

공유경제 기반의 지역맞춤형 공동체주거 조성 방안 연구

Planning at Local Level : Community Housing based on the Sharing Economy

변나향 Byun, Nahyang
윤주선 Yoon, Zoosun
박석환 Park, Seokhwan

(a u r i

Planning at local level: community housing based on the sharing economy

SUMMARY

1. Introduction

This study has established its research direction and purpose through research questions: ① What does community housing mean, as used in Korea? ② What business projects and laws and systems are available as related to community housing? and ③ What is the current status of community housing (share house) that is sharply increasing lately with the interest in the concept of sharing? To address the institutional limitations that show after the emergence of community housing and through its expansion, this study reviews the concept of community housing and explores a plan to ensure that its creation considers regional circumstances by identifying the current related business projects and legislations.

The study has the following goals. First, it will present the concept of community housing. Second, it will present a plan to create community housing that takes into consideration regional circumstances and potential users (the youth). Third, it will present a plan to upgrade related systems with the aim of creating and activating quality community housing. The ultimate purpose of the study is to induce the creation of community housing that focuses on regional characteristics and various social groups through restoring the local community.

2. Concept of community housing

Community housing is a concept which comprises residence type and residential mode, and ① includes common spaces and facilities that are physically shared and ② has a covenant among residents for using, operating and managing the common spaces and facilities. In the public-style management, the study classifies the types according to how the common spaces are created and used in community housing. This is related to how far community spirit is pursued and whether different households are distinguished.

Firstly, common spaces are provided as common areas. Different households are distinguished physically by the front door, room, and living room, while the residents of different households create common spaces as accessory facilities through agreement. In this case, demonstrating strong community spirit, residents sometimes engage in the entire project for creating a house. Classified as design concepts, co-housing, collective housing, and co-op house are included in this category, which is instanced in the homes built in community housing project and housing co-op currently implemented by Seoul Metropolitan City.

The next category is the common spaces that are shared. This is about sharing common spaces in the existing housing structure or physical space. The physical sharing of spaces varies, ranging from sharing the front door, living room, kitchen, and bathroom except the bedroom or sharing other spaces than the bedroom and bathroom. In this category, the community spirit shown by the residents is weaker than in the previous one, thus registering further difference in social exchange as well. Room share, flat share, share house, and group home fall into this category.

This study focuses its examination on share house, the type of community housing that shares common spaces. However, as for the need to legislate on community housing and what is considered for the housing classification system as specified in the related law as a new type of housing, the study treats the directions for improving the system by reviewing the results of the current situation in South Korea and overseas systems.

3. Community housing and its issues

If we look at the current laws related to community housing, we see that it is not specified as a type of housing based on the Building Act and Housing Act but is supplied in various types such as apartments, houses, multi-household & multi-family housing, gosiwon ('a very small room for students preparing for an exam'), dormitory, and multi-studio housing. As public interest in and demand for community housing increase lately, light is being brought on the abuses related to a living arrangement that shares living room and kitchen. On the contrary, some people arbitrarily remodel multi-studio housing where independent cooking for separate units is not possible into an illegal building where separate residences are possible.

The issues with the current laws may be summarized as follows. On the Framework Act on Residence and Housing Act, there is no comprehensive basic principle on community housing. Since it is hard to classify as any one existing type of housing, its current planning criteria and safety standard are inadequate and there is no minimum residential standard including the regulations for getting common spaces and facilities that meet the characteristics of community housing.

Currently created share houses are mostly located in Seoul. By region, most of them are in Seoul. As of Dec. 1, 2017, a total of 314 share houses (including households and families) were registered nationwide with 1,398 rooms and 2,407 beds. By use, 314 share houses included 119 apartments, 118 multi-household houses, 43 houses, and 16 buildings entirely used as share house as well as 10 other instances. Most of the share houses were either apartments or multi-households houses. To classify share houses created by quarter, we see that the number of share houses rapidly increased over the last one or two years. Especially, the early half of 2017 saw a sharp increase in them; Q1 and Q2 of 2017 accounted for over 50% of all with 86 share houses.

4. Overseas cases: policy and standards related to community housing

As for the related overseas policies, systems, and standards, I examined the sharehouse in Japan, 'house in multiple occupation' in the UK, single room

occupancy (SRO) in the US, and rooming house in Australia and Canada. In Japan, being quite similar to South Korea, the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism conducted two surveys of the actual status of its nationwide sharehouses and published the Sharehouse Guidebook in 2017 with the aim of providing information on the operation and management of share houses. The Guidebook includes ‘Share house Overview’, ‘Different Stages of Share house Operation & Management and Key Precautions’, and Share house Precautions for Those Specially Considered for Housing Needs’. The UK and the US enforce residential space management system, which is concerned with multiple residentially challenged persons residing in a house. It presents the standards for common spaces such as bedroom and hygienic facilities according to the number of residents. Following the fires at rooming houses, Australia and Canada came up with fire safety standard, and ensured living safety by providing minimum living standards.

Implications from the analysis of related overseas systems and standards are as follows. First, there is an approach customized to the social groups for the residents. Different countries adopt different approaches depending on the characteristics of the livelihoods of residents. Second, it is about recognizing the importance of the execution and monitoring of community housing management system. Most of the overseas instances reveal insufficiency in the compliance with established regulations and the management of permit acquisition. Third, community housing planning standard has been established for ensuring minimum residential quality. As many of the rooming houses in Canada and Australia are remodeled from houses, the countries have limitations in providing specific guidelines as for SRO and HMO.

5. Community housing: planning at local level and improving system

The plan to create a region-adapted community housing has been presented with a focus on the characteristics of the regions where share houses are located, the social groups as potential users by region, physical conditions, and resident interview. Regions can be divided into ① residential & commercial district close to university, ② commercial district centering on subway stations, and ③ senior

residence & commercial district. There are many districts close to universities, as a lot of college students or graduates preparing to get a job reside to use the colleges and nearby facilities (private academies and libraries). Commercial districts centering on subway stations, where residents can walk to subway stations or bus stops, are highly in demand among college students, corporate employees, and others. In Seoul metropolitan region, they are districts with high housing costs. Residential & commercial districts, where dilapidated areas or outdated buildings mass have had residential spaces created in connection with youthful entrepreneurship spaces. As different regions show differences in residential users, mode of housing, and livelihood, a community housing project needs to take them into account. Along with the plans to create community housing in different regions, I have suggested other common details related to the creation of share houses. The reason is that the information on share houses and the understanding of life in a share house remain unsatisfactory. Thus, I have suggested share house operation mode, cautions, residents, operators, considerations for housing owner and construction project owner.

As for possible improvements to the related systems, the concept of residence needs to expand from the previous family-focused on to the one that reflects the mode of residence and family composition of the shared housing. Planning standards for users and size of common living space should be created. For quality living environment in sharehouses, appropriate residential standards are needed for common and private spaces. More than anything else, on top of the region-specific creation plans, we need universally applicable guidelines that can be referred to in all regions.

6. Conclusion

First, the study has examined the meaning of community housing and defined the concept of community housing in terms of mode of residence. This is significant, in that it has clarified the concept of the currently unclear concept of community housing and created a basis for follow-up research for different types of community housing. Second, the study has analyzed the on-going domestic community housing projects and related systems, thus bringing light on their

issues. This will serve as the basis on which possible upgrades of the related laws and systems are explored for the purpose of responding to changes in family structure and diverse needs for housing. Third, the study has identified major issues through a survey of the actual status of share houses. It is significant, in that it has suggested the perception, advantages and disadvantages, demand, and prospects with regard to share houses through a nationwide investigation of the actual residence of the youth and interviews with the residents who lived in share houses. Lastly, the study has suggested the plan to create community housing according to regional conditions and the plan to upgrade related systems while focusing on share houses, which will be used as grounds for establishing and upgrading related guidelines related to share houses.

The study has limitations, in that it has conducted its survey of the current status of community housing with a focus on the youth and share houses. About community housing, other types of residence than share house needs to be researched. The users need to be expanded to include middle-aged and aged people, while diverse family composition including single-person family needs to be studied.

Keywords :

sharing economy, community housing, planning at local level, shared space, share house