From squatter settlements to cultural heritage: the preservation and revitalization as “group of buildings” based on the case experience of Treasure Hill Art Village in Taipei City, Taiwan
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ABSTRACT
This paper focuses on the value of squatter settlements (SS) as cultural heritage, which has not been fully addressed. This paper aims at arguing the possibility of utilizing the value of cultural heritage embedded in SS as an art incubator under community participation through a case analysis based on the experience of the Treasure Hill Art Village (THAV) of Treasure Hill Settlement (THS) in Taipei City, Taiwan. This paper clarifies the significance of SS as “a group of buildings” realized by the process of preservation, legalization, and revitalization by way of community participation.

THS can be evaluated as a unique case from the perspective of the preservation and legalization processes because it might be considered a mixed type of “legalization of the ownership of buildings and land” and “legalization of residence rights of residents” of SS. Focus on the revitalization of THAV has many spatial characteristics because of the restoration transcending the mere maintenance of its intrinsic value. Further, community participation has evolved to be stronger during the process of preservation and revitalization of THS as THAV. The possibility of how SS may become an irreplaceable space for the city by dynamically revitalizing its value has been clarified by THAV.

1. Introduction
This paper focuses on the value of squatter settlements (SS) as cultural heritage, which has not been discussed until now. This paper aims at arguing the possibility of utilizing the value of cultural heritage embedded in SS as an art incubator under community participation through a case analysis based on the experience of the “Treasure Hill Art Village” (THAV) of Treasure Hill Settlement (THS) in Taipei City. Discussions about the how to discover the value of SS as cultural heritage and how community participation might be important for discovering the value of SS will be reviewed at the first.

1.1. Squatter settlements (SS)
Since the end of World War II, SS around large cities have become a worldwide phenomenon (Mangin 1967a, 1967b). The definition of SS varies widely from country to country and depends on various defined parameters. In general, SS is considered a residential area in an urban locality inhabited by the very poor “squatters” who have no access to tenured land of their own and hence “squat” on vacant land, either private or public (Srinivas 2015). In most countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America – developing countries, in particular – the national political situations and economic policies have produced large numbers of people in poverty, such as migrant workers, who have entered the cities from farming villages and provinces. These individuals form SS and illegally occupy public
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1.2. Environmental improvements and legalization approach for SS

Environmental improvements and legalization of SS have been considered the major approaches for solving the living issues in SS. Traditional regulatory measures – price control, minimum physical standards, eradication of SS, and urban growth control – have failed to improve the housing conditions among the poor. More recently, international donor agencies have encouraged new policies based on affordability for consumers, and many developing countries are shifting their priorities to upgrading existing SS to sites and services projects for low-income settlements (Lim 1987; Handzic 2010). However, the aforementioned approach can be further divided into two types, the method of legalization of existing SS in site, namely, legalizing the ownership of buildings and land of SS, and the method of providing another house to the existing residents of SS at another place, namely, the legalization of residence rights of SS residents.

Regarding the first method, for instance, successful upgrading the case of Bathore, an SS location on government land, located on the outskirts of Tirana, the capital of Albania, also provides important implications. Bathore was formed in the early 1990s by poor squatters, mostly from rural northern Albania, a region that became impoverished and lost most services after the fall of communism in 1990. The area that the squatters occupied was bereft of infrastructure. However, the squatters built houses that were permanent structures of good quality, often multistory. In the mid-2000s, the Albanian government started taking steps to legalize squatter housing and subsequently, to equip the area with infrastructure. Now, Bathore is starting to resemble a middle-class-style suburb if only in terms of physical appearance (Pojani 2013). Further, in the case of Rio de Janeiro, the Favela Bairro upgrading program (FBP), which seeks to transform SS into formal neighborhoods, is seen as a complex and appropriate solution to Rio’s housing woes. The FBP is noteworthy as an example of SS upgrading without full land tenure legalization and for its use of the state of exception, primarily the concession of right to use but not full ownership of land in order to allow this program to see the light of day. This placed greater emphasis on infrastructural and living condition improvement rather than the legalization of land tenure. As a result, the implementation of FBP has had the effect of increasing the security of tenure of favela residents (Handzic 2010).

As for the second method, for example, Sengupta and Sharma (2009) analyzed the experiences of the Kirtipur Housing Project (KHP), the first ever grassroots-led SS betterment project in Kathmandu. It is widely hailed as a success story as it has been able to provide a legal, affordable, and good-quality housing solution through community participation. Another case is regarding the SS surrounding the cities in the rapid urbanization experienced during Turkey’s industrialization. The Turkish Housing Development Administration developed a new model in 2003 that aimed to upgrade illegal settlements by demolishing existing SS locations and constructing new residential units in the same area or a different one. The model provides housing units to slum owners as compensation for their slums while giving an opportunity to the squatters and low-income people living outside of the upgrading area to buy a housing unit with affordable long-term payments (Uzun, Çete, and Palancioğlu 2010).

To sum up, the existing approaches to SS legalization have mainly addressed the resolution of the inhabitants’ residence issues by first legalizing their existing illegal housing and bestowing land rights or providing alternate places to go. Further, organizing infrastructure and reconstructing with modern techniques to improve the quality of their residential spaces are commonly needed for both of the aforementioned types.

1.3. Significance of SS as built cultural heritage

On the other hand, the preservation and revitalization of the value of SS as cultural heritage have been given priority recently than the conventional approach of environment improvement as mentioned. Aydan Sat (2007) cites the example of SS in Ankara, Turkey, focusing on the preservation of existing houses, while arguing for the importance of organizational procedures encouraging legalization. Further, Gouverneur (2014) discusses cities in Venezuela and Colombia, where plans for squatters suggest the formation of revitalized neighborhoods and effective resource use by way of balance with existing houses. However, SS themselves are part of the history of the cities they exist within, which also includes the unique culture and
history of the squatters. SS are often recognized as common memories of many urban residents. In addition, according to the increased social and international awareness and acceptance of cultural heritage, the preservation and revitalization of SS are on the upswing.

Cultural heritage is an important part of societal and community wellbeing. However, in increasingly multicultural societies subjected to the extreme homogenizing pressures of globalization, the problem of what to protect has come to the forefront of debates about built heritage. In addition to understanding how to preserve built cultural heritage it is important first to elaborate what qualifies as cultural heritage and to explain why it is so (Tweed and Sutherland 2007). Effective management of the built cultural heritage requires a clear understanding of what makes a place significant (Bond and Worthing 2016). Built cultural heritage is an important part of the cultural heritage of towns and cities. However, current definitions of built heritage are narrow and rely on conventional conceptions of architectural and historical value. In many countries, these values are enshrined in legislations that define what constitutes “built heritage.” Similarly, an entire district or town can be designated a conservation area to prevent significant development. The most pressing problem is, therefore, how to address areas within towns and cities that are not considered worthy conservation areas and yet form an essential part of the urban character (Tweed and Sutherland 2007).

Regarding the case of SS, there is actually a complex relationship between cultural heritage and poverty. This relationship is particularly evident in the depletion of historical centers. In addition, when considered along with the impact of the intertwined forces of urbanization and modernization, it may result in the dangerous threatening of the cultural tracts, social structure and urban patterns of the poor living in historical centers (Razzu 2005). Hernandez and Lopez (2011) indicate that it is possible for SSs to contribute positively to branding cities. Trying to “hide” these areas from visitors’ views is not only impossible because of their size, but also not desirable because of how they can enrich a branding strategy. However, there are also major downsides that need to be taken into consideration. Ulack (1978) also emphasizes that most peripheral urban SSs have the potential to play a positive and productive role in cities. Factors such as age of settlement and location should be evaluated carefully before governments decide to evict or relocate populations of SS.

1.4. Community participation as a key factor for preserving SS as cultural heritage

Community participation is considered as a common key factor for both the preservation as a cultural heritage and environment improvement especially in the case of SS. Assessing the value of heritage to different groups within a city and together with appropriate visualization tools for new development should facilitate greater community participation, which is essential in any discussion of urban sustainable development (Tweed and Sutherland 2007). Effective community participation is a topical issue in management of cultural heritage (Simakole, Farrelly, and Holland 2019). Participatory approach and community participation, engaging civil society, heritage community area increasingly used expression in heritage management and conservation (Van der Auwera, Vandesande, and Van Balen 2015). Protection of cultural heritage has long been considered as the responsibility of the government. However, over the last 20 years, a number of heritage projects, mainly in minority communities, have attempted to engage with community participation in China (Xu 2007). Cultural heritage does not have direct economic benefits. However, if properly managed it can stimulate social cohesions, improving the environment, and have beneficial economic spin-offs for the local communities (Mogomotsi et al. 2018).

For example, cultural heritage is the most important tourist attraction in Penang, Malaysia. However, cultural heritage tourism would not be sustainable without community participation (Huibin and Marzuki 2012). The considerable growth in tourism and recreational shopping regarding cultural heritage has created tensions within tourist historic cities, which may be amenable to resolution through community participation. The case of York, England suggests that the community participation might be amenable to resolution to the tensions created by the considerable growth in cultural and heritage tourism and recreational shopping within tourist historical cities. (Bahaire and Elliott-White 1999). Through the case study of Kastoria, Greece, findings suggest that community participation is mainly driven by community members with high place attachment while the values of cultural heritage play a significant role (Dragouni and Fouseki 2018). Regarding the issue of increasing the participants’ positive feelings toward community participation, suggest that incorporating cultural and historical information about cultural heritage may encourage more pro-social behaviors (Chng and Narayanan 2017).

For examples of conservation and regeneration as SS similar to Treasure Hill Art Village (THAV) namely the focus of this paper, the Village Regeneration Project of Gamcheon Culture Village of Busan in Korea might be a similar case of preservation SS as cultural heritage through community participation. While geographical constraints excluded the SSs from urban redevelopment projects, the same factors have contributed to the maintenance and conservation of these living spaces and communities for a long time. Recently,
these SSs have been re-classified as heritage sites of modern urban history, because they constitute a spatial display of the city’s migration experience (Seo, Cho, and Skelton 2015). As the Gamcheon Culture Village Project began to receive a flow of funding from the central government agencies and Busan City government, the village operation council started soliciting residents’ participation in project management. The village has been successful in improving deteriorated houses and streets of SS, constructing a new service center, public restrooms, tourist information centers, and art shops (Hong and Lee 2015). In this way, community participation is an essential element for discovering the value of SS as a cultural heritage, especially for utilizing this kind of value for community revitalization.

1.5. Positioning the case of Treasure Hill Settlement (THS)

Today, the possibility of artistic intervention has emerged as a new measure for the revitalization of cultural heritage especially in the case of SS community similar to THAV. In fact, derelict historical buildings and sites within the SS have been reused in an informal, spontaneous way for artistic, cultural, or social activities (Prujut 2003; Shaw 2005; Göbel 2014; Plevoets & Sowińska-Heim, 2018). Meanwhile, the existence of SS is recognized even in developed countries, and especially in Western countries, there is a movement that aims to revitalize the local region by using SS’s existing building as a base for art and creative activities according to previous studies (e.g. Prujit 2003; Shaw 2005; Sandler 2016; Plevoets & Sowińska-Heim, 2018).

In the case of Lithuania, SS contributed to the city with their cultural capital, creating local subcultures and making the urban space more attractive. An alternative way of life, contributed to the preservation of the city and fostered counter-cultural activities was promoted by the residents of SS, spaces for performances, exhibits, and concerts were also provided in SS. These activities are still present up to this day in the Užupis neighborhood that hosted the most long-lived squat, which in turn was transformed into an art incubator (Aidukaite 2016). Similar experience, for example, since the mid-2000s, cultural and creative clusters, especially arts clusters, has flourished across cities and towns in China as a result of local governments’ efforts to establish the cultural and creative sector for urban regeneration. Using two cases of arts clusters in SS of Guangzhou, it was argued that this top-down creative placemaking approach, although seemingly commercially successful, overlooks the needs of grassroots artists – thus compromising the creative nature of the cluster (Li and Liu 2019). Arts were utilized as a means for encouraging and enabling community participation, as well as providing opportunities for social interaction and networking, which are essential for the wellbeing of disadvantaged residents according to the case of the Mid West of Western Australia (McHenry 2011).

In THS, which is the focus of this paper, the value of SS as a cultural heritage is recognized with the community participation, and artistic intervention is attempted as a method for utilizing the space as THAV after its conservation. As Ng (2015) mentioned that the spatial organization and the consequent social cohesion found in the settlement were valuable knowledge on use values of the evolving lived space in the THS. Mastering this knowledge and capitalizing on the wider socio-political opportunity of the new mayor’s emphasis on cultural development during the 2000s, the social activists have succeeded in developing a co-living discourse, arguing for the merits of having artists-in-residence, housing tenants and youth hostel sojourners to co-develop a sustainable, creative environment. On the other hand, there are still many unclear points such like, how the value of THS as a cultural heritage was evaluated, and how the process of legalization of SS was realized in THS while how the community participation influenced it. This paper is positioned as an advanced research in clarifying the significance of preserving the value of THS as a cultural heritage through the process of community participation and revitalizing it for THAV.

2. Research overview

2.1. Research perspectives and objectives

As covered in the first section, the residential areas known as SSs have, thus far, been treated as an issue accompanying rapid urban development and concomitant population increase, regardless of country, and handled mainly through environmental organization and formalization. On the other hand, it is globally rare to find SSs treated as part of urban history and their value as cultural heritage considered for preservation and revitalization.

This paper aim at arguing the possibility of utilizing the value of cultural heritage embedded in SS as an art incubator under the community participation of local residents through the case of the THS squatter settlement community in Taipei. In the case of THS, it has been recognized for its cultural value and designated as a “Group of Buildings”1 on the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (CHPA), the national law in Taiwan and revitalized as an art incubator for artists and

---

1According to Article 3, Item 1, Number 4 of Taiwan’s CHPA, “Groups of Buildings” as a type of cultural heritage include “buildings … or neighborhoods with intact historical context and texture, harmonious landscape, and historical, regional, or industrial features.” (Ministry of Justice, R.O.C 2016).
creative workers so-called the THAV since the late 2000s. As already mentioned that built cultural heritage is an important part of the cultural heritage of cities with the increasingly multicultural societies subjected to the extreme homogenizing pressures of globalization (Tweed and Sutherland 2007; Bond and Worthing 2016). By clarifying the way to manifest the value of SS as “a group of building” by methods including preservation and revitalization through community participation, the significance of SS for the city will be clarified and discussed.

Based on the above argument and purpose, this paper focuses on the preservation and revitalization of THS as a cultural heritage, thereby clarifying the following two points from a planning perspective:

(1) Preservation and legalization: Beginning with the development of the THS preservation movement, this paper first clarifies the process leading up to its designation as a cultural heritage. Further, this paper also clarifies the legalization process of THS considering its characteristic as an SS (Section 3).

(2) Revitalization: This paper clarifies the revitalization of THS post-preservation as THAV and its spatial characteristics. Further, this paper also clarifies the designation criteria for THS as cultural heritage, especially the value of THS as “a group of buildings” (Section 4).

(3) Process for preservation and revitalization through community participation: Further, as mentioned above this paper clarifies the organizational process through community participation, to preserve and revitalize the THS as cultural heritage (Section 5).

2.2. Overview of research and investigation

The analysis in this paper is based on the experience attained and independent investigation performed by the author while a graduate student (2010–2012) at the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning at National Taiwan University (NTUBP), which has been involved with the preservation and urban revitalization of THS for over 10 years. It is also derived from the data gained through an investigation conducted as part of the author’s duties as a member of Taipei City Government staff from 2013 to the present. Further, the author also conducted several field surveys over February 15–16 and December 7–10, 27-29 October 2017 and December 24–25, 2018, and March 4–5, 2019. The author directly observed and took field notes including the distribution and status of various types of ateliers and shops and the revitalization of preserved buildings. The paper also uses the aforementioned acquired data from the investigation reports of Taipei City Government, including the PSLO (2001) and DUD (2013) (see reference), and other publicly available materials including electronic maps and photos of THS and THAV.

2.3. Research targets

THS is a leafy village located at the southern tip of Zhongzheng District, Taipei, separated from Yonghe District, New Taipei, by the Xindian River, which it overlooks from the Guanyinshan hills near Gongguan. The total area of the village is approximately 2.3 ha (see Figure 1). Its overall appearance is shown in Figure 2. In recent years, with the creation of a riverside park, walkway, and bikeway along the Xindian River, THS has been drawing attention as a new tourist spot.

Figure 1. Location of THS (Source: Created by the author based on map data of DUD (2020)).
As mentioned above, THS recognizes the value of its cultural properties, and its use as a THAV in 2010, the atelier, creative shops, tourist accommodation facilities, and living spaces of existing residents coexist. As of 2020, there about 22 households (about 60 people) of existing residents live in the restored houses and about 120 artists stay in the arteria or incubators of THAV. THAV records about 30,000 visitors annually, and most of them come to participate in art activities or art exhibitions in THAV (DCA 2019). Further, because THAV is located along the bicycle path on the bank of Xidian River, there are also substantial numbers of tourists who stop by during their bicycle tour.

3. Preservation and legalization process of THV

3.1. History of THS and eviction plan

The history of THS dates back to the 19th century. It has been named Treasure Hill (TH) after one of the oldest temples in Taipei, built by immigrants from Anxi County, Quanzhou in Fujian Province around 1798, during the Qing dynasty.

The development of the village around TH transpired under Japanese colonial rule in the 1930s, with artillery unit barracks built there as a military base; beginning in the 1940s, local farmers constructed five or six illegal buildings. During the Kuomintang regime, in addition to military personnel who journeyed from the mainland to the 1960s, migrant workers moved to the area, which expanded to a SS of some 200 houses in about 4 ha, including some legal buildings erected by the Ministry of Defense. Against this backdrop, Taipei City began an eviction plan in the 1980s to create a new park (Table 1).

Taipei City positioned its measures for THS as part of the creation of a new park along the Xindian River rather than as squat clearance. During the mayoralty of the Kuomintang’s Lee Tong-hui and Huang Ta-chou, plans for THS eviction intensified. First, after designating the site for park creation in the 1980 urban plan by the DUD, the PSLO announced a THS eviction plan in 1993. To realize the plan, they discussed it in detail with the landholder – the Ministry of National Defense – and began removing the 46 buildings owned by the Ministry in 1994 (Hsiao, 2018).

However, when the Taipei government changed in 1995, Chen Shui-bian of the reform-minded DPP focused on ensuring a place for relocation in response to public criticism and opposition, also announcing that the evictions would be on hold indefinitely. His

### Table 1. Status of THS eviction plan.

| Date   | Mayor            | Action                                                                 |
|--------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| July 1980 | Lee Tong-hui (KMT) | Urban plan for THS changed from natural preservation area to city park area. |
| June 1993 | Huang Ta-chou (KMT) | City announced THS eviction.                                           |
| June 1994 | Chen Shui-bian (DPP) | 46 legal buildings were cleared.                                       |
| Nov. 1995 | Taipei Mayor Chen Shui-bian | Responding to repeated residential opposition, city put eviction on hold indefinitely; construction of basketball court, river stairs (bank shoring) began. |
| June 1997 | NTUBP | Taipei Mayor Chen Shui-bian visited site; announced the eviction as placed on hold indefinitely until relocation was ensured. |
| Sept. 1997 | | NTUBP began involvement in participatory park design at THS, forming the “THS Work Team.” |
| Nov. 1998 | Mayoral election | The “1st Taipei City Vulnerable Region Revitalization Exhibition” was held at THS; mayoral candidate Ma Ying-jeou agreed to “urban reform.” |
| 1999 | Ma Ying-jeou (KMT) | Ma won election and established cross-department “Zhongzheng Park 297 Eviction Relocation Headquarters.” |

Source: Amended and created based on the data of PSLO (2001), DUD (2013) and Hsiao (2018).
successor, Ma Ying-jeou, followed his lead and carefully reviewed the plan.

Regarding the housing status of the existing residents, the Taipei City Government’s Department of Social Welfare (DSW) surveyed them twice, beginning in 1997 and clarifying their status as of 1999. When the eviction plan was finalized that year, THS comprised 132 houses, 93 of which were occupied; the ratio of occupied to empty homes at THS was about 7:3. The status of each was as explained below (Hsiao, 2018).

(1) Occupied: 60 households wanted to remain (45.5%, red text in Table 2), while 33 did not and by then had relocation plans (owning houses elsewhere, national or municipal public housing, totaling 25%; shaded portion of Table 2). This suggests that residents were actively prepared to relocate, fearing forcible evictions, such as that of March 1997 at the Taipei Park 14/15 Site. While prioritizing relocation sites, eviction was the basic policy as of 1999. Therefore, although the eighth meeting of the Zhongzheng Park 297 Eviction Headquarters in August 2001 had decided to establish a “village/art exhibit area,” of the 132 houses, 38 along the riverbank were removed that December, the households’ relocation sites having been confirmed. Thereafter, of the households wanting to remain as of 1999 (red text in Table 2), only 22 remain today.

(2) Empty: as the right column of Table 2 shows, excluding 20 houses (15.1%) made vacant by deaths, etc., all 19 households (14.4%; Table 2 right column, shaded) relocated early in response to Taipei’s request (or because in some cases, they had houses elsewhere or other personal issues). Based on the above, the finalization status of the THS eviction plan in 1999 was as below.

(1) Clearly defined as an SS

The basic characteristics of an SS are as indicated in Section 1; frequently, SSs are formed when migrant workers from farming villages and others in poverty are forced to occupy public land illegally because of low income. These characteristics were clearly present in THS as well. Except for the 15.9% of residents in the underlined values of Table 2, a large majority of residents – 84.9% – faced the risk of losing their residence because of eviction, as they had no other houses elsewhere.

(1) Taipei City’s firm stance on eviction

The two Taipei City Mayors from 1995 to 1999 (Chen Shui-bian and Ma Ying-jeou) actively worked to advance the eviction plan, while using national and municipal public housing as relocation sites. Notably, however, because national public housing is owned rather than rented, even residents who agreed to relocate there were not necessarily able to pay back the costs in full. In addition, municipal public housing is only provided to the low-income households comprising the bottom two deciles of average income in Taipei City, with extremely few apartments available. Therefore, not all would-be residents could be accommodated. In short, at the time, it was not feasible to guarantee relocation housing suitable to the eviction plan.

### 3.2. Designation of THS as cultural heritage, preservation plan proposed

As noted, the opposition to eviction had more or less begun in the early 1990s; its main thrust at the time was, in addition to “respect for residents’ rights,” “preservation of cultural heritage.” Responding to these claims, Taipei City began accepting the site’s value as cultural heritage. First, based on the CHPA, Taipei City designated the THL reliquary shrine and center of faith located at the village entrance as a “Monument” in August 1997. The existing park creation scheme was thereafter redirected in 2001 to a village-integration preservation plan, contracting “research on the potential of village-type preservation of Zhongzheng Park 297” to NTUBP. Finally, as noted above, the change of status for THS from “park area” to “village/art exhibit area” was finalized in August of the same year.

As of 2001, in response to forceful requests from residents and specialists, Taipei City’s policy was to designate the entire village as a cultural heritage site. However, at the time, the CHPA had no cultural heritage categories applicable to a whole village; in 2004, for convenience purposes, Taipei designated THS “historical

---

2For example, of the “Empty” houses in Table 2, seven households (5.3%) had houses elsewhere, and members were living outside THS so that their current house status was “empty.” As well, households “in residence” in the village as a rule with houses elsewhere would, on principle, transfer to their houses outside the area if evicted.

---

Table 2. Status of THS eviction plan.

| Total houses at THS | Occupied  | Empty  |
|---------------------|----------|--------|
| 132 (100%) Relocating House elsewhere | 93 (70.5%) | 39 (29.5%) |
| National housing | 18 (13.6%) | 11 (8.3%) |
| Municipal housing | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| Wanting to remain | 60 (45.3%) | Death, etc.: 20 (15.1%) |

Source: Amended and created based on the data of PSLO (2001), DUD (2013) and Hsiao (2018).
Figure 3. Status of THCCA and Specialty Grocery Store (Source: Amended and created based on the field survey conducted by the author using the photos and data of Specialty Grocery Store of THAV (2017)).

Figure 4. Status of THAV (Source: Amended and created based on the field survey conducted by the author using the map data of DUD (2013)).
architecture" in its entirety. Thereafter, the 2005 amendments to the CHPA added Groups of Buildings to its cultural heritage types and – responding to the village restoration in 2009 (see the next section for details) – after public hearings and meetings of the Taipei City Cultural Heritage Review Committee in January 2011, THS was finally designated a group of buildings in February of the same year (Hsiao, 2018). The Department of Cultural Affairs, Taipei City Government (DCA) played a significant role throughout.3

The community participation realized by community organization was also a significant factor in achieving preservation. In 2004, about 40 residents independently formed the Treasure Hill Community Cultural Association (THCCA), holding various holiday events toward village cultural preservation (see left side of Figure 3, Autumn Festival event) and working toward increasing resident solidarity. As the mediator with Taipei City on the plans for transfer and village preservation, the THCCA continued dialog with the opposing residents. Further, they were instrumental in patrolling and cleaning4 the village during the restoration work. To summarize their roles in community participation; they mainly worked to form agreements among residents; to manage the village during the restoration period; and to determine how to proceed after the restoration. Currently, the THCCA promotes interchange among residents, tourists, and other visitors at THAV (see the next section for details) by operating the THAV Specialty Grocery Store (Figure 4 red circle), which offers residents’ home cooking and locally grown products, as well as through various participatory events (see yellow circle Figure 4).

3.3. Legalization process of THS

The legalization process of THS for local residents is summarized in Figure 5 and as follows.

(1) Designation as Cultural Heritage and Preservation: as already mentioned that TH and THS were designated Monument and Group of Buildings in 1997 and 2011, respectively. This provides the basis for the legalization of SS, namely the existing houses in the THS.

(2) Restoration: In 2003, upon the formation of the THCCA community organization, arrangements for the “village/art exhibit area” advanced. First, Taipei City agreed in 2004 to “permit resettlement after village preservation/restoration work” to the 22 households that were unwilling or unable to leave. In 2005, the architecture studio headed by former professor John K.C. Liu of NTUBP was contracted by the DCA for a “THACO-OP Restoration Design Plan.” Therefore, 87 of existing houses were earmarked

---

3John K.C. Liu, the former NTUBP professor who handled the THACO-OP Restoration Design Plan (see Section 4 for details), says, “At the time, there were many elderly and socially vulnerable people at THS, and in response to their arguments for ‘respect for residents’ rights’ and ‘preservation of cultural heritage,’ the DSW, in charge of the former, said ‘the issue is cultural heritage, so the DCA should handle it,’ while the DCA said ‘the issue is socially vulnerable people, so it’s the DSW’s problem.’ As a result of NTU’s active survey of residents’ status and notification of Taipei City, DCA Chief Lung Ying-tai agreed to act positively.” Thereafter, the DCA played an active role from the cultural heritage designation through the plan for preservation and revitalization. In addition, through the active participation of the DCA head, the atmosphere changed from one of eviction to one of preservation and revitalization, putting the DCA in the lead from the cultural heritage designation through the THAV planning concept and then on to realization; thereafter, it became the most important factor in realizing preservation and revitalization.

4In particular, important factors in carrying out the plan were convincing the opposing residents on a resident-to-resident basis and working with opposing activists who had occupied empty houses in the village. In short, the association played various important roles by not simply negotiating with Taipei City as a community organization but also convincing opposing residents within the village; bridging the gaps among agreeing residents, residents in general, and the city; and coordinating the improvement of residents’ solidarity. In addition to the DCA’s strong leadership as noted above, the activity of the association was also an important factor in bringing about preservation and revitalization. This content was gleaned from interviews with Mr. Chang, the first chair of the association, and from Taipei City Archives (2011).
for repairs and rehabilitation while others that are difficult to repair have been removed. In 2006, work began according to the above design plan. The characteristics of the restoration were as follows.

- Restoration targets: Mainly empty houses and houses at risk of collapse, as well as the removal of existing walls and changes to freely adjustable room arrangements for conformity with THAV revitalization.
- Restoration methods: Mainly small-scale repairs, structural reinforcements, and roof repairs, focusing on plumbing, lighting, and facilities construction (Figure 6-(1)).
- Restoration materials: Given the important principle of coexistence with nature, many natural materials were used in the restoration (Figure 6-(2)).

(1) Temporary relocation: Notably, existing residents’ houses needing preservation were also targeted for reconstruction, and intermediate housing (Figure 6-(3)) was found for residents during construction. The transfer of existing residents was completed in 2007.
(2) Relocation: 22 of existing households started to return to the repaired houses after the restoration work since October 2009. Today, they pay for 2,000–2,500NTD (approximately 0.034USD) per month as house rent to Taipei City Government according to their house area. In other words, the SS itself has undergone the process of legalization such as the designation of cultural properties and restoration, but the existing residents are not given the property right of the house or the land right, but only the residence right.

From the case of THS in Taipei City, although the SS itself is undergoing the process of legalization, instead of approving the ownership of the houses or lands to the existing residents of SS (Pojani 2013) or providing alternative housing (Sengupta and Sharma 2009; Uzun, Çete, and Palancoğlu 2010) outside the SS as in the case of overseas, Taipei City Government owns the land right and the property right of houses after the restoration, and rents it to the existing residents. This kind of approach might be quite similar to the case of Favela Bairro slum-upgrading program (FBP) of Rio de Janeiro (Handzic 2010).

3.4. Characteristic of preservation of THS

It was clear that THS had strong characteristics as an SS while around 84.9% of existing residents might lose their residence because of eviction. Due to the strong support of NTUBP and the significant role of DCA, THS was finally preserved and designated as cultural heritage through the legalization process. On the other hand, existing residents are granted only the residential right, not the ownership of the land or building. Considering the fact that existing residents were not resettled to another house but to the restored existing housing without being given any property right, THS might be considered as a mixed type of “legalization of the ownership of buildings and land of SS,” and “legalization of residence rights of SS residents.”

4. Transformation into THAV and revitalization

In October 2005, to create a system and structure enabling operation with an eye to THAV’s future, the NTUBP-linked Organization of Urban Re-s (OURs) was contracted by the DCA to create the “THACO-OP Operation Management Plan.” Drafts were prepared for the “Change of Taipei City Zhongzheng Park 297 Area to Treasure Hill Historical Art Village Designated Area” and for “Detailed Plan for Treasure Hill Historical Art Village Designated Area.” Because the existing park area plan required changes in urban planning, the adoption of these drafts at the 550th

---

1 The “Detailed Plan” in urban planning in Taiwan refers to a plan regulating detailed applications and land use conditions for a relatively small area, mainly as a supplement to the main plan. It usually reflects opinions and requests collected from residents through the resident participation process.
meeting of the Taipei City Urban Planning Commission produced the needed conditions for the organization of THAV. 

After the restoration work as mentioned in 3.3, THAV in its current form opened officially in October 2010, operated by the Taipei Culture

---

6 Based on regulations such as the Urban Planning Law in Taiwan, this refers to a third-party organization created from academic experts, etc. to discuss urban plans made by the Taipei City Government.
Foundation (TCF) and Good Morning Culture (GMC) as DCA-designated managers. In addition, the Treasure Hill Artivists CO-OP (THACO-OP), serving as the name of multiple plans, took as its objective for the existing residents, the artists who arrived after THAV operation began, and other related parties, to respect one another in addition to the waterfront and the surrounding nature.

4.1. Spatial characteristics of THAV

(1) Separation of THAV and residential areas

As shown in Figure 4, the buildings open to the public are separate from the Treasure Hill Homeland (THH), which is home to the existing residents. Accordingly, lines of transit within the village have been planned to remain separate, with consideration for residents’ daily lives. However, there are three locations where the two come into contact (see purple circles in Figure 4).

First, the entrance/exit points to the residential area and THAV coincide at the village entrance past the TH reliquary shrine. Furthermore, the large plaza at the village center is regularly open to the public, forming a common boundary with the residential area to the left. Finally, the open lines of transit to the riverbank overlap with those from the residential area.

In addition, the two areas are separate in spatial management as well, with THAV operated by TCF as the DCA-designated manager and DHH equally operated and managed by GMC. In addition, THH has a designated manager because the city essentially owns THS, with rental contracts signed with the resettled existing residents on a 2-year renewal basis.

However, as noted above, THAV’s principles of “coexistence” mean that residents usually welcome tourists, who are barely a problem as long as they behave as ordinary visitors and respect residents’ privacy and local etiquette.

(1) Provision of various spatial functions

As shown in Figure 7, THAV has various spatial functions for the newly entering artists and tourists. First, the Artists’ Atelier includes 14 artists’ studios usable for two- or three-month short stays, and 15 micro-lofts usable for concentrated creative work at THAV for up to 2 years. Further, the TAV-Attic Hostel has eight rooms (18 beds) for backpackers. In addition, with 22 existing residents’ households, visitors and tourists are entering and leaving daily, creating a perennially renewing space that constantly enables various contacts and conversations.

### Table 3. THS and TH as cultural heritage.

| Characteristic | TH | THC |
|---------------|----|-----|
| **Type of cultural heritage** | Monument | Group of Buildings |
| **Designation criteria** | | |
| (1) Historical, cultural value | | |
| (2) Value as a monument | | |
| **Designation reason** | Value for preservation | Historical value as representative independent construction by military personnel and the socially vulnerable such as immigrant workers and indigenous residents in the postwar city |
| | Restoration began in Dec. 2008 and finished in Oct. 2009. Currently 87 buildings, with 22 existing households resettled in after restoration, adding THAV for dynamic preservation of the entire village. |
| **Status** | Current use as the TH reliquary shrine, the faith center for the region. | |
| **Zoning** | Preservation area. | “Specific dedicated area” used for THAV exhibits and atelier space |

Source: Amended and created based on the data of Hsiao (2018).

(1) Diverse arrangements of public space

As in Figure 7, THAV provides diverse public spaces, utilizing its existing 10 green areas and plazas and adding five lawns and exhibition spaces, etc., open to the public. Attributes of use include exhibition spaces for artworks and multifunction areas that even first-time tourists can easily use, as well as those that are mainly for residents’ use; the newly added five spaces mainly function as exhibition spaces.

4.2. Characteristics of the SS passed on to THAV

The various spatial characteristics of today’s post-rehabilitation THAV draw on those of its past life as an SS, as below.

(1) Spaces with human-scale density: In the SS, spaces with human-scale density naturally arose because of the limitations of the topography and land area. The outlines of these spaces remain perfectly retained, with the distances
between the newly entering artists, tourists, etc. naturally shrinking so that space enables stimulation for conversation and interchange. The top portion of Figure 8 shows an example of one building at THAV.

(2) Spaces serving as organic gathering places: In the SS, all of the spaces were effectively used to the maximum extent, with even small spaces in the dense village organically forming gathering places. For example, areas shown in Figure 7, (1), (3), (5), (6), (8), and (10) are now naturally occurring spaces for residents to share interchanges with artists and tourists in the existing plazas and green areas of the village.

While using the above existing spatial characteristics – by organizing new public spaces and providing new spatial functions, such as the atelier and accommodation areas (see Figure 8 bottom) – the production of the space enables the existing residents to maintain their daily lives while artists and other newcomers can use the space easily, creating various conversations and interchanges.

### 4.3. Value of THS as cultural heritage: a group of buildings

Because of the efforts of the community organization THCCA and the expert support of NTUBP, Treasure Hill and THS were designated cultural heritage sites (monuments) in 1997 and 2004, respectively, followed by the operation of the entire village as THAV in 2010. Moreover, responding to the amended law, THS designation as a group of buildings was granted in 2011.

The characteristics and value of this cultural heritage are organized in Table 3 based on information from the designating DCA and the national Ministry of Cultural Affairs.

Notably, THS positive evaluation as a group of buildings rests on its “historical value as a representative example of independent construction by military personnel and the socially vulnerable such as migrant workers and indigenous residents in the postwar city,” characterized as “a typical postwar SS village” (Bureau of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Culture (BOCH), Republic of China (Taiwan) 2017). This case is remarkable in that an SS has been recognized for its value as a cultural heritage after previously receiving minimal attention for its cultural or historical value. Furthermore, the SS has not only been preserved but also witnessed 22 households of existing residents resettled there, using the dynamic preservation of its transformation as THAV.

Further, focus on the value of THC as cultural heritage, “group of buildings,” Table 4 summarizes the building characteristic of THC. Although the preservation criteria of THS as a group of buildings is not clearly digitized, according to the building characteristics described by the Bureau of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Culture (BOCH), Republic of China (Taiwan) (2017), “The construction method of the buildings is for the urban disadvantaged groups to build and erect their own structures. Most of the structures are made of wood, brick, reinforced brick, and a small part of it is concrete”. As shown in Table 4, in THS, more than 65.1% of buildings are constructed with simple and cheap building structure including wood, brick, wood, and brick mixed and reinforced brick, the historical value of self-construction by residents who are in poverty with limited building materials during the postwar period can be seen.

Another significance of THS is that it was the first SS in Taiwan to be recognized the value of cultural heritage and was registered as “group of buildings.” As shown in Table 5, all 18 groups of buildings currently registered in Taiwan might be roughly divided into three according to their age and form. First might be the traditional villages of the Han people and indigenous peoples before the beginning of the Japanese colonial in 1895. Next is the pre-war dormitory village for such as government officers or factory workers during the Japanese colonial period from 1895 to 1945 before the end of World War II. The third one is the postwar dormitory village for military and production government officers after 1945, when the Japanese era ended with World War II. The case of THS is the first and only case of SS registered as a group of buildings which cannot be categorized by the above three groups. Furthermore, as already mentioned, the history of THS can be traced back to the Qing dynasty, and after several eras such as the Japanese colonial and the postwar period, the value of cultural heritage due to the unique building characteristics of SS has been accumulated gradually. Since

| Table 4. Value as cultural heritage: the building characteristics and structures of THS. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wood and Brick Mixed | Reinforced Brick | Reinforced Concrete | Total |
| **Unit** | Wood | Brick | | | |
| **Percentage** | 6 | 57 | 14 | 10.6% | 4.5% | 6.8% | 34.8% | 100.0% |

| Table 5. Registered list of all “group of buildings” in Taiwan. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Traditional villages (Before 1895) | Pre-war dormitory villages (1895–1945) | Postwar dormitory villages (After 1945) | Squatter settlement | Total |
| **Amount** | 10 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| **Percentage** | 55.6% | 16.7% | 22.2% | 5.5% | 100% |
the values and significance that the residents themselves attach to various parts of their dwellings in SS in Riobamba, Ecuador has already been clarified (Klaufus 2000), the case of THS can be an important opportunity and experience not only for the attachment of SS as a residence of individual residents but also for the reevaluation of the value of SS as the cultural heritage, “group of building” consisting of multiple informal buildings with historical and tacit knowledge.

5. Process for preservation and revitalization through community participation in THAV

Figure 8 shows the process that took THS from a mere SS slated for removal to a cultural heritage site designated for preservation and revitalization through community participation.

(1) 1985 to 1995

As Figure 8 shows, until recently, THS was the target of clearance as an illegal SS and was threatened with removal on the pretext of park planning. Individual residents gave in to the authorities without banding together, and many left the village altogether. However, attention from society increased, leading to the second stage. At this stage, the degree of community participation was weak, as few residents participated in the preservation movement of THS, which was still treated as an SS.

(1) 1996 to 2006

During the first half of this stage, the eviction policy was still in force, in accordance with which the Taipei City Government’s DSW surveyed residents’ circumstances. Then, with the support of NTUBP and other external experts, the cultural and historical value of the village became recognized. Motivated by the designations of THAV as a cultural heritage site in 1997 and 2004 and by NTUBP’s demonstration of the potential for village-type preservation, residents began to organize. Community participation has been promoted mainly by the community organization THCCA, formed in 2003, and has been manifested in diverse ways, including not only patrolling and cleaning work in the THS but promoting negotiations and agreements among residents. Thereafter, the city’s contracting plans led to the embodiment of the THAV concept on the premise of preservation. Further, plans were made for intermediate residences to guarantee resident transfer destinations, as well as changes to urban planning, and the conditions required to create THAV were achieved. In 2006 the restoration work for village preservation and rebuilding for use as THAV began. At this stage, with the establishment of THCCA, the community organization that leads community participation, many residents gradually became involved in the preservation and community activities in THS, and the degree of community participation increased and reached a medium level. This stage was an important turning point for active community participation in the next stage.

(1) 2007 to present

In 2007, the transfer of existing residents to intermediate housing was completed, and in 2008, the restoration began in earnest. In 2009, the existing residents returned. Then, in 2010, THAV opened officially. Further, in 2011, THS as a whole was designated a cultural heritage group of buildings village, thereby
further enhancing community participation. Currently, TCF and GMC, respectively, operate and manage THAV and THH as DCA-designated managers, with active cooperation from THCCA, the community organization, and a three-way cooperative management system among residents, the private sector, and Taipei City.

In this way, THS changed from an SS slated for clearance and eviction through support from experts and the effects of community organization to achieve cultural heritage designation, organizing THAV as a form of dynamic preservation of the entire village. Further, it entered a period of renaissance as a space for varied interchange and dialog among diverse subjects, from resettled residents to newly settled artists, the designated manager TCF, and visitors. At this stage, strong community participation has been realized, as not only the community organization THCCA but residents themselves actively participate in the operation of THAV operation and actively interact with tourists of THAV.

To summarize the preservation and revitalization process of THS, emphatic lobbying for preservation movement proposed by the external experts motivated not only the residents but also DCA. Active lead from DCA in response to the preservation movement further motivated the community participation while THCCA was founded consequently. Finally, THCCA as well as residents’ solidarity and spontaneous community participation within the operation of THAV have been evolved. In addition to the DCA’s leading role and the strong support of NTUBP, the most important factor seems to be the multi-aspect role played by THCCA as a community organization (negotiating with Taipei City, convincing opposing residents, bridging the gap between agreeing residents and the city, and encouraging residents’ solidarity) (Hsiao, 2018). In the process of preservation and revitalization of THS, clear growth in the degree of community participation was observed. In addition, toward the realization of THS preservation and revitalization, with the DCA in the lead, legitimacy was achieved through the effective use of the “cultural heritage” designation at the preservation stage and “urban planning” at the revitalization stage, in cooperation with the Department of Urban Development, making THAV what it is today.

In regard to preservation, in the transition from the THS cultural heritage designation toward the preservation plan from the early 1990s on, both “respect for residents’ rights” and “preservation of cultural heritage” were emphasized, on the premise of the opposition to eviction. Further, with the 1997 designation as cultural heritage of the Treasure Hill reliquary shrine, which was the village’s center of faith, and with its basis in the CHPA, the process shifted from eviction to preservation and revitalization. Important therein were the NTUBP, already a powerful backup for the residents, and the THCCA, the symbol of the residents’ own solidarity, while the DCA’s positive stance was important as well.

THS can be also considered as a unique case considering the aspect of the legal framework. Since existing residents were not resettled to other housing but returned to the restored existing housing with property rights, THS might be considered as a mixed type of “legalization of the ownership of buildings and land of SS” and “legalization of the residence rights of SS residents.”

Concerning revitalization, although the experience of being reborn from THS to THAV has some similarities with the Gamcheon Culture Village case, THAV has many spatial characteristics due to the restoration that transcend the mere maintenance of its value as cultural heritage. First, by separating THAV, which is open to the public, and THH, which is not, the existing residents’ privacy and living spaces have been respected. Further, by adding various spatial functions, ateliers and accommodation have become available to a multinational, multi-area array of artists for residence and use according to their purposes, realizing THAV’s variety-rich spatial planning. Thus, in the diverse public spaces throughout the village, artists and visitors can make contact with residents and easily create spaces for interchange and conversation. In particular, it can be said that the operation of THAV with the community participation takes full advantage of the possibility of such spatial characteristics.

Community participation stimulated by external cooperation from experts outside the community may have been the most important factor leading to the success of preservation and revitalization of THS. Opposition to eviction arose at THS in the early 1990s, through calls for the preservation of cultural heritage as well as respect for residents’ rights, and this majorly affected Taipei City’s policymaking with the support of experts such as those of NTUBP and OURs. As the national government’s confusion over operation and acceptance of the new CHPA law came and went in the background, the DCA’s active role in working toward the cultural heritage designation became clear.

Further, the role of the community organization therein was also a significant part of community participation. THCCA, formed independently by about 40 residents, has worked consistently not only to enhance

6. Summary and discussion

This paper has focused on the value of the SS as cultural heritage, and based on the globally unusual status of preservation and revitalization of this case study, has verified the possibility of utilizing the value of cultural heritage embedded in SSs by community participation through a case study of THS.
solidarity among residents but also to gain agreement among residents in the planning stages, to manage the THAV during restoration, and to handle local activities thereafter. They still operate the Specialty Grocery Store and promote various initiatives aimed at encouraging interchange at THAV among residents, artists, tourists, and visitors. Further, due to this kind of effort, the degree of community participation has clearly grown during the process of preservation and revitalization of THS as THAV.

The outcome of this paper has been to clarify the potential for the preservation and revitalization of SS as cultural heritage and the specific process thereof, with THS in Taipei City as a case study. The civic practices of new social movements and historical knowledge that emerge from the context of informal and neglected urban environments such as SSs illustrate emergent answers to the exclusionary dynamics of urban heritage planning (Weiss 2014). Although THS used to be stigmatized as an SS, it has turned out to be one of the most important tourist spots today in Taipei City as THAV, after the preservation and revitalization based on its value as a group of buildings. The revitalization case of THAV after the preservation of THS has not only proved the static value of SS as cultural heritage for the first time in Taiwan, but has also clarified the possibility of how SS may become irreplaceable spaces in the city by dynamically revitalizing their value.

This paper has verified how community participation might motivate the preservation and revitalization of SSs. Moreover, the process of movement from THS to the revitalization of THAV has been clarified, and the discussion has shed light on the current three-way cooperative operation system among residents, the private sector, and Taipei City. Future research will need to focus on the results of THAV’s operation since its opening in 2010 and the status of the improvement in its operation through resident participation. Finally, regarding the three-way cooperative operation system, an objective evaluation of its more specific results and effects is called for.
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