ABOUT THE STUDY

Research conducted by Social Ventures Hong Kong (SVhk) Study Team

Francis Ngai          Lehui Liang
Maria Lam            Florence Cheng
Edwin Song

Acknowledgements

Support from members of over 25 organisations added to the breadth and depth of research efforts. For more information about these organisations, see APPENDIX I: Acknowledgements

About Social Ventures Hong Kong (SVhk)

Founded in 2007, SVhk is an Impact Purpose Organisation (IPO) that innovates social change by re-imagining the city. We focus on inventing and incubating pioneering sustainable business solutions to urban social and environmental challenges. SVhk has incubated, invested in and supported more than 40 ventures.

This report has been commissioned by, and prepared for, the Urban Renewal Authority in Hong Kong, as a consultancy study in relation to community making for Staunton Street / Wing Lee Street Development Scheme and its surrounding neighbourhood.

Copyright © 2019 SVHK Capital Limited. All rights reserved.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT .................................................................................................................... 4
HIGHLIGHTS ......................................................................................................................................... 4

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION TO COMMUNITY MAKING ..................................................................... 7
  1.1. WHAT IS COMMUNITY MAKING? ............................................................................................... 7
  1.2. COMMUNITY MAKING BLUEPRINT ......................................................................................... 8

SECTION 2. THE STUDY ........................................................................................................................... 9
  2.1. KEY OBJECTIVES ....................................................................................................................... 9
  2.2. STUDY SCOPE ........................................................................................................................... 10
  2.3. STUDY APPROACH .................................................................................................................... 14

SECTION 3. EXPLORE: COMMUNITY SNAPSHOTs ........................................................................... 15
  3.1. A MULTI-CHANNELLED APPROACH TO COLLECT COMMUNITY VIEWS . . . . ............... 15
  3.2. KEY FINDINGS FROM COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EXERCISE ............................................. 20
  3.3. INSPIRED COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES .................................................................................... 26

SECTION 4. CITIZEN GROUP INSIGHTS ............................................................................................... 30
  4.1. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS AND INSIGHTS .............................................................................. 30
  4.2. “RAINBOW LENS” ANALYSIS .................................................................................................. 33

SECTION 5. ENVISION: COMMUNITY MAKING PROPOSITIONS .................................................... 35
  5.1. ENVISIONING A “LIVING COMMON” ....................................................................................... 35
  5.2. URBAN PROGRESSING VISIONS ............................................................................................... 36

SECTION 6. STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS ......................................................................................... 49
  6.1. H19 COMMUNITY MAKING DIRECTIONS ................................................................................... 49

SECTION 7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS .............................................................................................. 50
  7.1. KEY IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES ...................................................................................... 50
  7.2. PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS .................................................................................................. 51
  7.3. INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION ............................................................................................... 52
  7.4. PROPOSED NEXT STEPS .......................................................................................................... 53

SECTION 8. CLOSING REMARKS .......................................................................................................... 54

APPENDIX I: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .............................................................................................. 56

APPENDIX II: LIST OF NEARBY SITES ............................................................................................ 57

APPENDIX III: DETAILED RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ................................................................ 58

APPENDIX IV: STAKEHOLDER VIEWS MATRIX ............................................................................... 69

APPENDIX V: H19 COMMUNITY MAKING EXAMPLES ..................................................................... 74

APPENDIX VI: INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION EXAMPLES .............................................................. 77

APPENDIX VII: INSPIRATIONS FROM AROUND THE WORLD .......................................................... 79

APPENDIX VIII: GLOSSARY ............................................................................................................... 82
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

In December 2018, the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) engaged Social Ventures Hong Kong (“SVhk”) as a consultant to conduct a comprehensive community study (“the Study”) to pilot the incorporation of community making into the neighbourhoods surrounding Staunton Street / Shing Wong Street / Wa In Fong East / Wa In Fong West / Wing Lee Street including the Staunton Street / Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (“H19”) site.

This report, detailing the Study and recommendations was prepared by SVhk and submitted to the URA for consideration.

HIGHLIGHTS

Integration of Place Making and Community Making

Communities are living organisms with a natural ecosystem that should evolve in line with the needs and beliefs of its members. Urban renewal, at its heart, represents the very opportunity for authorities and citizens alike to reassess the current state of development and, more specifically, the connection between people and places.

Weaving together place making and community making, stakeholders can look collectively to reflect upon the core values that define the community and seek innovative means to integrate landscape and lifescape aspirations into the planning process.

H19 Community Study and Key Findings

The primary objective of the Study was to embed community inputs into URA’s revitalisation proposal for this neighbourhood and work with local stakeholders to identify a consensual way to proceed in enriching social bonds in this community and to generate social benefits.

Between January and May 2019, SVhk’s study team actively reached out to members of the community through street surveys, interviews, community outreach activities, and focus groups. Invitations to resident engagement activities were also extended to over 20 nearby residential buildings in the neighbourhood. From local residents, businesses, schools, elderly centres, community-based organisations, to members of the Central & Western District Council, the study team empathetically listened to feedback provided leading to the below observations:

- Agreed on the need to preserve a “non-Soho” serene ambience
- Expressed preference for a resident-centric development model
- Recognised diverse citizen groups and demand for intergenerational activities
Staunton Street / Shing Wong Street Community Making Study | Highlights

- Agreed in the importance of preserving and inheriting values of rich cultural heritage
- Welcomed existing URA pilot schemes to generate social impact e.g. Light Be, WL Residence
- Identified room for improvement in walkability and accessibility
- Desired for more common space for hanging out and community use
- Expected optimal use of green public space, with some residents advocating for the preservation of trees on Shing Wong Street
- Presented inconclusive views on the efficient and appropriate use of current vacant lots

### Four Urban Progressing Visions

Based on the above, the study team developed four Urban Progressing Visions centered around a “living common” model built upon sharing, collaboration, mutual trust and support. The study team engaged local residents, teachers, and members of the Central & Western District Council in focus group discussions to test and refine these as tools for strategic discussions going forward. The four visions were presented and well-received across all focus groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Progressing Visions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Common</strong></td>
<td>- Living history and interactive displays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transgenerational interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Synergise with nearby revitalisation initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Common</strong></td>
<td>- Youth development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affordable living options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community-centric planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Common</strong></td>
<td>- Community sharing and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible use of space and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellness Common</strong></td>
<td>- Green and open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved walkability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal wellness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommended Community Making Directions**

The Study proposes that priority consideration should be accorded to the below community making directions, as part of the URA’s overall revitalisation scheme design and place making initiatives:

1. Adopt a “non-Soho” development approach against introducing commercial elements that may constitute a public nuisance to local residents in URA properties

2. Promote diverse and intergenerational community initiatives to connect local stakeholders including nearby revitalisation initiatives and educational institutions

3. Continue to support local social impact initiatives building on existing collaborations between URA and local organisations

4. Promote accessibility for all, through improving the pedestrian network and enhancing barrier-free facilities in the neighbourhood

5. Establish multifunctional communal area, optimising existing open space with additional greenery and uphold a low-density development approach. Facilities provided by the URA should be aligned to Urban Progressing Visions, and take into account community preferences to preserve existing trees and heritage

6. Collaborate with community stakeholders to further explore “community making” in the neighbourhood in the form of pilot initiatives and regular impact reviews

As a way forward, the Study recommends that the URA continues to engage and collaborate with community stakeholders in light of its notable yet minority ownership within the wider neighbourhood. Through innovation, collaboration, and empowerment, SVhk hopes that the Study and its recommendations can serve as guiding principles for the URA to embed *community making* in urban renewal within this neighbourhood and beyond.
1.1. What is Community Making?

Around the world, we see place making emerging as a global megatrend to embed community impact and people-centric design in the use of space. The High Line in New York and El Campo de Cebada in Madrid, for example, serve as prime illustrations of how idle sites can be successfully transformed into vibrant open spaces in a way that reenergised an entire neighbourhood. In Hong Kong, the application of place making principles is also increasingly prominent from the redesign of Central waterfront to public parks and the Urban Renewal Authority’s H6 CONET space in Sheung Wan.

Place making inspires all of us to rethink the way we build the physical dimensions of our urban landscape based on community needs. Yet missing in some conversations is how this interplays with lifescapes, and the way in which the social, cultural, and economic dimensions of the neighbourhood can also be enabled and supported to evolve with its citizens. This, as envisioned by the Study, is the power of community making, and specifically what we imagine to be a pioneering approach to understanding ‘what’ and ‘how’ to breathe life to a changing neighbourhood and make it more sustainable – with human factors at the heart of creating a city for the citizens.

Weaving together place making and community making, we hope to reimagine a new design system that can meet both the material and social needs for humans as social beings. We aspire to bring different sectors of our society together and create a movement embedding innovation, collaboration, and empowerment in urban regeneration going forward.

COMMUNITY MAKING AS A NEW ENGAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
1.2. Community Making Blueprint

SVhk reimagines a *community making* blueprint built around **8Es** – *explore, envision, enlighten, engage, empower, extend, embed, evangelise*. This framework actively explores, tests, and advocates for the development of new urban models to redefine community experiences and the pursuit of wellness in our society.

**A SPIRAL BLUEPRINT FOR CREATING AND EMBEDDING SOCIAL CHANGE**

Key to the above are considerations for “software”, namely programme and infrastructure, innovations that include strategies, visions and mechanisms to unlock unexploited potentials for each neighbourhood to act as an engine for social impact.

We see the first two Es as the foundation of theory and a hands-on approach to the start of a community making journey, covering:

1. **Explore**: seeks to build an objective assessment of local needs, values and aspirations;

2. **Envision**: leverages the assessment to inform new strategic directions to embed social innovation and impact in the community’s future development.
SECTION 2. THE STUDY

2.1. Key Objectives

"The Chief Executive’s 2018 Policy Address and motions to support a revised revitalisation proposal for the Staunton Street / Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (“H19”) as a consultant to develop a study (“the Study”) to pioneer the application of community making to support a revised revitalisation proposal for the Staunton Street / Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (“H19”). The Study was designed to:

- holistically assess current aspirations and future potentials of the nearby neighbourhood through research and broad-based community engagement
- analytically filter and funnel feedback from different stakeholder groups to identify common layers of community needs and motivations
- collectively, with inputs from the community, develop new visions to generate social benefits in this neighbourhood

The Study sought to look at the revitalisation of this neighbourhood from fresh perspectives, guided by the directions set forth by the Chief Executive’s 2018 Policy Address and motions passed in the Central & Western District Council over the past year. It represented a collaborative journey between URA and the community in exploring a sustainable future for this neighbourhood."

SOURCE: The Chief Executive’s 2018 Policy Address, Central & Western District Council
2.2. Study Scope

The Study focused on exploring the social innovation possibilities in URA’s H19 scheme – bounded by Staunton Street, Aberdeen Street, Wa In Fong East, Shing Wong Street ("H19 area") and its surrounding neighbourhood ("the neighbourhood").

THE H19 AREA AND ITS SURROUNDING NEIGHBOURHOOD

H19 Area

Staunton Street
Wa In Fong East
Wa In Fong West
Shing Wong Street
Chung Wo Lane

The Neighbourhood

Aberdeen Street
Kwong Hon Terrace Garden
Shing Wong Street
HK News-Expo
PMQ

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AT A GLANCE:

The H19 area is located within the **Mid-Levels East Constituency** in the **Central and Western District** of Hong Kong. According to the 2016 By-Census\(^1\), the District and Consistency stand out as:

- A high-income and educated population
- An extension of the central business district
- A culturally diverse neighborhood

Central and Western District has one of the highest concentration of high-income earners in HK

![% Population by Income Class including foreign domestic helpers](image)

Many more of whom are degree-holders... ...and of working age compared to a HK average

![% Degree Holders](image)

The neighbourhood is also home to proportionally more one-person households...

![% Population by Household Composition](image)

...coupled by a significantly more racially and culturally diverse population

![% Population by Ethnicity](image)

The extended neighbourhood (spanning across Central and Sheung Wan) is currently a vibrant place to live, work, learn, and play. Estimated as at April 2019, it is currently home to at least:

- 13 co-working spaces
- 12 outdoor community spaces
- 7 heritage attractions
- 7 indoor community spaces
- 12 schools
- 1 outdoor community spaces
- 7 indoor community spaces

For a list of the above sites, please see APPENDIX II: List of Nearby Sites
A LAYERED HISTORY OF PERPETUAL PROGRESS

The neighbourhood has a rich history and evolving cultural identity since its becoming in the 1800s:

The first commercial developments set the tone for the area to become a distinctively international lower / middle-class neighbourhood, primarily populated by Chinese and Portuguese labourers and families.

Consecutive block of 30 tong laus built along Staunton Street, later giving rise to the neighbourhood moniker “30 Houses” (卅間).

Incubation ground for social change and anti-Qing revolutionaries including Dr Sun Yat-sen, as the birthplace of Hong Kong’s earliest schools, revolutionary networks, and newspapers.

Reconstruction following war damages transformed the neighbourhood into a vibrant social scene with thriving wet markets and cosy neighbourhood eateries catering to the livelihood needs of local community members.

Opportunities to redevelop pathing the way for new visions to carry forward the community spirit and its values to greater heights.

H19 AREA AS A PLACE TO LIVE, WORK, AND PLAY

Key facts and figures about the H19 area:

- ~430 Residential Units <10% owned by URA
- ~20 Commercial Units <50% owned by URA
- ~1000 Residents / Tenants <10% in total properties
- 3 Outdoor Parks & Gardens 0% Operated by URA

SOURCE: SVhk analysis, stakeholder expert interviews

(estimanted as at April 2019 for the “H19 area”, bounded by Staunton Street / Shing Wong Street / Wa In Fong East / Aberdeen Street, as defined in Section 2.2)

Whilst the H19 area is around 4,700m², roughly equivalent to 12 standard basketball courts, it is nonetheless home to over 1,000 residents across around 500 residential units and supported by commercial and recreational facilities. Of which, the URA currently retains notable yet minority ownership.
2.3. Study Approach

The **Explore** and **Envision** phases of the Study took place between January and May 2019.

Research findings will be converged through a “Rainbow Lens” framework to generate:

- **Urban Progressing Visions**: possible directions of travel to advance community development based on local needs
- **Community Making Directions**: recommended guiding principles based on which community making and urban renewal for the neighbourhood should be built
SECTION 3. EXPLORE: COMMUNITY SNAPSHOTs

3.1. A Multi-Channelled Approach to Collect Community Views

The Study Team conducted a 4-month community engagement exercise to collect views across stakeholder groups between January and May 2019. To bring in fresh and balanced perspectives to a needs-driven discussion on the future development of the neighbourhood, the overall engagement exercise targeted groups of local residents, locally based organisations and interest groups with established ties to this community. The exercise included over 30 community discussions and activities across age, ethnic, gender, and social profiles.

Key figures on the engagement exercise as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians observed</th>
<th>Interviews conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2,000</td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals surveyed</td>
<td>Focus groups sessions organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key targeted stakeholder groups include:

- Residents
- Schools
- Social Purpose Organisations
- Pedestrians
- Businesses
- Revitalisation Initiatives
- Central & Western District Office
- Central & Western District Council
- Urban Renewal Authority

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
3.1.1. Traffic Count cum Observation

- **Objective:** To build first-hand insights on the citizen profiles, behaviours and observe opportunities for improvement.

- **Approach:** Two key traffic count stations supported by a team of eight were set up on two randomly selected days in a week and over a weekend, at the junctions between Shing Wong Street and Wa In Fong East, Staunton Street and Aberdeen Street, to estimate the average flow of pedestrians travelling in / out of the neighbourhood. Three primary parameters were selected to determine the dominant citizen profiles and their relative changes throughout the day: (1) gender, (2) age, and (3) ethnicity.

- **Outcome:** Over 2,000 individuals were observed, and their attributes documented to form the basis for an overall estimate.

3.1.2. Street Surveys

- **Objective:** To develop personal contact with local pedestrians to gauge impressions of and aspirations for this community.

- **Approach:** The study team designed a short survey targeting local residents, students, workers and tourists, focusing on three key aspects:
  - **Values:** What does this neighbourhood mean to you?
  - **Needs:** What activities do you most frequently visit / best serve your needs in this neighbourhood?
  - **Aspirations:** What else would you like to see in the neighbourhood?

- **Outcome:** Over 60 pedestrians were randomly selected as a sample over a 2-day period to complete the surveys.
3.1.3. Interviews

- **Objective:** To gain expert views on the community’s potentials and their recommendations, as well as to collect personal stories and experiences to identify changes locals would like to see in this neighbourhood.

- **Approach:** Community and expert interviews were conducted with all identified stakeholder groups to deep dive into the experiences of stakeholders and their priorities in accordance to a tailored interview guide.

- **Outcome:** Over 25 groups interviews were conducted with over 100 local residents, community groups, schools, businesses, NGOs, and experts in planning, housing and other related fields.

[Clockwise from top] Interviews with local heritage expert, Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association, Wing Lee Street resident, Central & Western District Councillors.
3.1.4. Community Outreach Activities

- **Objective:** To connect parties across sectors and enable open dialogues on the future development of this community.

- **Approach:** An open event was organised in March 2019 for the community and visitors alike to spend an afternoon in the neighbourhood in a two-part programme: starting with a docent tour and finishing with an open discussion in the form of "Cha Chaan Teng Change-Maker’s Club" to brainstorm potential ideas to improve the community experience. Promotional materials for the event was put up along Shing Wong Street, and inside nearby residential buildings (including Dawning Heights) and non-residential complexes (including Hong Kong News-Expo, Lo Yau Kee and O2 Hair Salon) to draw the attention of interested parties.

- **Outcome:** Over 15 participants supported the afternoon event across age and social groups, including residents from Light Be units on Wing Lee Street, residents from Caine Road, Robinson Road, as well as former residents and tourists from around the neighbourhood. Ideas collected were added to the Study’s recommendations.

Participants of the outreach day noted down their impressions of the neighbourhood and expectations for the future, before and after a community docent tour.

Local residents actively expressed their views on the neighbourhood in a facilitated conversation on Wa In Fong East, with venue support from O2 Hair Salon and snacks provided from Lo Yau Kee.
3.1.5. Focus Group Discussions

- **Objective:** To test initial findings and ideas with target stakeholder groups

- **Approach:** Five small group discussions were set up for local (1) elderly residents, (2) parents and teachers, (3) social purpose organisations, (4) resident representatives\(^2\) and incorporated owners, and (5) District Councillors and District Officer. Each meeting lasted 1.5 – 2 hours and included an overview of the four preliminary visions to collect feedback.

- **Outcome:** Over 30 individuals were engaged across the **five focus groups.** Comments and feedback collected from the sessions were used to refine the vision ideas and helped informed the Study’s final recommendations to the URA

For details on the “Explore” phase, please see **APPENDIX III: Detailed Research Methodology**

\(^2\) Over 50 invitation and reminder letters were hand-delivered to the management offices or mailboxes of 20+ nearby residential buildings
3.2. Key Findings from Community Engagement Exercise

Through community engagement, the study team collected a snapshot of diverse local views and the expressed preferences of participating parties to help further our understanding of the neighbourhood and its members.

Three emerging themes can be identified from the research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transient Dynamics</th>
<th>Perceptions of neighbourhood diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A cosmopolitan uptown area attractive to young adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing dynamics by the hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Characters</th>
<th>Where old meets new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dr Sun Yat-sen and journeys towards better futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Journalism and the dissemination of ideas and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 30 Houses and social impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Life Preferences</th>
<th>Values and aspirations from the community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quiet ambience and inclusive community spirit as the most highly appreciated values by locals and visitors alike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accessibility and child-friendly facilities emerge as the top aspirations shared across all stakeholder groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.1. Transient Dynamics: perceptions of neighbourhood diversity

Through traffic count cum observations exercises along Staunton Street and Shing Wong Street, the study team was able to build an impression of the community mix around the neighbourhood.

A COSMOPOLITAN UPTOWN AREA ATTRACTIVE TO YOUNG ADULTS

A two-day traffic count exercise suggested only 70% of c. 8,000 passing by the neighbourhood on an average day were observed to be of Chinese descent.

This international mix was similarly noted from the 2016 By-Census where 31% of residents in the Mid-Levels East constituency (where this neighbourhood in based) were non-Chinese, compared to the 8% observed across Hong Kong.

Breakdown of Average Traffic by Ethnicity, and by Age

It appeared the neighbourhood has also been also particularly successful in attracting young visitors, as our study shows that 40% of those visiting the area are between the ages of 20-39, which is around 20% higher than the proportion of residents of the same age estimated in the 2016 By Census.

TOP 5 CITIZEN PROFILES OBSERVED IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Profile (Gender – Age Group - Ethnicity)</th>
<th>% Citizen Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female – 20s and 30s - Chinese</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 20s and 30s - Chinese</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 30s and 40s - Chinese</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female - 30s and 40s - Chinese</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 20s and 30s - Caucasian</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGING DYNAMICS BY THE HOUR

There were significant changes in the flow of pedestrians by citizen groups throughout different timeslots observed. It could be assumed that the neighbourhood is typically at its busiest during lunch and secondly in the mid-afternoon as students leave school.

Estimated Traffic Flow on an Average Day

![Graph showing traffic flow on Staunton Street and Shing Wong Street]

SOURCE: SVhk analysis

When further broken down by age, a significant variance could be observed when comparing the average citizen mix by age and the actual estimates specific to a time period. For example, more elderly may be expected to be out and about in the neighbourhood in the morning, whilst lunch-hour traffic is dominated by those of working age. These demonstrated significant shifts in the citizen mix and behaviours as the day progresses.
Citizen Group Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Toddlers (0-5)</th>
<th>Children (6-12)</th>
<th>Teens (13-19)</th>
<th>Young Adults (20-39)</th>
<th>Middle Aged (40-59)</th>
<th>Elderly (60+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average citizen mix</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Average number of pedestrians observed from a particular age group throughout an average day = score of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by timeslot</th>
<th>Toddlers</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Teens</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Middle Aged</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early morning</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late morning</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early afternoon</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late afternoon</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterwork hours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak traffic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Toddlers</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Teens</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Middle Aged</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:30 Early afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:30 Early afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:30 Early afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30-19:30 Afterwork hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:30 Late morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00-10:30 Early morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** SVhk analysis

**Time**

**Typical citizen group profile**

- **Morning rush hours (08:00-10:30)**
  - Mix of children and adults travelling to school or work
  - Popular time for dog walking
  - A relatively higher proportion of elderly was observed, mainly in transit or exercising in parks

- **Late morning (10:30-12:30)**
  - Relatively quiet time with more toddlers observed with young mothers and / or domestic helpers running errands around the neighbourhood

- **Lunch hours (12:30-14:30)**
  - Busiest time in the neighbourhood with an influx of office workers (mostly from Central) entering the area to take advantage of its diverse culinary offerings for lunch

- **Early afternoon (14:30-15:30)**
  - Another quiet hour with a relatively higher proportion of toddlers with young mothers and / or domestic helpers running errands in the neighbourhood

- **After-school hours (15:30-17:30)**
  - Staunton Street becomes even busier with the highest proportion of students observed passing by the neighbourhood en route from school / to join extra-curricular activities on Caine Road
  - Worth noting that public open spaces including Kwong Hon Terrace Garden become particularly popular during this time with many students playing in the parks after school on their way home

- **After-work hours (17:30-19:30)**
  - Significantly higher proportion of young adults around in the neighbourhood, a relatively higher ratio of whom are non-Chinese enjoying after-work drinks (in Soho) or dog walking (along Shing Wong Street)
3.2.2. Cultural Heritage Characters: where old meets new

Through expert interviews and conversations with locals, the study team observed the critical role and value placed by locals and visitors on cultural heritage in this neighbourhood. Three key elements of cultural heritage appeared to receive the most attention amongst members of the community:

**DR SUN YAT-SEN AND JOURNEYS TOWARDS BETTER FUTURES**

The neighbourhood is currently home to 5 of the 16 spots within Dr Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail, including To Tsai Church, the Alice Memorial Hospital and the College of Medicine for Chinese, Hong Kong, former Queen’s College on Hollywood Road, and Preaching House of the American Congregational Church on Bridges Street. Through the Study’s engagement with local stakeholders, it was observed that the stories of Dr Sun’s education and revolutionary pursuits in the area continued to serve as genuine sources of inspiration particularly amongst schools. Dr Sun’s personal journey towards mapping out a “new China” movement here can be more widely interpreted to represent the quest of, and progress towards, better futures embedded in the DNA of this community.

**JOURNALISM AND THE DISSEMINATION OF IDEAS AND KNOWLEDGE**

The Central and Sheung Wan area was home to 16 of Hong Kong’s earliest newspapers including Wah Kiu Yat Po (or Overseas Chinese Daily News) that used to be housed in 88-90 Staunton Street. Remnants of old printing press can still be found including in Wing Lee Street and Wa In Fong East. Building on its past as a hub that disseminated new ideas and knowledge to mainland China in the 1900s, the neighbourhood is now seen by a number of stakeholders interviewed as an education and art platform spearheaded by the Central and Western District Office and District Council through Dr Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail, Hong Kong News-Expo through media education workshops, and other programmes organised by neighbouring schools and museums within easy walking distance of the H19 area.

**30 HOUSES AND SOCIAL IMPACT**

For more than half a century, Yu Lan Festivals have been hosted annually by locals and led by the now-Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association as part of an age-old tradition of the Chiu Chow diaspora to make offerings to ancestors and help those in need in the community. These festivals become synonymous with the moniker “30 Houses” (卅間), both in terms of the low-rise low-density buildings that used to define the streetscape of this neighbourhood as well as the “Yu Lan spirit” of “good men doing good deeds” core to the values of this community. Such philosophies further live through other current inhabitants, including numerous non-profit organisations such as Light Be and the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups to pilot affordable housing and youth development initiatives for the betterment of the wider society.
3.2.3. Urban Life Preferences: values and aspirations from the community

From the analysis of street survey results, the study team noted two primary themes on the lifestyle preferences with reference to the neighbourhood:

**QUIET AMBIENCE AND INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY SPIRIT AS THE MOST HIGHLY APPRECIATED VALUES BY LOCALS AND VISITORS ALIKE**

Almost 50% of the surveyed described the neighbourhood either as a uniquely quiet area that gives a leisurely air to the fast-paced city life, or as an inclusive neighbourhood where old meets new, East meets West. The above preferences were particularly strong amongst Chinese residents in the neighbourhood, with their Caucasian counterparts typically placing a higher value on convenience and vibrancy instead.

**What the Community THINKS of the Neighbourhood:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Vibrant</th>
<th>Convenient</th>
<th>Hipster</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Touristy</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Inclusive</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SVhk analysis

**ACCESSIBILITY AND CHILD-FRIENDLY FACILITIES EMERGE AS THE TOP ASPIRATIONS SHARED ACROSS ALL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS**

Common across all citizen groups (by age, by ethnicity, and by years spent in the area) was the shared aspiration towards improved walkability and accessibility in the neighbourhood. Many of the residents specifically look for more convenient means of moving around, means of public transportation and more importantly, more pedestrian-friendly streets to improve the overall walking experience along the steps connecting Caine Road and in Central. Secondary to the above was a preference for more parks, quiet space and cultural features, particularly popular in wish lists expressed by Caucasian residents and families with young children.

**What the Community WANTS to Add to the Neighbourhood:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Convenient stores</th>
<th>Parks and gardens</th>
<th>Diverse F&amp;B options</th>
<th>Cultural immersion</th>
<th>Recreational facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Improved walkability</th>
<th>Child-friendly facilities</th>
<th>Common area</th>
<th>Quiet ambience</th>
<th>Dog-friendly facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
3.3. Inspired Community Experiences

The diverse citizen mix and casual setting appeared to have enabled the neighbourhood to embody multiple dimensions with a strong sense of neighbourliness. Based on interviews and informal chats with locals and visitors in the neighbourhood, the study team observed that the neighbourhood has organically evolved to become an inclusive space catering to these distinct community needs and inspiring a wide range of community experiences.

SELECTED INSPIRED COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES:

**A Hangout Spot for All Ages**

Mr Kwok was born in an upstairs apartment in 19 Shing Wong Street and was raised there before moving out as an adult. Even though he now lives in the New Territories, he still considers this neighbourhood as “his root” and often travels back to hang out and walk along the steps to reminisce about his childhood days. He admitted that even though the neighbourhood may no longer be how it used to be, that he still hopes to pass on the spirit of the old days and bring his children to learn about his upbringing here.

Mr Kwok is not alone – many old ‘gai fongs’ within the Central 30 Houses Yu Lan Kai Fong Association moved away but still return regularly for social gatherings and annual festivities to pass on the “Yu Lan Spirit” of “good men doing good deeds”.

The vicinity not only brings back old residents, it also attracts newcomers and visitors from across age groups and ethnic profiles. Mr Ho, who lives in Sai Wan, may not be from the area but he was so enamoured with the laid-back attitude that he brings his young daughter, Ching, to explore and hang out in the area every weekend.

Local facilities including Kwong Hon Terrace Garden and the old hopscotch located on 1/F of Hong Kong News-Expo are hotspots for young children like Ching to play and enjoy a great family time.
Mr Lai is a financial services professional working in Central, who often frequents a local café in the neighbourhood during the workday for a breath of fresh air. During the afternoon, he would take a break from his office desk and continue his work or take conference calls at the café over a sip of coffee and a freshly baked tart — turning this leisurely neighbourhood into his very own private distraction-free work lounge where he can recharge and refocus.

On a daily basis many other individuals can be observed, from young freelancers and designers hot-desking in local cafes in the neighbourhood. They enjoy the tranquil space as a great place to work, to socialise, and to be inspired, all just minutes away from the confines of a home office or more traditional workplace settings in Hong Kong’s buzzing Central area.

Ms Law is a local resident who has been living in the neighbourhood for over 40 years. Over the past decade she has worked tirelessly with a number of local residents to campaign for the conservation of existing ‘tong laus’ as well as heritage fabric within the Central and Western District including Shing Wong Street / Wing Lee Street. Ms Law saw the neighbourhood and specifically the area surrounding the current vacant lots on 4-10 Shing Wong Street as important “breathing space” and “green lung” greatly cherished by the community. She strongly recommended that the lots should be opened up as a public open space, or “community living room”, with community garden features and unobstructed by new building structures that may be incompatible with the existing ambience.

Ms Law’s perspectives were shared by some local residents who expressed a similar desire to maintain the neighbourhood as a welcoming spot surrounded by trees and greeneries amongst the historic low-rise tenement buildings. Amongst these local residents include a gentleman who voluntarily helped to decorate Wa In Fong East with potted plants. He once told the study team that this neighbourhood, to him, is a “town within a city” and with a “soul”. He saw the neighbourhood as the “Montmartre” of Hong Kong and aspired to see limited development in the revised URA revitalisation scheme in order to maintain the area’s existing ambience as an urban oasis.
Grandpa Lau, Grandma Chan and many of their friends are currently in their 70s and 80s, many of whom have lived in the area for more than 50 years. Whilst they appreciate the quiet ambience and greenery as a local beneficiary, more importantly they observe the need for more community space to host resident-centric events and recreational facilities. “We would love to have a 10,000 square-foot centre”, joked Grandpa Lau when speaking of a wish list.

Ms Tsui, centre-in-charge of this 1,600 square-feet community centre with over 1,200 members, noted that limited availability of activity space within safe and easy walking distance posed significant restrictions to the engagement activities the centre can host. Many of their existing gatherings were only possible after being split into smaller occurrences. She was particularly keen to see the addition of community space for her members to give back and enrich their social experiences.

Likewise, other local organizational players including schools, non-profit organisations, and residents expressed a similar request for more amenity spaces. Events proposed by these groups include creative arts performances and exhibitions, glass painting workshops, docent tours and garden / art therapy sessions.

“**It is important to let our children out of the classroom to experience the neighbourhood…and to pass on the spirit of the community**”, says a local school principal. When speaking to the study team, she expressed her commitment towards teaching our next generation to play their parts as global citizens, and her work in providing innovative opportunities for students to immerse themselves within the community.

**Hong Kong News-Expo** also share an aspiration to drive education in civic values, through journalism. Taking note from the neighbourhood’s history as the revolutionary hub of anti-Qing sentiments and the origin of Hong Kong’s newspapers, it is dedicating significant resources to establish a media and education hub to inspire students.

When speaking about room for improvement, the study team noted that some students saw the neighbourhood as “**zero-friendly to children**”. A number of residents with school-age offspring interviewed also felt that **more interactive child-friendly facilities** should be installed, so they can enjoy themselves whilst **learning** and establishing “**a sense of belonging to give back**”. 

---

**Experiences shared by**
- Schools
- Elderly centres
- Community organisers
- Non-profit organisations
- Businesses

**Experiences shared by**
- Schools
- Gai fung organisations
- Museums
- Non-profit organisations
- Families
Ms Lai is the founder and CEO of a local non-profit organisation that has moved to the area for more than two years. She credited the neighbourhood as “a place to incubate and grow” her start-up team through its proximity to Central and the associated networks invaluable to small and medium-sized enterprises.

Incubation and growth also apply to families and youths who moved into Wing Lee Street as part of URA’s community pilots. Many of the individuals interviewed by expressed support for the continuation of these social impact initiatives for those in need in the wider society. For the new Wing Lee Street tenants themselves, the neighbourhood was seen to have provided a physical as well as mental space to break away from their daily minutia despite the daily influx of dog walkers and tourists visiting Wing Lee Street en masse. The key downside, they admitted, is the lack of more affordable eateries – meaning their only options were deemed to be between Western fast food chains or a home-cooked meal.
SECTION 4. CITIZEN GROUP INSIGHTS

4.1. Overall Observations and Insights

Consolidating research findings from different channels of engagement, the study team was able to draw the below insights based on citizen views gathered from over 100 individuals and over 25 discussions / activities. In general, members of the community:

1. **Agreed on the need to preserve a “non-Soho” serene ambience**

   Throughout the Study’s engagement, stakeholders were, first and foremost, in alignment in their appreciation of the neighbourhood’s distinctly low-rise low-density atmosphere. Results from the street surveys indicated that almost 50% of the respondents places the quiet ambience as their most valued attribute to be maintained in this neighbourhood.

   The above is in line with the expressed demands of members of the Central & Western District Council, which was acknowledged by the URA in the District Council discussions in January, March and May 2019.

2. **Expressed preference for a resident-centric development model**

   There was a general consensus amongst those interviewed that the future neighbourhood should be a resident-centric place driven by community needs. With PMQ and Tai Kwun’s successes in drawing new crowds, it was felt that tourism needs were sufficiently catered for in these destinations, and that a vision built upon the preservation of existing serenity and ways of living should be maintained as a priority within H19 area and its surrounding neighbourhood.

3. **Recognised diverse citizen groups and demand for intergenerational activities**

   Through onsite observations it was recognised that members of the community living and passing through the neighbourhood were more ethnically and socially diverse than Hong Kong as a whole. The citizen mix and needs were also seen to significantly shift throughout the day. Since the URA is only one of the property owners in an area, the above suggests that a new way to optimise the use of existing community resources may be required to address the wide-ranging needs expressed by the community.

   One of the most commonly noted aspiration was the demand for dynamic and inclusive activities to strengthen social bonds across these very different sectors of the community. There were also keen interests amongst local organisations in favour of intergenerational activities that can bring children, parents, and grandparents together to improve mutual understanding of how we live in a shared society as well as to reinforce concepts of family wellness.
Agreed in the importance of preserving and inheriting values of rich cultural heritage

In addition to the physical make-up of the neighbourhood, some of the experts and education professionals interviewed agreed in the importance of preserving values and spirits of the past as part of the neighbourhood’s legacy for future generations. A similar call for action is noted through street surveys, where 10% of those engaged named “heritage” as the single most important defining character of the neighbourhood, and another 12% regarded “cultural immersion” experiences as something they would like to add to the neighbourhood.

 Welcomed existing URA pilot schemes to generate social impact e.g. Light Be, WL Residence

Since 2012, the URA has been leasing some of its residential and commercial units at below-market rates to social purpose organisations, including Light Be (social housing) and WL Residence (youth housing) on Wing Lee Street, and Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association on Staunton Street. One of the key elements receiving widespread community support was the continuation of these existing social impact on Wing Lee Street, Staunton Street, and Shing Wong Street.

From local residents to members of the Central and Western District Council, a majority of parties interviewed by the study team recognised the success of these programmes and expressed a general support towards building upon similar societal and community efforts in this neighbourhood, particularly in support of underprivileged families and the youth.

Identified room for improvement in walkability and accessibility

A number of stakeholders, particularly young children and the elderly, were concerned about the steps and narrow paths in the neighbourhood and saw them as a significant inconvenience to their daily lives. To which there was a particularly widespread agreement that more barrier-free facilities with improved signage to connect existing parks, rest gardens, and paths, would be desirable.

 Desired for more common space for hanging out and community use

30% of the individuals interviewed explicitly highlighted a desire for affordable social gathering place to “hang out” as the top of their wish list. More generally, the study team noted that over 50% of the community players interviewed indicated that additional community space (indoor and/or outdoor) will be preferred to allow them to organise more activities and events for their beneficiaries.

Some of the community-generated ideas include the provision of indoor event space for local families, library corner, music or dance practice rooms, community hall, open-air community living room, and community gardens.
Expected optimal use of green public space, with some residents advocating for the preservation of trees on Shing Wong Street

Across resident and visitor groups, there was a recognition amongst interviewees that greeneries should be an indispensable feature to be maintained, if not upscaled, in the revitalised neighbourhood.

A number of local residents and District Councillors also specifically called out the need to preserve existing trees and maintain open-air public spaces in the current vacant land lots in 4-10 Shing Wong Street.

Central to both is the desire to ensure public access and enjoyment of the urban oasis that has organically evolved along Shing Wong Street and Wa In Fong East over the past decade.

Presented inconclusive views on the efficient and appropriate use of current vacant lots

Whilst the focus of the Study was on a needs-based assessment of community aspirations, it was noted that some members of the local community expressed strong views on how certain URA-owned properties should be developed going forward. In particular, discussions on the future needs and design for the vacant land lots located on 4-10 Shing Wong Street remained a controversial topic with a divergence in community opinion observed throughout the Study.

Ideas expressed by the community include:

- **Community hub**: a mix of indoor and outdoor facilities tailored to addressing identified community needs, as a shared space for public enjoyment and events / activities organised by members of the local community

- **Community living room**: an outdoor community space with features such as community planting activities, community gathering, swap party, exhibitions

- **Public open space**: a green outdoor space with simple recreational facilities such as outdoor benches
4.2. “Rainbow Lens” Analysis

Building on the key insights drawn from the Study’s engagement activities, a key learning was the dispersion of community views based on the different hats and social roles a stakeholder assumes simultaneously. For example, a young professional may enjoy living within easy walking distance to his place of work, and yet also looks for a child-friendly environment as a parent, as well as unique values and identities in the neighbourhood that may create value as a homeowner / investor. The multiplicity of each stakeholder’s perspectives inspires us to look at community needs beyond standard classifications defined by the likes of age, gender, ethnicities - and instead, in terms of different layers of motivations, or Rainbow Lens, stakeholders share.

The Rainbow Lens framework adapts the renowned Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs\textsuperscript{3} model (1943) in psychology and can be seen as its ‘community-centric’ variant. The objective of this framework is to lay out key community elements landed from the engagement exercise and categorise them under common layers of needs.

Specific to the neighbourhood and the Study, 20 community elements were identified across five lenses. These form the basis of potential visions that can bring together the aspirations of different citizen groups united in a shared set of directions towards improving their community experience.

REFERENCE: Maslow’s 

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (A. Maslow, 1943) was first theorised in “A Theory of Human Motivation” to describe a five-tier model of human needs, with higher needs (e.g. growth needs stemming from a desire to progress) coming into focus after more basic needs (e.g. deficiency needs that motivates people when they are unmet) are met. Inspired by Maslow, this study would like to explore the possibilities of adapting this model to the context of community motivations.

\textsuperscript{3}Maslow, Abraham. 1943. A Theory of Human Motivation
AN OVERVIEW OF EXISTING CITIZEN NEEDS THROUGH RAINBOW LENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainbow Lens</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Livelihood</td>
<td>- refers to the community’s expressed needs to deal with immediate daily necessities, improve quality of living, and address existing pain points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>e.g. amenity space preferred by schools and elderly residents for community activities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Fabric</td>
<td>- refers to a set of expectations expressed by local citizens on the physical make-up of this neighbourhood and the use of space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>e.g. improved walking experience favoured by all stakeholders</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>- refers to the community’s need to establish a sense of belonging and affection within the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>e.g. creating opportunities to ‘hang out’ and social gatherings for all ages</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old &amp; New</td>
<td>- refers to the identity’s local residents place on the community and what it represents in their eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>e.g. innovating means to preserve rich cultural heritage</em> in an interactive and dynamic manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Function</td>
<td>- refers to a collective aspiration for the community to realise its full potential and empower itself to achieve a greater social impact beyond servicing its inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>e.g. passing the torch</em> to inspire next generations through knowledge and education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a brief account of expressed views gathered during the engagement exercise, please see APPENDIX IV: Stakeholder Views Matrix
SECTION 5. ENVISION: COMMUNITY MAKING PROPOSITIONS

Stakeholders from all walks of life, across all generations and an extensive range of organisations have given ideas and suggestions to inform the Study. Building on the Rainbow Lens framework and upon cross-examination of the citizen insights generated, the Study would recommend a set of community making visions and directions worthy of further consideration in this neighbourhood.

5.1. Envisioning a “Living Common”

The Study envisions the neighbourhood surrounding URA’s H19 site to be built upon sharing, collaboration, mutual trust and support – a place for people across age, ethnic, and social identities to come together and enjoy the neighbourhood as an extended home.

Embedded in this “living common” will be the continuation of its existing low-rise low-density design valued by a significant portion of existing residents and complemented by indoor and outdoor public open spaces for community use and public enjoyment.
5.2. Urban Progressing Visions

The “living common” model will be supported by four dynamic and collaborative sets of pillars, or Urban Progressing Visions, building on elements that already exist in the community. Collectively the visions serve both “inward looking” and “outward looking” perspectives, as well as across the different layers of community motivations as identified through the Rainbow Lens. They are intended to be used as tools for strategic discussion to steer different members of the community towards a direction in common. All visions were tested with five focus groups, with feedback collected leveraged to form design principles as the basis for the community and URA to make informed decisions on how to proceed going forward.

5.2.1. Knowledge Common

Rainbow Lens: layers of community needs that may be addressed by this vision

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
Selected Community Snapshots

“From a social education standpoint, it is important to let our children out of the classroom to experience the neighbourhood. From a family wellness perspective, we can incorporate more intergenerational activities to bring the younger generation closer to their parents and grandparents by allowing them to experience their ways of living back in the days”

- Local school principal

“With its rich history, this neighbourhood is well-positioned to become a historic township that can showcase stories of “30 Houses” and synergise with nearby revitalisation initiatives”

- Central and Western District Councillor

“We hope to engage visitors of all age groups, to promote civic values through news and journalism, remind our younger generation of the Old Hong Kong values of self-perseverance and mutual support. It would be most effective if we can do this as part of a wider network of cultural and heritage sites within the Central & Western District”

- Representative from a local museum

Macro Trends

In 2017, the Hong Kong Tourism Board rolled out an “Old Town Central” campaign repackaging culturally significant elements around Central including the revitalised PMQ complex and Dr Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail within easy walking distance from the neighbourhood. Whilst none of the buildings or structures within the H19 area itself is graded as a heritage landmark as at mid-2019, the low-density low-rise ambience and traces of intangible cultural heritage including hints of Dr Sun Yat-sen’s early life, Yu Lan Festivals, and remnants of 30 Houses are considered by many as signature features that are worth preserving going forward.

The Vision

To recognise, connect, and pass on local characters, knowledge and values that define the neighbourhood
Key Features and Expected Social Benefits

- **Community education**: create and promote more interactive cultural and social education opportunities to position the neighbourhood as a place for students and locals to learn.

- **Intergenerational activities**: kick-start programmes that brings together different generations (grandparent-parent-child) to share experiences, knowledge, and skills that are mutually beneficial and to foster strong longer-term relationships.

- **Cultural experience**: promote “culture-as-an-experience” platforms to help students and visitors learn more about Hong Kong's development.

- **Synergise with nearby revitalisation initiatives**: connect existing cultural heritage sites in Central & Western District through building a common platform for engagement.

Conceptual Pillars

Through five focus groups discussions, the study team observed that there was a general consensus within the community to build Knowledge Common based on the below:

- Preservation of old town values should be at the heart of Knowledge Common and showcased in an interactive manner that allows for community participation and the display of local work.

- Residents and local students should be the target beneficiary of programmes to be introduced, over and above tourists' needs which are already felt to be fulfilled by the likes of PMQ and may have an adverse effect to the existing quiet ambience in the neighbourhood.

- Programmes introduced should be reflective of the breadth of old and new experiences that make up the evolution of this community – from the essence of its past including printing press, anti-Qing revolutionaries, to the current including Yu Lan Festivals and community art.

- Programmes and themes should be refreshed on a regular basis to attract recurring visitors and learners.

Community Generated Possibilities

- Gathering point and information centre for visitors.

- Tong lau living experience as a demonstration or hostel experience for the next generation.

- Storytelling sessions share personal stories from former residents or historians.

- Intergenerational workshops where young and old can bring back old crafts and games.

- Experts-in-residence to invite local or international fellows to live and conduct their research in the neighbourhood.
Existing Community Leads

- **Local schools**: nearby schools including King’s College Old Boys’ Association Primary School and Catholic Mission School are already embedding community elements from the neighbourhood into its curriculum, including through self-initiated docent tours, collaborations with local elderly centres, and other outreach programmes.

- **Hong Kong News-Expo**: positioned as a media education hub, Hong Kong News-Expo is actively engaging students from schools around Hong Kong in learning more about journalism and its values through exhibitions and workshops.
5.2.2. Impact Common

**Rainbow Lens:** layers of community needs that may be addressed by this vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Self-realization</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Young &amp; old</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Fabric</td>
<td>Love &amp; Belonging</td>
<td>Co living</td>
<td>Social Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Livelihood</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Green &amp; open space</td>
<td>Residential Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Kids friendly facilities</td>
<td>Commercial Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SVhk analysis

**Selected Community Snapshots**

“This is a place for start-ups and young enterprises to incubate and grow”

- CEO of a local NGO

“We have no objection to the continuation of existing affordable living initiatives for underprivileged families and youth in the neighbourhood, and applaud the authorities for extending a helping hand to those in need”

- Local resident

“There are many old shops and facilities that go back generations in the extended neighbourhood, and these are worth reintroducing to neighbourhood to serve livelihood needs and reinforce local characters as a social gathering place. However, it is important to ensure that these facilities are positioned to serve the needs of the local community and not as a tourist attraction receiving overbearing attention in a way that may disrupt the existing quiet ambience.”

- Local resident
Macro Trends

Supporting those in need has long been part of the ways of living within this very neighbourhood, as an incubation ground fostering the integration of migrant workers (from Chiu Chow hard labourers to modern expat professionals) into Hong Kong. First steps have already been taken to re-establish this neighbourhood as a place of personal journeys towards better futures through earlier revitalisation efforts, including pilot schemes run by the URA to provide affordable housing options at below-market rate to underprivileged families and the youth.

Existing residents interviewed expressed no objections to the idea and appeared to be particularly supportive of the social value they create for the community and for Hong Kong. Some remarked that more synergies may be created locally including through the introduction of livelihood facilities to create convenience for the community. There were also suggestions to expand on the above to create more working (or volunteering) opportunities for new residents in order to build a new community impact ecology.

The Vision

To create a place for families and the youth to incubate and grow as part of their personal journeys towards better futures

Key Features and Expected Social Benefits

- **Youth development**: provide space and support programmes, e.g. knowledge sharing, incubation, expert-in-residence, to nurture the younger generation and their development journeys
- **Livelihood facilities**: introduce retail facilities that provide more ease and convenience to local residents
- **Co-living innovation**: provide affordable living options for those in need in the form of social housing and other housing innovations
- **Societal function**: introduce programmes geared towards enhancing liveability within the neighbourhood as well as to service needs of the wider district
Conceptual Pillars

There was an agreement across all focus groups interviewed that an Impact Common should be founded upon the below values:

- The continuation of existing social impact initiatives including, but not limited to, affordable housing (e.g. Light Be and WL Residence) leased to non-profit organisations by the URA at below-market rate
- Any livelihood facilities introduced should be selected on the basis of the actual needs and service gaps identified by existing and new residents to the neighbourhood
- The sale of alcoholic drinks or “Soho-style” eateries should be avoided in existing URA-owned commercial properties

Community Generated Possibilities

- Livelihood facilities such as affordable neighbourhood bakery or grocery store to bring convenience to residents
- Affordable housing options for families, similar to Light Be already in place on Wing Lee Street
- Co-living options for the youth, similar to WL Residence already in place on Wing Lee Street
- Incubation space for the youth, similar to the start-up enterprises currently operated by the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups on Staunton Street
- Monthly gatherings for new and existing residents to mingle for social and community purposes
- Neighbourhood newsletter to bring the community together and keep its members connected

Existing Community Leads

- **Light Be**: provides empowerment housing solutions to underprivileged families
- **Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups**: operates youth residences and incubates youth enterprises
- **O2 Hair Salon / Lo Yau Kee / Common Ground**: local shops actively supporting community activities and serve catering needs of local residents as privately-owned boutique eateries
5.2.3. Community Common

**COMMUNITY COMMON**
a home-in-community model that enhances the neighbourhood network

**Rainbow Lens:** layers of community needs that may be addressed by this vision

**Selected Community Snapshots**

“There is a lack of affordable common place to hang out in the neighbourhood for social gatherings and to support community activities including local performances and extra-curricular activities for students”

- Representative of local community organisation

“There are many children out and about in the neighbourhood particularly during afterschool hours. It would be a good idea to introduce more child-friendly facilities including libraries to provide a safe yet interactive learning environment in the future”

- Local resident

“The neighbourhood and its community are uniquely organised but relies mainly on the goodwill and capacity of volunteers. Some level of operational support may be required to build a more sustainable collaborative model going forward”

- Local resident
Macro Trends

Within the compact space of H19 area and the surrounding neighbourhood, the very coexistence of the likes of Eastern and Western culture, old and new residents, modern hipster cafes and historic low-rise tenement buildings, lead residents and visitors alike to see this neighbourhood as a cultural melting pot. The study observed diverging views amongst these stakeholders generating a wide spectrum of needs and aspirations.

A commons-based sharing economy can be the answer to upholding diverse values, particularly through:
(i) enabling an optimal use of existing resources across different sectors and parties / operators in the neighbourhood, and
(ii) maintaining and celebrating its much-treasured diversity. It can also reinforce social networks through encouraging participation, interactions and cooperation across different stakeholder groups.

The Vision

To encourage all members of the community to come together and optimise the use of resources

Key Features and Expected Social Benefits

- **Community sharing**: ensure more sustainable use of idle and underutilised resources, and provide opportunities for different members of the community to interact and thereby create a stronger social network of mutual support and understanding.

- **Optimal use of resources**: promote sharing in the community to optimise the use of existing resources.

- **Community collaboration**: work closely with other community stakeholders to co-create an inclusive living place to drive collective action for the benefit of the local neighbourhood.

- **Multifunctional space**: design spaces that can be flexibly adapted to different uses and activities to cater for the specific needs of the neighbourhood as preferences shift over time.
Conceptual Pillars

Local residents and community organisations lend their support to two defining components of *Community Common*:

- Provision of a multifunctional amenity space (with most agreeing to the need for both indoor and outdoor components) for community use through the transformation of premises owned by the URA and other available open spaces
- Design of a capability / mechanism to bring together different community stakeholder groups and manage the introduction of new community initiatives as well as the operational challenges that may arise from the shared use of community resources

Community Generated Possibilities

- Community living room / common room, as a casual setting for local residents to rest and for social gathering
- Community library, from books sharing to tools sharing enabled by donated items from other households
- Indoor and outdoor amenity space flexible in catering to different event needs including farmers' market, handicraft workshops, heritage fairs, and wellness sessions
- Community pop-up events and temporary exhibitions to showcase the residents’ talents

Existing Community Leads

- **Wing Lee Street / Wa In Fong East**: The platforms, steps and lanes along Wing Lee Street and Wa In Fong East are currently leveraged by different groups for a range of one-off activities, including social gatherings and community-organised workshops.
- **2gather**: leveraged existing space along Shing Wong Street to organise community events including glass recycling workshops and busking performances
- **Hong Kong News-Expo**: conduct community outreach activities in its premises including media education workshops and talks
5.2.4. Wellness Common

Wellness Common

WELLNESS COMMON

a modern wellness hub that helps city-dwellers recharge their personal batteries

Rainbow Lens: layers of community needs that may be addressed by this vision

```
Social Function
Old & New
Social Network
Urban Fabric
Local Livelihood
Integration
Young & old
Co-living
Green and open space
Child friendly facilities
Progress
Printing press / Journalism
Social housing
Residential
neighbourhood
Wellness
Cultural Heritage
Shared resources
Amenity space
Commercial activity
Knowledge
East meets West
Community participation
Walkability & accessibility
Affordable retail

SOURCE: SVhk analysis
```

### Selected Community Snapshots

“The low-density setting in this neighbourhood makes it an urban oasis and a great place for city-dwellers to relax in the shades of existing trees and to sounds of birds chirping away”

- Local resident

“A stone-throw away from Central, existing public open spaces in the neighbourhood has a potential to be transformed into community gardens or hydroponic facilities to promote mental wellbeing and as a stress reliever”

- Representative from local community organisation

27% of all locals surveyed pinpointed enhanced accessibility as the top priority amongst improvements to be addressed in the neighbourhood, with a particular strong emphasis to improving the walking experience characterised by busy road traffic, steep steps and slopes.

- SVhk analysis
Macro Trends

According to a 2018 survey completed by US health insurer Cigna, Hongkongers ranked as the fifth most stressed population globally, with as many as 92% of people in Hong Kong facing stress in their daily lives. Located within a 10-minute walking distance from the buzzing central business district in Hong Kong, the neighbourhood is already known as a quiet place for busy city-dwellers to relax and recharge.

With young adults as its dominant citizen profile, the neighbourhood is currently, and expects to continue as, a home to many of the hardworking professionals who dedicate long hours in high-pressured working environments. Many local residents agreed that this neighbourhood is currently a uniquely leisurely ‘urban oasis’ where they can relax and recharge, and it has the potential to do even more through the curation and introduction of more wellness activities to enhance liveability.

The Vision

To provide a holistic space and programmes to raise awareness and promote overall wellbeing

Key Features and Expected Social Benefits

- **Urban greenery**: promote urban greenery and public open spaces to beautify the neighbourhood and provide comfort and reinforce the existing organic ambience for community enjoyment
- **Improved walkability**: improve the pedestrian experience by enhancing accessibility and connectivity in the neighbourhood
- **Public open space**: provide community space for activities and to facilitate public use and enjoyment
- **Personal wellness**: introduce new programmes to provide opportunities for local residents and workers to relax, recharge and refresh their minds

---

**Conceptual Pillars**

It was agreed by parties interviewed that *Wellness Common* should include:

- Greening as a fundamental part of any future hardware design within the purview of the URA revitalisation scheme
- Synergising with other nearby parks and open spaces to maximise the use of community resources and community benefit
- The improvement in accessibility and connectivity to nearby destinations to improve the overall walking and across nearby streets to promote and enhance the overall walking and wayfinding experience
- Cross-sector collaboration with wellness activity service providers and operators to enrich programmes offered in the neighbourhood

**Community Generated Possibilities**

- Rejuvenation of existing (albeit underutilised) open spaces
- Garden therapy programmes to transform existing open space into community gardens with resident participation
- Personal wellness and mindfulness programmes including yoga, zentangle
- Additional green elements and outdoor furniture for public enjoyment
- Community art or painting by local community members to decorate the neighbourhood

**Existing Community Leads**

- *Existing public open space*: existing landscaped gardens and sitting-out areas within the H19 area are currently open to the public albeit some may argue they are under-maintained as it stands
- *Tung Wah Group of Hospitals*: headquartered within 10-minute walking distance from the H19 area, Tung Wah leads a wide range of wellness programmes across Central & Western District, including iGreenery (garden therapy) and other regular mental wellness education and promotional platforms

For examples of community making initiatives, please see [APPENDIX V: H19 Community Making Examples](#)
SECTION 6. STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. H19 Community Making Directions

The completion of this H19 Community Making Study concludes a current-state assessment of community needs and the envisioning of potential community aspirations as at May 2019.

On the basis of the large volume of feedback collected and insights generated, the Study proposes that the URA should accord priority consideration to the below the community making directions as a contributing factor to its overall revitalisation scheme design and place making initiatives:

1. Adopt a “non-Soho” development approach against introducing commercial elements that may constitute a public nuisance to local residents in URA properties

2. Promote diverse and intergenerational community initiatives to connect local stakeholders including nearby revitalisation initiatives and educational institutions

3. Continue to support local social impact initiatives building on existing collaborations between URA and local organisations

4. Promote accessibility for all, through improving the pedestrian network and enhancing barrier-free facilities in the neighbourhood

5. Establish multifunctional communal area, optimising existing open space with additional greenery and uphold a low-density development approach. Facilities provided by URA should be aligned to Urban Progressing Visions, and take into account community preferences to preserve existing trees and heritage

6. Collaborate with community stakeholders to further explore “community making” in the neighbourhood in the form of pilot initiatives and regular impact reviews
7.1. Key Implementation Challenges

The four Urban Progressing Visions supported by community making initiatives and infrastructure innovations put together possible directions of travel for the neighbourhood based on views of existing stakeholders and where consensus can be reached. The Study notes, however, that there are still some lingering considerations requiring further remediation beyond the completion of the Study.

7.1.1. Minority Ownership as a Barrier to Scale Impact

As at April 2019, the study team estimated that the URA’s stake in the area bounded by Staunton Street / Shing Wong Street / Wa In Fong East / Aberdeen Street was limited to:

- <10% of the circa 430 residential units are acquired by the URA
- <50% of the circa 20 commercial units are owned by the URA
- <10% of the 1,000+ residents estimated to live in the neighbourhood lived in URA-acquired properties (note: 30+ residential units owned by the URA were vacant as at April 2019)

Minority ownership, in turn, restricts the ability for the URA to influence the overall development of the neighbourhood and scale its impact as envisioned in the above, without due support of other property owners and members of the community.

7.1.2. Integration of Place Making and Community Making

While all stakeholders engaged in the community making study agreed that the vacant land lots located on 4-10 Shing Wong Street (~333m² in area size) should be open for community use, discussions on its future place making design attracted significant debate and continued to be inconclusive with strong views expressed by selected community groups. This added uncertainty to the adoption and, subsequently, successful implementation of the relevant community making initiatives.

7.1.3. Anticipated Movements in Stakeholder Needs

As new residents move into the 30+ currently vacant URA-owned domestic units over the next year, new community needs may emerge in a direction different to those proposed in the Study. This may pose a particular challenge to the future development of the vacant land lots, the design of which would be intended to cater to a snapshot of community views. Regular reviews will be essential to ensure that the community design evolves with the mix and needs of those it intended to serve.
7.1.4. Feasibility of Proposed Ideas

A number of the proposed community making initiatives were captured as conceptual ideas that may not have been sufficiently tested in this community (or others). The technical feasibility of accommodating these activities within URA premises may not be guaranteed, and further considerations will be required to understand their operational and financial sustainability going forward.

7.1.5. Finding The “Right” Operator

The success of community making in this neighbourhood depends on the effective execution of agreed visions and initiatives. It is envisaged that challenges may arise from the identification and selection of partnering organisations that are in perfect alignment with the URA and the wider community on such aspirations. Additional time and effort may be required during the search or tender process to communicate and engage potential operators to reinforce a set of shared values and demands. The URA may also need to continually assess the performance of its appointed operators for the established programmes to monitor efforts towards realising and bringing these visions alive.

7.2. Practical Considerations

To address the above challenges, the Study identifies three primary critical success factors to ensuring the longer-term success of community making in the neighbourhood.

7.2.1. Pilot-based Experimentation

Innovative ideas are key to imagining new possibilities against a backdrop of inconclusive stakeholder views and a potentially shifting community dynamic. To move beyond existing debates, the Study recommends that the URA adopt a pilot-based experimentation approach as an effective, low-cost, flexible trial for the community to test its many ideas and their respective feasibility. It is anticipated that the pilot will also provide invaluable opportunities for the community to:

- Reinforce an aligned understanding of actual community needs and the feasibility of proposed visions as the neighbourhood continues to evolve
- Allow additional time for members of the community to understand and accept (or adapt / reject) new ideas after a “proof of concept”
- Connect and build trust between new entrants or operators and existing community, before a potential larger scale implementation
7.2.2. **Community Making as a Persistent Cross-Sector Effort**

Given the URA’s minority stake in the neighbourhoods, engagement and collaboration with existing community stakeholders on an ongoing basis is of critical importance to create an enabling community environment for change. Collaboration can be sought on multiple fronts:

- **With other property owners:** to optimise use of existing community resources and common space beyond URA-owned assets to address diverse needs expressed by stakeholders through the Study. For example, URA may wish to collaborate with Leisure & Cultural Services Department to renovate/refurbish the sitting-out area in Chung Wo Lane with an aim to create a more user-friendly public open spaces within the neighbourhood for better utilisation.

- **With other local stakeholders:** to better understand their needs, service requirements, and opportunities to fine-tune existing hardware design at regular intervals.

7.2.3. **Ongoing Citizen Participation and Open Dialogues**

A participatory alternative that empowers local citizens to contribute towards future programme developments can help ensure the voice of the community is duly noted by any organisation commissioned by the URA to deliver its community making initiatives in the neighbourhood. Such ongoing engagement and participation opportunities can further act as a checks and balances mechanism to drive quality servicing and continuous improvements.

7.3. **Infrastructure Innovation**

At present, the neighbourhood around Staunton Street and Shing Wong Street is blessed with the support of a diverse group of local citizens actively involved in community initiatives to drive social bonding and value creation. However, most of these activities rely strongly on the support of volunteers and may create an undue burden to the community if scaled or operated on a more regular basis.

To further support the implementation of “bottom up” community making in H19, new infrastructures and mechanisms may be appropriate to bolster existing community efforts – firstly, to make it easier for residents and organisations to continue playing an active role, and secondly, to allow relevant authorities to recognise and respond to shifting needs in the neighbourhood as it evolves.

A potential idea is the establishment of a “**Community Curator**” capability to take on the operational mantle of supporting the coordination and promotion of local community initiatives in the neighbourhood. Parties engaged by and large acknowledged its potential benefits and agreed that the URA can further explore and test a “**Community Curator**” capability in H19 in the near future.
The Study would also recommend the URA set up a more formal structure to regularly assess and evaluate social impact and the effectiveness of *community making* initiatives in its revitalisation schemes, leveraging H19 as a pilot. The framework may address the temporal dimension of urban design from the perspective of the URA, including:

- **Evaluation of existing community initiatives**: to take place on an annual basis in order to pulse check community sentiments, determine the effectiveness and impact of existing initiatives in achieving their predetermined community objectives, and identify enhancement opportunities.

- **Overall review of community needs and aspirations**: similar to the scope of the Study, it is also recommended that a strategic review should take place every 5 years to capture the essence of any significant changes in the urban environment, community needs, and expectations. This can provide an opportunity for the URA to adapt its vision for the area accordingly.

For further details of the suggested infrastructure innovation initiatives, please see **APPENDIX VI: Infrastructure Innovation Examples**

### 7.4. Proposed Next Steps

To deliver in line with the above recommendations, the Study proposes for the URA to place primary focus on the following activities within the next 12 months:

- Internally evaluate the feasibility of recommendations from the Study, and map potential collaboration partners and existing community resources that can be leveraged to further the Urban Progressing Visions.

- Further explore, refine expectations, and setup a “Community Curator” capability to support the ongoing development and review of *community making initiatives*.

- Clearly communicate latest plans and URA’s proposal for the H19 revitalisation scheme to members of the general public.

- Prioritise and develop quick-win initiatives and / or pilot programmes in support of the community making in H19 and its surrounding neighbourhoods.
SECTION 8. CLOSING REMARKS

A Vision to Demonstrate a Lifescape Model

The H19 Community Making Study is the first of its kind to be commissioned by the URA to inject social innovation and lifescape assessments into considerations of an integrated urban regeneration scheme. The study team hopes that this report can infuse a new dimension of thinking into existing urban design and planning discussions, and that it will be the first of many to pilot community making in creating a new urban ecosystem. Through articulating principles of innovation, collaboration, and empowerment, we aspire to see the future of H19 revitalisation as a showcase that marks the start of our city’s movement towards redefining a new community-centric development model that can be replicated in other districts across Hong Kong.

An Opportunity to Reimagine the Neighbourhood

The small yet diverse neighbourhood around Staunton Street and Shing Wong Street has stood the test of history as an incubation ground for people from all walks of life in their journeys towards better futures. The revitalisation of this area affords a unique opportunity for authorities and citizens alike to build on its past and collectively reimagine the future roles this close-knit community can play in the decades to come. With the support of its active resident and community groups, the study team believes this neighbourhood has every potential to leverage the best of its past for future successes, and continue to be one of Hong Kong’s most dynamic cultural melting pot with visions of “knowledge”, “impact”, “community”, and “wellness” at its core.

A Pilot Platform to Rediscover Community Connectivity

Throughout the five-month study, the study team at SVhk is grateful to have the support and enthusiasm across 25+ organisations and 130+ individuals who provided invaluable feedback fundamental to informing a balance of perspectives in the process of community making. From their diverging perspectives, this report’s recommendations seek to distil a common ground for the neighbourhood to evolve to serve the needs of its citizens with a primary objective to generate social benefits through the optimal use of community resources. The study team hopes its efforts has set the stage for ongoing dialogues and collaborations amongst community stakeholders including the URA to continue playing an active role in shaping this neighborhood, not just as a great place to making a living but more importantly a great place to make a life. After all, as William Shakespeare once noted, “what is the city but the people”\(^5\).

---

\(^5\) Shakespeare, William, *Coriolanus*, Act III. Scene I.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
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<tr>
<td>2gather</td>
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<td>Catholic Mission School</td>
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<td>Central &amp; Western District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese YMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of the 30 Houses Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central &amp; Western District Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hide &amp; Seek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong News-Expo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>King’s College Old Boys’ Association Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Light Be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lo Yau Kee</td>
<td></td>
<td>O2 Hair Salon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>PMQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconnect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Wah Group of Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Renewal Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>VeryHK</td>
<td></td>
<td>WWCWDDHK Chung Hock Elderly Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 30 Houses Kai Fong Yu Lan Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>YB21</td>
<td></td>
<td>YB21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives from the incorporated owners of:
- Casa Bella
- Kam Kin Mansion

Other participating residents from residential buildings along Staunton Street, Wa In Fong East, Shing Wong Street and Wing Lee Street
APPENDIX II: LIST OF NEARBY SITES

The below is an indicative and non-exhaustive list of nearby heritage sites, schools, and indoor / outdoor spaces that may potentially be leveraged to build the “Commons” vision in the extended neighbourhood spanning into Central / Sheung Wan area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage attractions</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Co-working spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMQ</td>
<td>King’s College Old Boys’ Association Primary School</td>
<td>Compass Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Kwun</td>
<td>S.K.H. Kei Yan Primary School</td>
<td>Infinitus Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong News-Expo</td>
<td>San Wui Commercial Society School</td>
<td>Compass Offices - Nan Fung Tower Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sun Yat-sen Museum</td>
<td>The Woodland Montessori Academy (Mid-Levels)</td>
<td>Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Bridges Street Centre</td>
<td>San Wui Commercial Society School</td>
<td>Compass Offices BOC Group Life Assurance Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Museum of Medical Sciences</td>
<td>Ying Wa Girls' School</td>
<td>playground.work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Mo Temple</td>
<td>Women's Welfare Club - Western District - Hong Kong Kindergarten</td>
<td>WeWork – Bonham Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central and Western District Saint Anthony's School</td>
<td>Paperclip Startup Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmel School (Kindergarten Section)</td>
<td>UNO coworking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong True Light Kindergarten - Caine Road</td>
<td>WYND CO-WORKING SPACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King’s College Old Boys’ Association Primary School (School 2)</td>
<td>TGN Workhub - Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacred Heart Canossian School</td>
<td>cozy by workspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garage Society Sheung Wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WeWork – LKF Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor community spaces</th>
<th>Outdoor community spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheung Wan Sports Centre</td>
<td>Kwong Hon Terrace Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Sports Centre</td>
<td>Wing Lee Street Rest Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas Community Centre - Caine Road</td>
<td>Graham Street Sitting-out Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Centre</td>
<td>Wa On Lane Sitting-out Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGA JC Sheung Wan Children &amp; Youth Integrated Services Centre</td>
<td>Blake Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 CONET</td>
<td>Pak Tsz Lane Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMQ - Showcase</td>
<td>Kau U Fong Children's Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollywood Road Children's Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caine Lane Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa In Fong East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centrepoint Public Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Count cum Observation

(1) Capturing Traffic Count

A traffic count exercise was conducted on a randomly-selected weekday in January 2019, and a randomly-selected Saturday in February 2019 between 08:00 and 19:30, and 08:30 and 16:00 respectively, as the basis to estimate an (1) average flow of pedestrians and (2) average flow of dogs (accompanied by dog-walkers) per day across two junctions:

- Staunton Street / Aberdeen Street
- Shing Wong Street / Wa In Fong East

Three key parameters were selected to determine the dominant citizen profiles and their relative changes throughout the day: (1) gender, (2) age, (3) ethnicity

An average flow per day is estimated by taking:

\[
\frac{(\text{Jan weekday count } \times 5 \text{ days}) + (\text{Feb weekend count } \times 2 \text{ days})}{7 \text{ days}}
\]

Results Summary:

- ~8,000 walk past the Staunton Street / Aberdeen Street, and Shing Wong Street / Wa In Fong East junction every day
- ~87% observed were of working age
- ~70% were Chinese / East Asian; ~21% were Caucasian
- Weekend traffic appeared to be 24% more than weekday

(2) Formulating Citizen Group Index

Building on the traffic count findings, an index is created to measure the extent of change in citizen profile throughout the day. Using young adults in their 20s and 30s as an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>20s and 30s Count</th>
<th>Total Citizen Count</th>
<th>% Citizen Mix</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early morning</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%/62%*100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late morning</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%/62%*100</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%/62%*100</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early afternoon</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%/62%*100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late afternoon</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%/62%*100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterwork hours</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%/62%*100</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Calculation} = \text{X} \times \text{Y}
\]

\[
\text{Index Value} = \frac{\text{Calculation}}{\text{X}}
\]
Street Surveys

(1) Capturing Pedestrian Views
A sample of 62 pedestrians were randomly selected to complete street surveys in January and February 2019. A breakdown of the surveyed profiles is as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Ages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toddlers (0-5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (6-12)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-19)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (20-39)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Aged (40-59)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (60+)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former resident</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local visitor</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Interview Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shing Wong Street</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton Street</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa In Fong East</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMQ</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwong Hon Terrace Garden</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample Street Survey

### Location 地點:
- [ ] PMQ 元創方
- [ ] Kwong Hon Terrace Garden 光漢台花園
- [ ] Wing Lee Street 永利街
- [ ] Shing Wong Street 城皇街
- [ ] Staunton Street 士丹頓街

### 1 I pass by the area today because…我今天經過這裡是為了...
- [ ] Sightseeing 遊覽
- [ ] Leisure walking 休閒散步
- [ ] On route to / from work or school 上/下班/上學途中
- [ ] Attend events 參加活動/展覽
- [ ] Shopping 行街購物
- [ ] Others 其他:

### 2 (RESIDENT ONLY) My years of residence 我在這區居住/工作年數
- [ ] <1 year 少於一年
- [ ] 2 years 兩年
- [ ] 3 years 三年
- [ ] 4 years 四年
- [ ] 5 years +五或以上
- [ ] Not applicable 不適合

### 3 My frequency of visit 我來/經過這區次數
- [ ] Daily 每日
- [ ] Weekly 每週
- [ ] Monthly 每月
- [ ] Less than monthly 少於每月

### 4 My favourite activity in the neighbourhood 我在這區最喜歡的活動是
- [ ] Leisure walking 休閒散步
- [ ] Attend events 參加活動/展覽
- [ ] Shopping 行街購物
- [ ] Others 其他:

### 5 My wishlist for the neighbourhood 我希望這區可以增加/繼續或減少/停止...

### 6 Which word (adjective or noun) would you use to describe this neighbourhood？如果會一個形容詞來形容這區的氣質，你會用什麼形容詞？(Examples 例如: Leisure 休閒，Hipster 文青，Tourist attraction 旅遊點，Workplace 工作，Convenient 便利，Paradise 世外桃源，Others 其他)

### 7 My place of residence 我居住的地方
- [ ] Central and Western 中西區
- [ ] New Territories 新界
- [ ] Hong Kong Island 香港島
- [ ] Kowloon 九龍
- [ ] Overseas 海外

### 8 My place of Work 我工作的地方
- [ ] Central and Western 中西區
- [ ] New Territories 新界
- [ ] Hong Kong Island 香港島
- [ ] Kowloon 九龍
- [ ] Overseas 海外

### 9 My occupation 我的職業
- [ ] Student 學生
- [ ] Retiree 退休人仕
- [ ] Homemaker 家庭主婦
- [ ] Freelancer 自由工作者
- [ ] White collar 一般白領
- [ ] Blue collar 藍領
- [ ] Domestic helper 外傭
- [ ] Professional / Manager / Executive 專業 / 管理 / 行政人員
- [ ] Technician 技術人員

### 10 My household composition 我的家庭組合
- [ ] One-person households 獨居
- [ ] Composed of couple 我和伴侶
- [ ] With parents (<60) 和父母居住(60 歲以下)
- [ ] With parents (60+) 和父母居住(60 歲以上)
- [ ] With young kid(s) (0-9)
- [ ] With teenage kid(s) (10-17 歲)
- [ ] With grown-up kid(s) (18 歲以上)
- [ ] 和子女居住(9 歲以下)
- [ ] 和子女居住(10-17 歲)

### OFFICIAL ONLY 工作人員用
- [ ] Gender 性別
  - [ ] Male 男
  - [ ] Female 女
- [ ] Age 年齡
  - [ ] 0-6
  - [ ] 7-12
  - [ ] 13-19
  - [ ] 20-39
  - [ ] 40-59
  - [ ] 60+
- [ ] Ethnicity 種族
  - [ ] Chinese 中國藉
  - [ ] Filipino 菲律賓人
  - [ ] White 白種人
  - [ ] Others 其他:
- [ ] Party Size 隨行人數
  - [ ] 1
  - [ ] 2
  - [ ] 3
  - [ ] 4+
Interviews and Community Outreach Activities

(1) Capturing Community Experiences

An interview guide was designed as a template to steer dialogues with stakeholders and to ensure consistency in discussions across different groups. It is worth noting, however, that the actual content of each interview may vary subject to the role of the interviewee, the tone and flow of each discussion.

Individuals engaged include representatives from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Players</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Purpose Organisation</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organisation</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Body</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalisation Initiatives</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents

Representatives from:
- Wing Lee Street (selected units from 3-12)
- Hollywood Road (e.g. Centre Stage)
- Bridges Street (e.g. Grandview Garden)
- Caine Road
- Robinson Road
Focus Group Discussions

(1) Capturing Initial Feedback

Five focus group discussions were held to validate preliminary study findings as well as to gauge public views on proposed Urban Progressing Visions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local elderly</td>
<td>9 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*invitations were extended through WWCWDHK Chung Hok Elderly Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>13 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*invitation letters were issued to 20+ buildings in the neighbourhood bounded by Peel Street / Ladder Street / Caine Road and Hollywood Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Purpose Organisations</td>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*invitations extended to all non-profit organisations within the H19 area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local parents / teachers</td>
<td>26 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*invitations were extended through King’s College Old Boys’ Association Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Western District Office and District Council</td>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*invitations were extended through Central &amp; Western District Council Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) Focus Group Discussion Material

 jumlah rancangan, hanya untuk referensi

[Map of Shing Wong Street and Staunton Street]

Community Development Research

>25 Group Discussions

>60 Street Opinions

4 Group Discussions

(Note: The above materials and images are preliminary, only for discussion purposes.)
街坊心目中的理想社區

討論草案，只供參考用

初步構思

一個以人為本、多元共融的生活圈

共融
Wellness Common

共創
Impact Common

共聚
Knowledge Common

共享
Community Common

(註：上述資料及相片均在草擬階段，只供是次活動討論之用。)
【知識共聚 Knowledge Common】

- 连接区内文化热点 Connecting nearby heritage sites
- 口述历史 Storytelling
- 文化传承 Cultural inheritance
- 代代相连，薪火相传 A nexus that connects generations and sites through knowledge

学生会享受史出课题或参与社区，希望可以将附近资源融入课题上！Students show interest in the community. We hope to integrate community resources into our curriculum.

達區已經不是當年熟悉的環境，但希望能在下一代！This neighborhood may no longer be how it used to be, but those are still a part of the spirit of the old days for the next generation!
【民生共創 Impact Common】

構思 Ideas

中上環街坊
Local residents

要讓社區自然發展，讓居民獲享益於自己的社區

This is a place for startups to incubate and grow.

非牟利團體
Social purpose organisations

希望提供機會，培育下一代成為公民

參與校長
School principal

為有需要家庭實踐生活願景
Help families reimagine better futures

社區聚會
Community gathering

連結及培育青年發展
Nurturing youth development

為青年提供生活空間
Affordable living space for the youth

便利民生的小店
Shops catering to livelihood needs

其他？
Others?

連接新舊發展．共創更好生活
A stepping stone to nurture growth towards better futures
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【社區共享 Community Common】

構思 Ideas

社區會所 Community common room

工具分享室 Tool sharing

靈活運用戶外不同活動空間 Multi-functional outdoor space

社區Pop-Up表演 / 市集 Community pop-up events

社區策展 Community curator capability

其他？ Others？

放大生活圈，從家居走到社區
A home-in-community model that enhances the neighborhood network
【身心共融 Wellness Common】

構思 Ideas

提升區內銜接性
Improved walkability and accessibility

綠化及休憩元素
Green and diversified amenity space

心靈藝術
Art meditation

正念減壓
Stress reliever

園藝治療
Garden therapy

其他？
Others?

從「心」出發，由「靈」開始
A wellness hub that helps city-dwellers recharge their personal batteries
The community engagement process helped solicit views from a broad spectrum of community stakeholders including residents, community groups, and local institutions. Comments from parties interviewed were reviewed and a brief account per Rainbow Lens framework can be laid out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal Function</th>
<th>Residents(^6)</th>
<th>Community Institutions and Businesses(^7)</th>
<th>Other Public / Statutory Institutions(^8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old &amp; New</strong></td>
<td>- A diverse set of programmes would be desirable to cater to the needs of the cosmopolitan population including local Chinese speakers as well as expatriate / non-Chinese speaking households</td>
<td>- The neighbourhood was seen to resemble a bridge (“橋”), with the potential to act as a cultural platform connecting PMQ, Tai Kwun and other hotspots</td>
<td>- Some of the existing tong laus may be preserved to provide a demonstration of the living environments of similar tenement units in the past (“唐樓生活體驗”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Function</strong></td>
<td>- The neighbourhood was described a town with a soul and reminiscent of old Hong Kong neighbourliness, uniquely positioned for passers-by to relax from the hustle and bustle of the city life. Many local remarked on the area’s unique ability to integrate old and new, East and West cultural elements in Hong Kong</td>
<td>- Existing cultural sites and stories has provided an invaluable opportunity to promote community education (“社區教育”) to the younger generation. The integration of different cultures and life experiences have been at the heart of the community’s values throughout its evolution. Small businesses in the neighbourhood regarded this place as a “space to incubate and grow”</td>
<td>- Significant potentials could be observed to transform this neighbourhood into a mindfulness and mental wellness hub for the Central and Western District. Existing heritage sites and cultural values could be leveraged to transform the neighbourhood as a historic centre (“歷史城區”) and part of the cultural heritage triangle (“保育鐵三角”) in Central. Efforts from a wide range of social purpose organisations can be further connected through new programmes e.g. to create employment opportunities for local families (“為區內家庭製造工作機會”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Residents include: local residents and pedestrians observed in the vicinity around Shing Wong Street and Staunton Street (including but not limited to Caine Road, Hollywood Road and Robinson Road)  
\(^7\) Community institutions include: local schools, social purpose organisations, and nearby revitalisation initiatives  
\(^8\) Other institutions include: Central & Western District Office, Central & Western District Council, Urban Renewal Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Community Institutions and Businesses</th>
<th>Other Public / Statutory Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old &amp; New (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Docent tours, crafts workshops, storytelling, book sharing could be developed in the neighbourhood to pass on the community spirit for the benefit of existing residents and families (“以導賞、手作或故事館等形式將社區的精神傳承下去, 亦可加入社區中心元素 如圖書分享”)</td>
<td>- Local visitors and customers highly value the sense of nostalgia and local originality present within the area’s retail scene</td>
<td>- The Central and Western District has the potential to incorporate more community education (“社區教室”) elements and workshops including the promotion of intangible cultural heritage (“非物質文化遺產教育”) and rich values embedded in the evolution of this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More elderly-friendly and wellness programmes could be set up in the local neighbourhood (“長者身心健康活動”)</td>
<td>- Stories and crafts of old industries of local significance e.g. printing press (“印刷”) and news / journalism (“新聞”) could be developed for locals to learn more about Hong Kong’s early development</td>
<td>- Local Yu Lan culture (“盂蘭文化”) should be promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sites and traditions including Central 30 Houses Yu Lan Kai Fong Association (“中區卅間盂蘭會”) should be preserved and promoted</td>
<td>- It was recognised that unique local characters should be preserved in the neighbourhood whilst meeting the emerging needs of local residents and those in need. A dynamic model should also be adopted to allow for the organic evolution of community development (“最重要的是要保留地區特色, 和迎合新社區的需要...定位上以服務居民和弱勢社群為主...多變性亦非常重要, 讓社區有自然發展的空間和增強多元組合性”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More intergenerational (“家有三代”) activities including storytelling (“榕樹頭講故事”) could help reconnect the younger generation with their grandparents and pass on the spirit of the community (“延續社區精神”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The continuation of existing social impact pilots run by URA in the neighbourhood was welcomed by residents interviewed</td>
<td>- The addition of more affordable living options and facilities including social housing, co-living and affordable eateries was supported</td>
<td>- No objections raised to the provision of affordable living options and units to those in need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX IV: Stakeholder Views Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Network (continued)</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Community Institutions and Businesses</th>
<th>Other Public / Statutory Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The future development of this area should take into consideration and place a stronger value on neighbourliness built upon mutual support (&quot;互相照顧的街坊情&quot;)</td>
<td>- The neighbourhood’s proximity to Central and the associated networks were highly valued by local start-ups</td>
<td>- The development of multifunctional space was deemed appropriate in the neighbourhood given limited resources within disposal to cater to the needs of a diverse (&quot;多元&quot;) community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Different models of community sharing, from books, tools, recreational facilities, to the use of space were raised to optimise the use of limited available resources in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>- Interactive (&quot;互動&quot;) programmes, combining knowledge, art, and living history, were recommended by local teachers and parents</td>
<td>- Additional thoughts should be given to the infrastructure required to operationalise new community programmes and facilities in the neighbourhood, to avoid over-commercialisation or over-management (&quot;避免太商業化或涉及過分管理&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proposals for a community curator mechanism could be further explored and tested on a &quot;short term trial basis&quot; to take on the operational mantle of community programmes and to further connect existing stakeholder groups and their demands</td>
<td>- A social gathering place (&quot;聚腳點&quot;) should be developed to bring different community groups together</td>
<td>- A bottom-up engagement approach focussing on the needs of local residents should be adopted (&quot;應從居民角度出發&quot;) in designing the H19 revitalisation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The inclusion of more greeneries (&quot;綠化元素&quot;) such as lavender fields (&quot;薰衣草種殖園&quot;), garden therapy (&quot;園藝治療&quot;), and art programmes may be incorporated to help provide a more stress-free and relaxed learning space for local students</td>
<td>- A sustainable model of ongoing public engagement should be encouraged to allow the neighbourhood to evolve (&quot;自然發展&quot;) with its communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Fabric</th>
<th>Needs of local residents should be prioritised above that of local tourists</th>
<th>The inclusion of more greeneries (&quot;綠化元素&quot;) such as lavender fields (&quot;薰衣草種殖園&quot;), garden therapy (&quot;園藝治療&quot;), and art programmes may be incorporated to help provide a more stress-free and relaxed learning space for local students</th>
<th>Interviewed parties agreed that the neighbourhood should remain a primarily residential area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More outdoor furniture (&quot;戶外檯凳&quot;) and greeneries were deemed desirable to be incorporated into the neighbourhood</td>
<td>- Improved walkability and accessibility was recommended to create a barrier-free zone (&quot;提供無障礙的公共空間和行人路&quot;) with clear signage</td>
<td>- Improved walkability and accessibility was recommended to create a barrier-free zone (&quot;提供無障礙的公共空間和行人路&quot;) with clear signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Existing parks, gardens and rest spaces should be improved and optimised (&quot;優化附近公園&quot;) to provide more public open space for the local’s enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 71 |
### Residents
- Walkability and accessibility should be improved, e.g. through pedestrianisation of busy streets
- Objections were raised among some residents to the cutting down of trees in vacant lots on Shing Wong Street
- Some others suggested that the vacant lots could be turned into a community space capable of hosting regular indoor and/or outdoor events

### Community Institutions and Businesses
- “Minimal intervention” was suggested to be placed at the heart of any revitalisation and refurbishment works in URA premises within this neighbourhood
- Some stated the importance of maintaining the green ambience and objected to the cutting down of trees in vacant lots on Shing Wong Street
- It was also suggested that the vacant lots on Shing Wong Street can be used for an open-air “Community Living Room”
- Some others advocated for the inclusion of indoor elements in a future community space to provide flexibility for activities across seasons of the year and hours of the day

### Other Public / Statutory Institutions
- Low density development approach (“低密度發展”) and more public open space (“戶外空間”) should be introduced in the neighbourhood
- Existing open spaces including Chung Wo Lane Rest Garden (“中和里公園”) parks can be beautified
- Some objections were raised on the construction of new high-rise buildings and the cutting down of existing trees in the vacant lots on Shing Wong Street (“反對在城皇街空地斬樹”)
- Some others saw the need to introduce a degree of indoor multifunctional facilities including community libraries, piano rooms, study rooms for local students and residents

### Livelihood Needs
- A number of residents recommended to bring back classic local retail shops (“街坊老店”) as a social gathering place (“聚腳點”)
- There were also suggestions raised the need for more child-friendly facilities such as a community library, turtle sanctuary

### Community Institutions and Businesses
- A number of local groups propositioned for the addition of more communal multifunctional space and facilities (“公共/活動空間”), from child-friendly and recreational features, to performance venue (“表演場地”) or workshop space for local residents of all ages to exhibit their talents and learn new skills

### Other Public / Statutory Institutions
- Objections raised on the introduction of bars, new alcohol licenses, and overly touristic attractions (“反對引入酒吧, 新酒牌, 打卡點”) in URA properties to disrupt existing ambience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood Needs (continued)</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Community Institutions and Businesses</th>
<th>Other Public / Statutory Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                             | - Others indicated a preference for more recreational facilities for exercising  
|                             | - Affordable, and potentially Chinese, eateries would be preferred to add to existing F&B offerings | - More boutique shops with local characters should be encouraged in the neighbourhood, e.g. through more innovative leasing agreements (“期望這區可以發展特色小店，用不同的租務形式令平常未必能在正常商業條件上生存的小店都可以在這裡立足發展”) | - Classic local eateries (“街坊老店”) including Bo Bun Tea House (“寶賓茶居”) could be re-introduced to the neighbourhood  
|                             |                                                     | - Additional facilities may also be desirable to embed mindfulness and wellness concepts and improve the physical and mental wellbeing of individuals working and living in this relatively high-pressured business district  
|                             |                                                     | - Pet-friendly facilities could be added to cater to local dog walkers and residents |
APPENDIX V: H19 COMMUNITY MAKING EXAMPLES

Whilst community stakeholders may hold different views on the use of URA-owned open spaces in the neighbourhood, the study team recognises that some ideas received near-universal support and are therefore worthy of consideration as pilot initiatives to be implemented over the next three years.

These initiatives can operate as part of a community making pilot, before a target state revitalisation scheme is formulated and approved by the relevant bodies for implementation.

The below lays out six of the community generated ideas as examples of potential pilot initiatives that the URA can further explore as part of H19’s next phase development.

A multi-purpose common space for members of the community, including:

- A semi self-serviced shared lounge with indoor and outdoor elements that are open to local residents / registered members to relax, catch up with familiar faces, and make new acquaintances
- A shared library enabling exchange of books and tools
- An affordable multifunctional event space for activities e.g. pop-up performances, community gatherings
- A “Community Curator” capability to support community activities and facilitate collaboration across different local groups to foster stronger social ties (further details can be found in APPENDIX VI: Infrastructure Innovation Examples)
Affordable living options targeting underprivileged families and the youth, including:

- **Social housing** options for underprivileged families and marginalised youth, with empowerment support towards helping them pursue upward mobility
- **Youth co-living**, with social and co-working / incubation support to provide opportunities for personal development and growth

Introduce small retail concepts targeting local livelihood needs, to support:

- **“Non-Soho” retail** (e.g. F&B) alternatives for residents in the neighbourhood
- Preservation of the **traditional production methods and sceneries**

An expert-in-residence programme that includes:

- **Short-term accommodation** for local or foreign experts in journalism, art, heritage preservation or cultural inheritance
- **Community outreach** programmes, such as workshops or exhibitions (potentially run in the Community Common Room) spearheaded by experts-in-residence to promote their areas of expertise within the neighbourhood

---

**CO-LIVING INNOVATION**

- Social housing for underprivileged families
- Youth co-living and co-working initiatives

**NEW-OLD GAI FONG SHOP**

- Inherit old small retails
- Serve community livelihood needs

**EXPERT-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAMMES**

- Heritage preservation/ Journalism inheritance
- Intergenerational learning
User-friendly open space with considerations to:

- **Improve usability of existing open spaces**: work with existing property owners / operators (e.g. Leisure & Cultural Services Department) to refurbish existing open spaces and landscaped gardens in the neighbourhood with greeneries and facilities suited to local needs e.g. outdoor furniture.

- **Introduce wellness programmes**: bring in new programmes to capitalise on existing resources e.g. garden therapy / communal gardens in existing open space, fitness training / stone steps trail runs along Shing Wong Street.

Improve walkability through introducing:

- **Barrier-free access**: work with relevant departments (including Highways Department) to improve accessibility by installing additional ramps.

- **Clear signage**: provide clearer indication signage on accessible entrances and potential walking paths to nearby landmarks wherever possible.

- **Dog-friendly facilities**: work with relevant departments (including Leisure and Cultural Services Department) to install additional pet latrines and dog excreta collection bins on quieter lanes in the H19 area such as Wa In Fong East and Chung Wo Lane to divert dog walking from the busier Staunton Street and Bridges Street and improve overall dog walking experience.
APPENDIX VI: INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION EXAMPLES

Community Curator Capability

To help facilitate connectivity and coordination of the use of communal space / facilities in the neighbourhood, the primary roles and features of the “Community Curator” may include:

- **Observe and evaluate** evolving community needs to propose new ideas
- **Connect and drive** collaboration between different stakeholders towards co-creating a dynamic and vibrant neighbourhood
- **Facilitate and support** the experimentation of different programmes with community inputs in the form of **community working groups**. These working groups may be formed by stakeholders including local subject matter experts and resident, as a representative body to advise and assist in the work of the curator
- **Fixed term appointment** of up to 3 years, subject to evaluation and regular performance and impact measurements

PROPOSED ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE “COMMUNITY CURATOR”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Curator</th>
<th>Facility Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the management of software, or programme, development of community initiatives within URA premises</td>
<td>Support the management of hardware, or use of communal facilities, operated by the URA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Community Curator is:**

- An enabler and aggregator of multiple views within the community
- An objective and independently operated mechanism driven with community support

**The Community Curator is not:**

- A top-down mechanism driving the design and development of community programmes
- An organisation, or player, that has limited prior knowledge or lack of community experience operating in the neighbourhood
Impact Evaluation and Community Making Review

To ensure the community making efforts is in tune with shifts in local demands and expectations, a more formal structure may be explored to regularly assess and evaluate social impact and the effectiveness of community making initiatives. The framework may operate on 5-year cycles.

PROPOSED 5-YEAR COMMUNITY MAKING REVIEW FRAMEWORK

AN INDICATIVE IMPACT MEASUREMENT META-FRAMEWORK

From experience, the study team understands that social innovation thrives in an environment conducive to experimentation, when management focus can be dedicated to observations and testing as part of a cycle of ideation, prototyping, and evaluation. It is in adherence with this spirit that the Study proposes for the URA to adopt a conceptual meta-framework to evaluate the impact and success of its community making initiatives going forward. This dynamic integrated approach may measure impact in multiple phases.

Proof of Concept and Prototyping
(Minimum of 2-3 years)

- The start of a community making pilot should include a “pre-measurement” period that focuses on encouraging innovation and the testing of new ideas to further refine an understanding of community needs
- Rigid impact measurements and quantitative representation of targets and achievements are not recommended
- As URA and its partners progress within a pilot-based experimentation approach, further insights may be generated on key social performance indicators for future reference

Production and Scaling Up

- After the completion of a pilot programme, it is expected that a maturing impact and operation model will lead to more clearly understood visions of programme “success”
- At this stage, both quantitative and qualitative impact measurements can be developed at a programme level to track progress and benchmark against informed expectations as it seeks to scale
## APPENDIX VII: INSPIRATIONS FROM AROUND THE WORLD

### Service Design in the City of Helsinki

*Community Design as a Methodology*

Initiated in 2016, Helsinki Lab leads the charge to integrate principles of design, and human interactions into the development of the City. When defining a 2030 vision, it developed four unique user personas through research and organised workshops and discussions with over 50 leaders of the city, including mayors, professionals and the academia, to discuss citizen experiences of the future. This human-centred approach provided an invaluable opportunity for participants to think from a perspective that may be different to their own based on intuition, develop empathy for these needs, and re-imagine new possibilities. Outputs of over 300 citizens led to four scenarios catering to each of personas developed:

- **Creative City**: for citizens who are ‘doing-it-themselves’, this is a city that can harness the collective imagination and intelligence of citizens in making, shaping and co-creating their city
- **Resilient City**: for citizens who are being served, this is a city that functions to support more vulnerable members of the community to thrive despite of their personal challenges
- **Smart City**: for citizens who collaborate to co-manage, this is a city that build better public services in a more energy-efficient and sustainable manner leveraging digital technology
- **Civic City**: for citizens who are deeply involved in co-producing activities, this is a city that draws on collaboration amongst citizens and emphases on what the citizens share

This case study inspires us to consider the possibilities of a participatory approach to community design centred around services and driven by shared visions for the future, over and above physical dimensions and hardware design.

Source: City of Helsinki (https://www.hel.fi/helsinki/en)
Community-led conservation in the Blue House Cluster, Hong Kong

Community innovation

Viva Blue House a project spearheaded by St James' Settlement to revitalise the Blue House Cluster in Hong Kong. With a dedicated focus on a bottom-up model to preserving the traditions and ways of life of existing residents, it showcases new possibilities and received international acclaim as the recipient of the Award of Excellence of the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Awards for Cultural Heritage Conservation 2017.

There are five core units to the project: “House of Stories” to record and exhibit oral stories, “Existing Resident Housing and Engagement Unit” to drive participatory planning on rental policy for the residents, “Good Neighbour Scheme” to identify potential new tenants to keep the spirit of the Cluster alive, “Social Enterprise Unit” covering two affordable restaurants that showcases local characters and provide employment opportunities, and “C.O.M.E. Hall”, a community centre inspired by ideas of Village Offices in New Territories. The “C.O.M.E.” Hall intends to be a social gathering place for members of the Blue House Community as well as fellow gai fongs in Wanchai. A range of regular fixtures and one-off activities are currently hosted in the C.O.M.E Hall, including a hair salon, massage parlour, tool library, swap party, book sharing, operating as both a service centre, and a consultation platform for based on a barter system for non-marketable skills and resources.

The inspirational set-up of Viva Blue House project serves as Hong Kong’s prime showcase on the integration between heritage and lifestyle preservation as two sides of the same coin. It leads us to imagine new ways in which livelihood needs can be served within the confines of tenement buildings of historical value with the community needs at its core.

SOURCE: Viva Blue House (http://www.vivabluehouse.hk)
Community Club House in Sham Shui Po, Hong Kong

Community innovation

Cradle to Classroom is a pilot project operated by SVhk with the aim to develop a new model of early childhood intervention, based on SVhk’s learning and understanding of the needs of underprivileged families in Sham Shui Po District. Since April 2017, Cradle to Classroom has engaged 200+ families, offered 1:1 intensive counselling support sessions through its Clubhouse, playgroup and more in-depth interventions.

Specifically, the Clubhouse serves as the primary engagement platform for registered Sham Shui Po families and their young children to play and relax. Opening every Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday from 9:30am to noon, the Clubhouse maintains its commitment to welcome these families to drop by any time to enjoy the common space and shared facilities at their pleasure. Community programmes are also regularly organised by the Cradle to Classroom team to enrich the social experience of its members, including a regular counselling sessions, career exposure workshops, and other gatherings. Through this platform, the Clubhouse aspires to empower mothers and create a mutual support and contribution system that further develops their sense of belonging and commitment to this community.

The successes of SVhk’s Clubhouse engagement platform lead us to imagine the possibilities of adapting a similar set-up to address the specific local needs in other districts, including Central & Western, in Hong Kong.

SOURCE: SVhk
### APPENDIX VIII: GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Making</td>
<td>A pioneering approach to define <em>lifescape</em> and embed the pursuit of social, cultural, and economic wellbeing into urban design. It complements the concept of place making that focuses on defining “lanscape” but with a stronger emphasis on breathing life to a changing neighbourhood and make it more sustainable with human-centred considerations at its heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Group Index</td>
<td>A quantitative measure to compare and contrast demographic profiles of different citizens passing by the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Life Preferences</td>
<td>A quantitative analysis to identify and prioritise the needs, values and aspirations by citizen groups in relation to their living circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired Community Experiences</td>
<td>A deep-dive into the stories and experiences of local citizens as a mean to identify a set of archetype from their perspectives, and to identify pain points and gain points as gaps between as-is and to-be community experience models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Group Insights</td>
<td>A set of converging observations and considerations drawn from community engagement exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Lens</td>
<td>An alternative approach to filter and funnel citizen views based on layers of needs shared across stakeholder groups. The model may be considered a ‘community-centric’ variant of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs model in psychology (1943), to reflect the multiplicity of each stakeholder’s social identifies and identify common grounds across different groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Making Principles</td>
<td>Overarching values drawn from Citizen Group Insights to underpin the formulation of Urban Progressing Visions as to improve the overall community experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Progressing Visions</td>
<td>Possible directions of travel to advance community development based on local needs. Urban Progressing Visions are intended to be used as tools for strategic discussion to steer different members of the community towards a shared set of visions, as well as a basis on which informed decisions can be made on how to proceed in implementing community making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Making Initiatives</td>
<td>Innovative ideas to advance one or more Urban Progressing Visions to drive desirable social impact as part of the community’s development journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Curator Capability</td>
<td>A party that supports the management of “software”, or programme, development of community initiatives within URA premises. Its primary responsibility is to act as an enabler and aggregator of multiple views within the community, and to connect different community groups towards the co-creation of new programmes for the community, by the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>