aspects in our own neighborhood.
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