Article

Participatory Planning through Flexible Approach: Public Community Facilities in Seoul's Urban Regeneration Project

Seon Gyeong Baek ^{1,*} and Hyun-Ah Kwon ^{2,*}¹ The Institute of Asian Culture, Mokpo National University, Muan-gun 58554, Korea² Department of Architecture, Mokpo National University, Muan-gun 58554, Korea

* Correspondence: mediatepace@naver.com (S.G.B.); helenack@naver.com (H.-a.K.); Tel.: +82-10-9899-4000 (S.G.B.); +82-61-450-2729 (H.-a.K.)

Received: 29 October 2020; Accepted: 11 December 2020; Published: 14 December 2020

Abstract: Since the 2000s, urban regeneration projects have been actively implemented to address urban problems in Seoul. These projects not only help improve the environment but also make the community sustainable. Accordingly, a number of public community facilities have been created through public participation. In Seoul, since there are few existing communities that have been active in relation to public projects, there are many cases in which the government must find residents who could participate in such projects, form a new organization, and induce participation. This study analyzes such cases and identifies related characteristics. In particular, flexibly planning community participation can increase sustainability under these conditions in various communities within cities. Planning from a flexible perspective assumes that the occurrence and impact of participation may not be sequential and allows and induces community change. This study is useful in preparing planning strategies under similar conditions in the future.

Keywords: community participation; participatory planning; sustainable community; sustainable public place; flexible approach; public community facility; community formation; community change; Seoul urban regeneration

1. Introduction

In line with major cities around the world, Korea's capital Seoul has also undergone rapid development and expansion, registering tremendous economic growth after the 20th century. About 20% of the country's total population of approximately 51.78 million is concentrated in Seoul [1]. Considering that Seoul occupies 0.6% of Korea's total area of about 100,210 km², it is a high population density. In terms of the urban environment, certain areas have been relatively underdeveloped on account of market logic or specific regulations; accordingly, the city has remained disparate. Corresponding to the characteristics of major cities, the degree of settling in certain places and the collapse of communality have intensified individualism and anonymity, and it has become difficult to expect that an environment that has not been developed will improve autonomously [2].

In order to improve the situation, the state has begun to actively intervene, but rather than applying the same development strategies, it has implemented "urban regeneration" projects to improve and revitalize the city, based on various existing conditions. In the case of Korea, which has witnessed rapid urbanization, unlike many overseas cities that have already conducted urban regeneration projects since the 1960s, the discussion on and the implementation of urban regeneration projects began in earnest only after the 2000s [3]. Following the enforcement of the Special Act on Urban Regeneration (SAUR) in 2013, the Korean government has established a national strategy and basic policy, and each

local government has designed detailed goals and visions and is implementing them accordingly [4]. Urban regeneration projects are being actively promoted in Seoul, which has advanced into a modern city with a long history, and are being implemented with a focus on existing identity and community lost when the city has been completely renewed. Representatively, Jongno-gu and the surrounding area, has been the capital of the country since the 14th century; many palaces and public facilities were built and, as the center of modernization in the 20th century, they are key project destinations [5]. This started in the Changsin-Sungin area (CSA), where markets and sewing factories were located around the old fortress. In 2014, when the government designated this place as a testbed for Seoul, urban regeneration began in earnest [6]. In Seoul, the main direction is to restore and establish the identity of the place, while revitalizing it; above all, the final goal is the sustainability of community and place through a cooperative relationship between the administration and residents.

As mentioned above, the first step toward creating a comfortable and safe settlement environment is through the physical improvement of the underdeveloped living environment. However, if it ceases here, it is actually considered “less development” and will not be much different from the full redevelopment method. Therefore, important actions are added in the following two aspects of urban vitalization and sustainability.

First, to not only improve infrastructures such as residential areas and roads, but to also establish “local facilities” such as schools and parks, and “local base facilities” such as public libraries and public cultural facilities, in accordance with the national basic urban regeneration policy. It can be expected that the community will become more concentrated and revitalized around these public base facilities. In addition, it creates a community-based sustainable living environment by allowing the community as well as the administration to directly participate in the operation and management of facilities.

Second, promote the participation and cooperation of communities in the planning process of public projects. Since the implementation of SAUR in 2013, the central government has been emphasizing practical mutual cooperation between the administration, experts, and residents. In particular, it is essential to collect and reflect the opinions of residents through public announcements or public hearings in the strategy and planning stage. However, in fact, detailed guidelines for community participation have not been presented. The government only suggests a direction for residents to lead the process and make decisions by demanding that their participatory capacity be strengthened, and residents’ councils be formed. Local governments in target areas for urban regeneration should establish dedicated organizations and support centers in consideration of their respective circumstances and prepare a plan for consultation with residents or residents’ councils [7]. Accordingly, in Seoul, administrators and experts seek to identify communities to participate in the project, sometimes forming new ones, and establish a cooperative relationship with communities. In this process, residents are encouraged to develop their capacity to consider urban problems in detail and to actively present solutions. One of the main goals is to connect communities that have participated in the process so that they can closely intervene in the operation and management of the project after the establishment of a public facility. The communities and the administration will cooperate continuously around these base facilities.

Considering the actual goals and methods, there are far more cases where the administration creates and induces new communities for participation, rather than when there have been voluntary communities that have been engaging in local activities related to public projects. We need to focus on this situation. According to a study, among the projects that have been carried out since 2002, 70% have included newly formed communities for participation, except for unspecified citizens [8]. This is, in fact, a similar characteristic not only in the creation of urban environments, including architecture, but also in other public decisions, and is quite different from Europe and the US, where there are many active demands and movements by the community. In the case of Korea, since the deliberation system began seriously only after the 2000s, there may be a time difference, but several discussions highlight that this is one of the characteristics of the community that emerged in the administrative–private division after

the 1900s [9]. Therefore, if these prerequisites are overlooked, the above strategy, which considers that the voluntary community can continue and participate, can easily face the following problems.

First, it can only be led from the beginning to the end by the administration. Community participation in public decisions allows for cooperative relations between the administration and the community from the standpoint of converting the existing “top-down” process to “bottom-up.” However, there is a risk of deliberately defining communities and inducing participation in order to fit the direction of the administration. Rather than solving the actual problem through participation, participation becomes an end and a means, and participation for the sake of participation occurs, which means that participation occurs from the teleological position of participation. The fact that communities exist and participate in itself does not guarantee sustainability [10]. Second, as the participating communities are formed somewhat narrowly, their personal needs may appear as if they are of public interest. There is considerable segregation between residents who are closely related to the planning or operation of certain projects and those who are not, and sometimes conflicts arise. Third, residents change frequently in cities rather than in rural areas, for example, residents who participated once may not be in a position to participate consistently owing to personal circumstances or because they relocated to another place. This can lead to gaps in subsequent processes, operations, and management.

In such circumstances, how can a non-narrow and inclusive community be created under the condition that the administration must first seek and induce community participation from the initial process of the project? How can the administration build a cooperative relationship with them? In pursuit of the sustainability of communities in cities, in what perspectives and ways should the plan proceed to ensure that the public environment created by and for them is sustainable? In this regard, Marilyn Taylor mentions the vague nature of communities that administrations and experts often miss and explains that communities should not be simply typified [11]. We should first start with an understanding that the participating communities are not static and can continue to grow or change.

The construction of three public community facilities as part of urban regeneration in the Haengchon area in Seoul highlights the sustainability of communities and urban areas by implementing public plans from this perspective. This study examines this case in detail and seeks to identify how participatory public planning can be performed from a flexible perspective on the community for sustainability, under the condition that community organizations must be newly formed and induced to participate. Specifically, it discusses the characteristics in relation to the roles of the administration, experts, and the community.

2. Materials and Methods

There are several viewpoints dealing with public planning through community involvement in architecture and urban design. While some discuss the concept of participation and its meaning and purpose in relation to publicity, others focus on governance and practical methodologies by which the community can intervene in the public decision process. In the case of Korea, where participatory practice by the community began in earnest only after the 2000s, it mainly focuses on applying the methodology by analyzing cases in the US, UK, and Japan. When planning community participation methods, in many cases, the steps of Arnstein (1969) [12] are referred to. In addition, Millbraid (1981) [13] and Connor (1988) [14], who expanded the content of participation and categorized it according to the process, are also employed.

However, very few studies have practically understood the domestic conditions and analyzed the current situation. In Korea, discussions about community participation in relation to the construction of public facilities have not been widely publicized [15,16]. Accordingly, this study analyzes the case in the Korean city of Seoul. Section 2 outlines the study area, discusses the conditions of the site’s community, and elucidates the research method.

2.1. Study Area

This study identifies public community facilities created as part of the urban regeneration project in the Haengchon area of Seoul. As a consequence of rapid development that has occurred since the modern era, the city's old assets have been destroyed, and considerable restrictions have been placed on development activities in order to preserve them. Many residential areas were concentrated around the old fortress, Hanyang-doseong, but those places were underdeveloped due to these regulations. Therefore, in order to improve the situation, the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) started a city revitalization project in 2013 by launching a comprehensive plan for the preservation and management of the environment around Hanyang-doseong (July 2013–June 2014).

The SMG accelerated this project because it aimed to list the city wall as a UNESCO World Heritage Site by 2022. This was a strategic plan to revitalize the surrounding areas to improve its status, while maintaining the old fortress, in line with the contemporary preservation trend [17]. With regard to the enactment of the Urban Regeneration Act in Korea in 2013, it was regarded as “urban regeneration” that restores the identity of a place and adds vitality to economic, social, and cultural aspects, rather than focusing only on improving the physical environment. It particularly focused on the participation and sustainability of the “community as a living heritage” in practice and attempted to establish a cooperative system between the administration and the community [18]. The area around the old fortress was named “Castle Village” with this community-based sustainable meaning [19] (pp. 6–7). According to the action plan for the villages (July 2014), the urban regeneration project was designated to be conducted in nine districts and 22 villages.

The work at the Haengchon area (Figure 1) commenced in May 2015. The establishment of a public community facility in the Haengchon area that has a population of about 4000 was actively promoted. In addition, it was planned in such a way that the community could be sustainable through public participation in the planning process and future operation and management [20] (pp. 9–18). At the beginning of the project, one building was considered, and a total of three public community facilities were built until July 2016. The community is constantly in charge of the operation and management of the facilities.

Figure 1. Map of Seoul, Jongno-gu, and Haengchon Area around Hanyang-doseong in Korea (Source: Wikipedia (left, center); reproduced by authors, SMG (right); reproduced by authors).

2.2. Conditions and Research Method

The Haengchon area, similar to other places around the fortress, was quite underdeveloped (Figure 2). The Haengchon area has a total size of 159,553 m², with a population of 4303. The ratio of middle-aged people over 40 and older people over 65 is 59.4%, which is a higher population age than other areas in Seoul. In particular, out of a total of 1925 households, the proportion of single-person households who are middle-aged or older reached a total of 821 households [1]. According to the survey at that time, about 77% of residents had lived in Haengchon for more than 10 years, and about 15.6% were residents who had lived there for more than 30 years [20] (p. 70). Religious groups, parent

and women's societies, and the Resident Committee worked to improve the environment and served the residents. There were about 150 people, mainly middle-aged and older residents. However, prior to the project, these local activities were not carried out as residents recognized the value or importance of local assets such as the old fortress. Specifically, there was no community in the Haengchon area that conducted activities related to the promotion of urban regeneration projects.

Figure 2. Haengchon Area (Source: Seon Gyeong Baek).

Accordingly, the administration began to investigate and confirm these community conditions before making a decision to implement the project. At the festival held under the theme of “600 Years of Walking in Seoul,” an unspecified number of urban and local residents were invited to walk along the Seoul City Wall. This was to raise citizens’ awareness of Hanyang-doseong. During a workshop held at Castle Village, details of the project plan were shared, and opinions were exchanged, through which the administration and the residents provided their feedback. When residents directly plan and propose local activities related to the Castle Village through the Community Support Project (CSP), the SMG provides financial support and encourages a number of community activities.

Through these programs, the administration identified residents who were active locally. In addition, attention was paid to the middle-aged and older residents who are at the center of the Haengchon area’s decline and at the same time hold the key to improvement and sustainability as they have been living there for a long time. In the workshop and CSP, the Resident Committee and parents actively participated, and some of them continued to participate in the subsequent planning process. Section 3 elucidates these steps.

Newspapers and magazines often covered information about community participation and facility management. However, through detailed investigation and research, the perspective and characteristics of the plan have never been discussed. Therefore, the study was carried out by examining all matters from an exploratory point of view. Official and informal data were reviewed in detail, focusing on the key roles of the “administration, experts, and community,” and face-to-face interviews were also conducted.

3. Case Analysis and Results

3.1. Seeking and Organizing Community before Planning

The SMG sought and organized communities before selecting urban and architectural experts to implement urban regeneration projects. Apart from these projects, the “Castle Village Value Sharing and Community Support Project (CVSP)” was conducted to seek and organize residents who will actively participate in the planning process. Rather than the administration unilaterally leading and deciding the direction of urban regeneration and public community facilities, this process helped establish a sustainable identity for the Haengchon area through discussions with the local community [21,22].

The SMG carried out the project in conjunction with experts (Sharing for Future Corporation). The administration and experts first contacted active residents who were already familiar with the previous three programs and formed a “Residents’ Network” including people from other Castle Villages. However, this was not established as a participatory organization, but as an attempt to create a network with other residents.

In the Haengchon area, the Resident Committee, which had previously participated in local activities, responded most actively to this. They held monthly meetings to discuss the upcoming urban regeneration project in the Haengchon area, and accordingly, organized a “Project Promotion Team” internally. The residents created an organization to actively respond to public projects and launched its activities by applying for the CSP that the SMG was conducting.

An open residency conference was also held in the Haengchon area. This was the first time the administration and experts interacted with a large number of residents, explaining the purpose and direction of the project. Simultaneously, the experts formed the “Haengchon Castle Village Promotion Committee (Promotion Committee),” comprising 10 residents who were willing to participate actively among the approximately 65 residents who had gathered at this conference. The residents of the former project promotion team also participated in the discussion and some of their recommendations were included.

The administrators and experts not only formed a community to participate in the planning process but also provided opportunities for many other residents in order to encourage their involvement. The experts supported the residents to plan for the local festival. Eight meetings were held, participants included members of the Promotion Committee as well as residents of local groups such as the women’s society. The residents decided on the location, themes, and methods by explaining about the old houses or cultural heritage in the area and suggesting alleys with gardens or points with a good view that could be a major attraction during the festival.

In this manner, from the process of seeking and organizing the community before planning, the administrators and experts approach the community with a flexible perspective. During this early period, the administration did not focus on deciding the direction of the project firmly and selecting or creating a fixed community organization. The administration communicated the basic intentions of the project to the residents, allowed voluntary activities, and revamped the organization, leading to flexibility (Table 1).

Table 1. Community participation before the planning.

Phase	Main Purpose	Contents	Decision Maker	Participating Communities and Characteristics	
Preparation: Total planning	Confirmation of community conditions	-3 Programs: festival, workshop, and CSP ¹	-SMG ³	-General residents (including local groups)	-Unspecified communities
Initiation: Decision of the action plan before planning experts' selection	Seeking and organizing communities, promoting the project, collecting feedback,	-CVSP ² : association of residents of the castle villages, workshop, and local exploration	-SMG ³ , expert ⁴	-Residents' Network	-Organized community (1)
		-Organizing a community based on the Resident Committee and general residents	-Resident Committee	-Project Promotion Team	-Organized community (2)
		-CSP ¹ : festival		-General residents	-Unspecified communities
		-Reorganizing a community based on Project Promotion Team, local groups, and general residents	-SMG ³ , expert ⁴	-Promotion Committee	-Reorganized community (3)
		-CVSP ² : resident conference, festival		-General residents	-Unspecified communities

¹ Community Support Project, ² Castle Village Value Sharing and Community Support Project, ³ Seoul Metropolitan Government, ⁴ CVSP experts: Sharing for Future Corporation.

3.2. Planning through Community Participation

3.2.1. Experts' Contract and Basic Planning

On 8 April 2015, the SMG announced the establishment of an urban regeneration plan for full-scale implementation in the Haengchon area based on the information collected during the process of seeking and organizing the community. Finally, it was decided that the domestic urban and architect groups Place Making Associates (PMA) and Urban Intensity Architects (UIA) will be in charge of regeneration planning and construction, while Soong-sil University will look into the academic aspect. These experts conducted a survey on the project target area and conceived a community-based participatory public plan by conducting interviews with some residents of previously formed community groups, including physical confirmation of the urban space.

Accordingly, the basic direction was suggested as “Urban agriculture” although this was not discussed initially as a way of restoring and building the identity of the declining Haengchon area. When the SMG was promoting the urban regeneration project, the historical and cultural assets remaining in the area were discussed according to their basic aspects. Subsequently, while the CVSP was underway, the residents recommended the creation of a garden in the city at the Resident Conference and Festival. Planning experts determined that it was difficult to regard historical assets in the Haengchon area as regional identities that affect the lives of residents through the investigation process. They noted that the residents had previously planted their gardens individually or jointly in one corner of the neighborhood, with support from the government or civic groups.

Since the construction of a public community facility was a key task in the urban regeneration plan in the Haengchon area, experts considered this as a base for urban agriculture and explored ways to utilize the rooftop or the yard of a building for creating a garden. First, they examined the possibility in terms of technology. The experts confirmed the location of the site prepared by the SMG and reviewed the scale and method through meetings. Based on this rough basic plan (Table 2), it was decided to proceed after consultations with the residents [20] (p. 14).

Table 2. Basic plan for a public community facility.

Division	Contents
Identity	-Public base place for local urban agriculture -Welcome center for residents and visitors
Location	-Intermediate point for easy access within the area -Use of buildings on the site that can utilize the rooftop
Method, Scale	-Remodeling or new construction -Modular prototype passive facility installed on the roof
Programs	-Facility: “Plant Pharmacy” that provides education, exhibitions, and sales for urban agriculture -Rooftop “Green House”: Four seasons smart LED plant factory
Operation	-Expert: urban agriculture education -Community: operation and management of facilities such as garden and sales

The residents reorganized the previously formed Project Promotion Team and Promotion Committee into the “Castle Village Resident Promotion Committee (Resident Promotion Committee)” in order to enhance participation. There was no involvement of administrators or experts in this process; residents voluntarily changed their representatives and secretaries and made appropriate adjustments to include other residents and local group members.

3.2.2. Concrete Plan

The following is the process of planning public community facilities after expert selection and basic design. The administration (SMG, Jongno-gu) and the planning expert team (PMA, UIA, Soong-sil University) held a resident meeting and resident presentation. Members of the Resident Committee and local groups were also invited. The administrative and planning experts explained the direction of

urban agriculture, based on the basic plan, and discussed the role of the community in the subsequent process. Some residents expressed concerns about the safety of building a roof garden on an aging house, and subsequently, the administration and experts reviewed the site in detail based on the five basic plans mentioned above. Accordingly, it was decided to install a greenhouse on the rooftop for buildings on the city site and create additional public community facilities, including indoor and outdoor cultivation spaces, instead of rooftop gardens [19] (pp. 356–363).

At the resident workshops after the residents' presentation, not only members of certain communities but also other residents participated. The main purpose of the workshop was to explain to more communities about the project and the progress so far, to listen to their opinions, and encourage them to better understand, care about, and engage in activities in the area. In the three workshops held in the process of specific planning, 11, 15, and 23 unspecified general residents participated. Following the resident presentation, the SMG appointed the MP as an additional expert in the Haengchon area. Discussions and decisions on the plans, programs, and operation of the two facilities were further advanced, centering on expert and MP meetings.

The existing Residents' Promotion Committee was reorganized into a "Residents' Council" by realigning its members to establish a cooperative relationship with planning experts. They attended expert meetings and made specific recommendations on the planning and operation of the facilities. This was an attempt to form a stable community organization comprising 13 members, based on the participation of the communities so far, and by appointing activists, chairmen, and assistants, taking into consideration future operations. In addition, before the construction, an "Urban Agricultural Community" was formed, following a proposal by the administration and experts in relation to the operation of agricultural facilities. This comprised members of the Resident Committee, interested residents, and an external urban agriculture expert. The composition of the communities and details of participation in this specific planning process are summarized in Table 3.

The remodeling of the first public community facility "Haengchon-gongteo 1" commenced. The construction of Facility No.2 was discussed at the residents' meeting and in the resident presentation, while the administration and experts consulted with the residents about the target site and subsequently purchased it. Facility No.2, whose concept is a local "shared living room," was designed in detail by the architect, reflecting residents' needs for garden and kitchen facilities. Additional plans for the third facility, which had not been discussed until the beginning of the plan, were discussed before the first facility's rooftop farm was installed. The SMG and planning experts considered the creation of new gardens and the construction of agricultural education facilities by reviewing municipal lands that residents were now using as gardens. In consultation with the community, it was also decided to recruit external experts related to agricultural education in the future. In this manner, the administrative and planning experts discussed and decided on the location, concept, program, operation, and amenities of Facilities 1, 2, and 3 with the community. Table 4 shows the plan of the three public community facilities "Haengchon-gongteo" 1, 2, and 3.

In this specific planning process, the residents did not participate only in aspects such as resident presentations, workshops, and meetings. The SMG and experts published and distributed monthly newsletters to inform residents about the process, communicated with them through SNS, and collected additional opinions on necessary areas by recruiting resident surveyors and by conducting surveys. Residents' activities included programs and educational events. This helped residents understand and receive both direct and indirect information about the progress. The consultation process, including the resident presentation and expert meetings mentioned above, was led by the administration and experts and involved the community. However, in the case of festivals held as part of CVSP and CSP, the administration and experts provided only material support such as financial resources, and all other aspects were planned and executed by the community. The administration and experts identified different targets, scope, and methods of support for each so that not only the reorganized community but also various organizations could participate.

Table 3. Community participation in the planning process.

Division	Main Purpose	Contents	Decision Maker	Participating Communities and Characteristics			
Event and Education	Promotion of the project, and activation of community participation	Festival (Twice)	-CVSP ¹ : festival	-Resident Committee, local groups	-Resident Committee	-Reorganized community (3)	
					-General residents	-Unspecified communities	
		-CSP ³ : festival	-Resident Committee, Residents' Council	-Resident Promotion Committee	-Reorganized community (4)		
				-General residents	-Unspecified communities		
	Local event (Twice)	-CVSP ¹ : walking the castle road, sharing projects	-Expert ³	-Residents' Network	-Organized community (1)		
				-General residents	-Unspecified communities		
	Education on urban generation and public facility	Education (Twice)	-CVSP ¹ : education for urban agriculture	-Expert ³	-Residents' Network	-Organized community (1)	
					-General residents	-Unspecified communities	
-33 programs					-Expert ⁴	-General residents who applied	-Unspecified communities
Presentation					Providing information and collecting feedback on the planning, activation of community participation	Resident meeting (Once)	-Basic plan direction
	Resident presentation (Twice)	-Basic plan direction and program	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-Resident Promotion Committee		-Reorganized community (4)	
				-Resident Committee		-Existing group	
	Resident workshop (Thrice)	-Resident needs	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-General residents		-Unspecified communities	
	Resident conference (Once)	-Site and programs	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-General residents		-Unspecified communities	
Consultation and decision	Detailed discussion and decision on planning	General meeting (Twice)	-Reorganization of community	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-Residents' Council	-Reorganized community (5)	
			-Operation	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-Residents' Council	-Reorganized community (5)	
		Expert meeting, MP meeting (14 times)	-Site, facility program, and operation	-SMG ⁵ , expert ⁴	-Resident Promotion Committee	-Reorganized community (4)	
					-Residents' Council	-Reorganized community (5)	
					-Urban Agricultural Community	-Reorganized community (6)	

¹ Castle Village Value Sharing and Community Support Project, ² Community Support Project, ³ CVSP experts: Sharing for Future Corporation, ⁴ Planning experts: PMA·UIA·Soong-sil University, ⁵ Seoul Metropolitan Government.

Table 4. Contents of the final plans for the three public community facilities.

Division	Plan Contents	Location
Facility 1	-Programs: center office, exhibition, Plant Pharmacy, Rooftop Farm -Method: remodeling -Scale: 1 underground and 3 above ground, Site area 73.98 m ² , Total floor area 179.77 m ²	<p>(Source: SMG; reproduced by authors.)</p> <p>-1: Haengchon-dong 210-678 -2: Haengchon-dong 210-333 -3: Muak-dong 46-1902</p>
Facility 2	-Programs: garden, processing, sales -Method: remodeling -Scale: 2 stories above ground, Site area 49.9 m ² , Total floor area 61.44 m ²	
Facility 3	-Programs: garden, agricultural education, cafe -Method: new construction -Scale: 2 stories above ground, Site area 211.81 m ² , Total floor area 115.62 m ²	

Accordingly, in the detailed planning stage for the construction of the three public community facilities, the participatory community, which formed and changed from a fairly flexible point of view, has been re-adjusted to a Residents' Council that can smoothly consult with the administration and experts. Accordingly, they participate in the process of consultation and decision on facilities. However, the Residents' Council did not participate as a unique and fixed community on all matters. During the planning process, various communities participated directly or indirectly in the project through events as well as presentations and workshops. The feedback received through these programs, in which other communities also participated, was reflected in aspects related to the site, programs, and operation of the facilities.

3.3. Continuous Operation, Management, and Use by Residents after Construction and Completion

From April 2016, the first of the three public community facilities, Haengchon-gongteo 1, which was partially opened during the planning process, launched remodeling work. The second and third units were also being constructed with an aim to open officially in July. Even at this stage of construction, the residents confirmed the progress through the resident presentation. However, they were not directly involved in the construction itself.

Until the facility was completed, the administration and experts operated educational programs more actively so that residents could operate, use, and maintain the facility. To encourage and promote this, four programs, festivals, and public hearings were held, apart from ongoing education. Specifically, nine local internal groups that had intermittently participated voluntarily gathered to form the "Inwang Village Network (Inwang Network)." They also held local events such as flea markets to help revitalize the community.

All the facilities were officially completed (Figure 3); shortly afterward, detailed discussions and decisions were made on the operation of the facilities through general meetings, resident presentations, and two expert meetings with residents. The SMG and experts attempted to establish a system as a complete operating organization by expanding to include some of the communities that had participated in the past. Therefore, the "Resident Community Operation Committee (Resident Operation Committee)" was formed, focusing on members who had actively participated in the planning process, the Residents' Council, and the Urban Agricultural Community. In the meantime, residents sent some agricultural products to other Castle Village areas and expanded on a pilot basis. The administration and experts supported the community to continue to receive education on agriculture and facility operation until the project was completed. Table 5 shows the composition of communities and the main contents of participation in the construction of public community facilities and the preparation process for operation after completion.

Figure 3. The three public community facilities in Haengchon area: (a) Haengchon-gongteo No.1 and Rooftop farm; (b) Haengchon-gongteo No.2 and garden; (c) Haengchon-gongteo No.3 (Source: UIA (a), MMKM (b), KDDH Architects (c)).

The urban regeneration plan and the construction of public community facilities, which had been ongoing for about 12 months, were completed. In the case of Haengchon-gongteo 1 and 2, a contract was signed with SMG, so that the members of the Resident Operation Committee can operate and manage the programs autonomously in the facilities. Accordingly, No.1 is continuing education, exhibition, and agricultural business while playing a central role in the local community; No.2 is used as a place for residents to process agricultural products or meet; and in the case of No.3, outside urban agriculture experts who joined in the planning stage are in charge of not only helping local residents but are also monitoring agricultural education conducted by the city and the districts. Residents continue to operate, manage, and use related facilities; they are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Examples of operation, management, and use by residents related to three facilities: (a) Local experience program; (b) Gardening; (c) Urban agriculture education (Source: Seon Gyeong Baek (a), SMG (b,c)).

There are cases in which the members of the community change while the administration and experts no longer intervene directly, and the community is in charge of autonomous facility operation and management. For example, there are several residents who have been involved consistently in the process of planning but are left out due to personal circumstances. In contrast, there are some members who are new. Although they did not belong to the Residents' Council, Urban Agricultural Community, or Residents' Community Committee, those who had previously participated in programs such as festivals or educational programs often intervened without difficulty in the operation, management, and use of the facilities. The Resident Operation Committee can be characterized as a highly flexible organization, where internal members are not permanent and keep changing. Such characteristics are manifested in the part that concerns the operation of agricultural facilities, the garden, and its education. Existing local groups, who have participated intermittently in the process, are continuing meetings by actively using the established facilities. The residents voluntarily improve facilities such as rooftop farms and cafés, using the spaces in various ways as needed. Consequently, not only the community but also the facilities they use continuously change according to the situation.

Table 5. Community participation in construction and preparation for operation after completion.

Division	Main Purpose		Contents	Decision Maker	Participating Communities and Characteristics	
Event and Education	Revitalization of region and community	Festival (Once)	-Planting event	-SMG ¹	-General residents	-Unspecified communities
		Local Event (Twice)	-Flea market, photo exhibition, etc.	-Inwang Network	-Inwang Network	-Organized community (7)
			-Share and promote agricultural products	-SMG ¹ , expert ²	-General residents	-Unspecified communities
			-13 programs	-Expert ²	-Resident Operation Committee	-reorganized community (8)
	Education for urban agriculture and facility operation	Education (Twice)	-Training for cafe management	-Expert ²	-General residents who applied	-Unspecified communities
					-Resident Operation Committee	-reorganized community (8)
Presentation	Providing information and collecting feedback on the facilities' maintenance	Public hearing (Thrice)	-Programs	-SMG ¹ , expert ²	-Urban Agricultural Community	-reorganized community (6)
		Resident presentation (Twice)	-Progress of construction	-SMG ¹ , expert ²	-Residents' Council	-reorganized community (5)
			-Operation and management	-SMG ¹ , expert ²	-Resident Operation Committee	-reorganized community (8)
Consultation and decision	Detailed discussion and decision on the operation	General meeting (Once)	-Operation organization	-Expert ²	-Resident Operation Committee	-reorganized community (8)
		Expert meeting (Six times)	-Operation and management	-SMG ¹ , expert ²	-Residents' Council	-reorganized community (5)
					-Resident Operation Committee	-reorganized community (8)

¹ Seoul Metropolitan Government, ² Planning experts: PMA·UIA·Soong-sil University.

4. Discussion

The case analysis shows that, under the same conditions, there are important characteristics that will be applied when planning public facilities through community participation for sustainability. Here, “condition” can be summarized as follows. It implies that there is no community that has previously requested or acted in relation to specific public matters on the urban environment, and accordingly, the administration must seek and form a community while the project is in progress and encourage participation and sustainability.

4.1. Premise for the Possibility of Out-Of-Order Occurrence of Community Participation Dimensions

Taking a comprehensive look at this case, community participation takes place in three dimensions. First, to promote the project and encourage community participation through programs such as festivals, local events, and education. Second, through presentations or workshops, additional information about the project is provided to residents, and community opinions are communicated to administrators and experts. Third, through working-level consultations such as expert meetings, the community participates in making specific decisions.

An important aspect of these three dimensions is that the differences in participation are not necessarily proportional to the degree that influences the decision. In particular, from project planning to completion, the level of community participation may not necessarily be progressively improved or deepened. Therefore, it should be recognized that the participation contents of these dimensions can occur out of sequence. In this case, the administrators and experts did not categorize participation as an increasingly deepening character. As the project progressed, they did not have a concrete participation plan, predicting that each would occur sequentially depending on the degree of impact. What is important is that the purpose of participation is not to generate participation itself from a self-defense standpoint, but to make the community sustainable around the public place to be created.

The sequential typification in political sociology [12–14] mentioned in Section 2 is useful for solving and making decisions about relatively simple problems. Conversely, in the case of architecture, each stage faces complex matters such as direction and concept, site, program, and operation. It is also necessary to reach a decision by discussing this with various stakeholders, and it is highly likely that the period can be extended for a long time. Therefore, it is difficult to see that participation in all these matters occurs sequentially and gradually. This is also closely related to the view of this case, which allows and induces a flexible change in the community.

4.2. Allowing and Inducing Community Change

There was an aspect in which the community was formed and changed in a fairly flexible manner, from the commencement of a project by administrators and experts, checking the community conditions of the site, and seeking and organizing the community to allow participation. There was a total of eight communities organized or reorganized during the planning process.

Initially, the administration and experts formed the Residents’ Network (organized community (1)) by seeking residents who have been actively engaged in local activities. The residents voluntarily organized a Project Promotion Team (organized community (2)) that could participate in the planning process in the future, taking the city’s support project as an opportunity. In addition, the administration and experts consulted with the community to hold a festival related to the project. In the process of planning this festival, a Promotion Committee (reorganized community (3)) was formed, which expanded the scope of its members, including the Project Promotion Team and other residents in Haengchon.

These changes in the participatory community continued to appear in the subsequent planning process. While selecting experts and during basic planning, the residents internally revamped the existing organization. Some members quit or were changed due to personal circumstances, and it was developed into a more structured Resident Promotion Committee (reorganized community (4)).

As detailed plans of the facilities began, this Resident Promotion Committee began to participate in earnest. In addition, in order to establish a more systematic cooperation structure with the community, the administrators and experts reorganized the Resident Promotion Committee into a Residents' Council (reorganized community (5)) by selecting members, chairmen, and secretaries. They then participated in the consultation and decision process. In the meantime, an additional Urban Agricultural Community (reorganized community (6)) was formed focusing on residents who were closely related to the operation program as well as outside agricultural experts.

Subsequently, in the construction process, local groups, which had been intermittently participating through events, joined the Inwang Network (organized community (7)) to work to revitalize the Haengchon area through another support project of the SMG. In addition, some of the aforementioned communities were integrated and expanded, and finally, a Resident Operation Committee (reorganized community (8)) was formed for operation. Of the eight communities organized during the project process, (1), (2), and (7) were newly formed, and the others were reorganized based on the existing organized communities and unspecified residents.

The three facilities that were built have been continuously operated and managed by the Resident Operation Committee. As the community has been organized and reorganized from a flexible point of view, this community is also not leading to a completely stagnant state but is flexible as new people are included and the old exit.

Accordingly, administrations and experts should not regard the community as a static organization based on the degree of participation in sustainability. From preparation for the project to deciding specific plans and future operations, it is important to bear in mind that the community can change depending on the situation. It would be much easier for the administrators and experts to set up a participating community early to suit the nature of the project and then consult with them. For example, it is preferable to form a Residents' Council before the basic or specific planning stage. In many projects under the same conditions, it may appear that the participation structure was formed in haste. However, this eventually enhances participation in a project that the administration leads and decides. This does not mean that the administrators and experts should view the community as an unspecified object and neglect it, but are required to monitor each situation, whether it is time to provide information if education is required, whether opinions need to be gathered, and if final consultations and decisions should be made. Simultaneously, it is necessary to respond flexibly, considering how best the community can participate.

In the process of the formation and reorganization of the community, other residents could also be included because the programs of the three aforementioned dimensions were continuously held without hierarchies so that local groups or an unspecified number of residents could also participate in the project. It was not just done by the administration and experts, but the community voluntarily opened up for the participation of other residents. During this process, the organization could be revamped several times as new residents enter and exit without difficulty. Therefore, even if any specific community can closely intervene in public matters, it is necessary to have an inclusive attitude toward other residents and respond flexibly to the project.

5. Conclusions

This study analyzes the case of Seoul, where discussions and practices on community sustainability in cities have become more active in recent years. The study confirms that sustainability can be achieved through a flexible approach to community and participation, especially in the condition of newly seeking and organizing communities to participate in public projects.

This flexible approach allows the participant community to adapt and change according to what needs to be consulted and decided from process to process. This perspective is required for both the administration, the professional, and the community.

The content of community participation can be divided into three categories, which do not have a sequential hierarchy in terms of impact. Undoubtedly, in the process of building construction,

participation does not necessarily increase gradually, depending on the process. It can appear quite out of sequence. Therefore, the way the community participates should not be narrowly planned in advance from a hierarchical perspective. Above all, by allowing such non-sequential participation to occur, a wide range of communities can intervene in projects in various aspects.

Through this flexible perspective, administrators and experts can maintain a cooperative relationship, rather than just forming a fixed community for the project and leading it. It is also possible to prevent the private interests of a particular community from being replaced by public interests. A community that has become inclusive through a flexible organization can be sustained while allowing its own change.

While discussions and practices on community participation in relation to the deliberation system continue to be carried out around the world, this study, which understands the general conditions prevalent in Korea and identifies key viewpoints and characteristics in public plans for sustainability, is original and valuable for future practice.

Based on this study, an appropriate practice model should be presented through research on additional cases for the same condition.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.G.B. and H.-a.K.; methodology, S.G.B.; software, S.G.B.; validation, S.G.B. and H.-a.K.; formal analysis, S.G.B.; investigation, S.G.B.; resources, S.G.B.; data curation, S.G.B.; writing—original draft preparation, S.G.B.; writing—review and editing, S.G.B.; visualization, S.G.B.; supervision, S.G.B. and H.-a.K.; project administration, S.G.B. and H.-a.K.; funding acquisition, S.G.B. and H.-a.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), by a grant funded by the Ministry of Education (NRF-2019R1I1A3A01061072).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. KOSIS (Korean Statistical Information Service). Available online: www.kosis.kr (accessed on 20 November 2020).
2. Kim, H.; Han, S. Seoul. *Cities* **2012**, *29*, 142–154. Available online: www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0264275111000199 (accessed on 26 October 2020). [CrossRef]
3. Kim, H. The Flow of Urban Design in Korea. In *Understanding of Urban Design*; Kim, Y., Ed.; Boseonggag: Seoul, Korea, 2014; Volume 3, pp. 50–67.
4. Urban Regeneration Information System. Available online: www.city.go.kr/portal/policyInfo/urban/contents02/link.do (accessed on 20 November 2020).
5. Seoul Urban Regeneration. Available online: uri.seoul.go.kr/eng/prgr/prgrView.do (accessed on 20 November 2020).
6. Kim, J.; Cho, M. Creating a sewing village in Seoul: Towards Participatory Village-Making or Post-Political Urban Regeneration? *Community Dev. J.* **2017**, *54*, 406–426. Available online: academic.oup.com/cdj/article-abstract/54/3/406/4614536 (accessed on 20 November 2020). [CrossRef]
7. You, A.; Yoo, H. A Study of the Policy Improvement for the Housing Area as the Urban Regeneration of New Deal Project. *J. Archit. Inst. Korea Plan. Des.* **2018**, *34*, 55–64. Available online: koreascience.or.kr/article/JAKO201810760744362.page (accessed on 20 November 2020).
8. Baek, S.; Kwon, H.A. A Local Public Building Production Process through Participation of Unspecified Community: Focused on the Improvement Project of Yeonhui-dong Community Service Center. *J. Archit. Inst. Korea Plan. Des.* **2020**, *36*, 41–52. Available online: koreascience.or.kr/article/JAKO202029462558626.page (accessed on 26 October 2020).
9. Lee, S.; Kim, H. *Citizen Participation Theory*; Pakyoungsa: Seoul, Korea, 2018; pp. 140–160.
10. Strange, J. The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration. *Public Adm. Rev.* **1972**, *32*, 457–470. Available online: www.jstor.org/stable/975015?seq=1 (accessed on 26 October 2020). [CrossRef]
11. Lee, Y. Marilyn Taylor: The Role of Community Voluntary Organisations and Welfare Mix in the UK. *Plan. Policy* **2005**, *284*, 85–99. Available online: www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE01169789 (accessed on 26 October 2020).

12. Arnstein, S. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *J. Am. Inst. Plan.* **1969**, *35*, 216–224. Available online: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944366908977225 (accessed on 26 October 2020). [CrossRef]
13. Milbrath, L. Political Participation. In *The Handbook of Political Behavior*; Samuel, L., Ed.; Springer: Boston, MA, USA, 1981; Volume 4, pp. 197–240. Available online: link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4684-3878-9_4 (accessed on 26 October 2020).
14. Connor, M. A New Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Natl. Civ. Rev.* **1988**, *77*, 249–257. Available online: geog.sdsu.edu/People/Pages/jankowski/public_html/web780/Connor_1988.pdf (accessed on 26 October 2020). [CrossRef]
15. Baek, S. The Characteristics of Community Participation in the Production of Public Places in Korea. Ph.D. Thesis, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea, 2002; pp. 49–65. Available online: s-space.snu.ac.kr/handle/10371/167572 (accessed on 26 October 2020).
16. Jeong, S.; Kim, T. A Review of Research Trends of ‘Maeul-mandeulgi’ and the Characteristics of Studies Focused on ‘Human Beings’. *Urban Des. Inst. Korea* **2015**, *16*, 123–138. Available online: www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE06530785 (accessed on 26 October 2020).
17. Park, S. Castle Village: The Heritage Value of the Urban Life Landscape and the Paradigm Shift of the Urban Management. In Proceedings of the The Value and the Possibility of ‘Castle Village’ around Hanyangdoseong, Castle Village Academic Conference, Seoul City Hall, Korea, 14 March 2014; The Seoul Institute, Ed.; Seoul Metropolitan Government: Seoul, Korea, 2014.
18. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Available online: whc.unesco.org/en/series/31 (accessed on 18 October 2020).
19. Seoul Metropolitan Government. *The Castle Village Haengchon: Records on Life Culture*; Seoul Metropolitan Government: Seoul, Korea, 2016.
20. Seoul Metropolitan Government. *Main Report: Establishment of Action Plans for Preservation and Management of the Haengchon Area of Castle Village*; Seoul Metropolitan Government: Seoul, Korea, 2016.
21. Seoul Metropolitan Government. *Report on the Performance of Value Sharing and Community Support Projects*; Seoul Metropolitan Government: Seoul, Korea, 2015.
22. Sharing for Future Corporation. Available online: www.yesnanum.org (accessed on 26 October 2020).

Publisher’s Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).