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ABSTRACT

While cities across the world are adopting urban sustainability plans and pursuing ‘sustainable development,’ the question of how these urban sustainability plans have made our cities indeed sustainable is a subject of debate. Some scholars are skeptical about whether urban sustainability planning challenges or reproduces existing power imbalance in the growth politics in cities. Given the current trend that the concept of sustainability has become embedded in our culture, little is known about the urban politics around urban sustainability plans and their effectiveness in promoting balanced sustainability in Asian cities. Using a case study of Seoul through in-depth interviews, this study examines the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of sustainability plans in Seoul. As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state, Korea serves as an example of how these transformations are likely to have for the urban politics of sustainability policies in other Asian countries. As conclusions, developmental states like Korea with a centralized governance system tend to use a “sustainability fix” that is heavily focused on ‘pro-growth’ development. With globalization, privatization, and democratization, the growth machine politics around urban sustainability planning in Korea is similar to that observed in the Western context. However, in Seoul, the growth machine is heavily influenced by the federal government and Mayoral leadership. This is because of the embedded legacy of the developmental state. In addition, with increased democratization and a growing role of civic groups in urban politics, we see a move towards “just sustainability” in urban sustainability planning in Korea.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the advice and support of my committee, with special thanks to Christina Rosan for guiding me through this process. My dissertation could not have been written without Christina Rosan who not only served as my advisor but also encouraged and challenged me throughout my doctoral program. Her encouragement, professional advice, and insight led me to complete this dissertation, as well as to navigate my academic way. I also thank Dr. Hamil Pearsall and Dr. Jacob Shell for generously providing their expertise, thoughtful comments, and supporting me throughout this process.

I am immensely thankful for the unconditional love and devotion of my lovely family, Gyeja Ga, Taewoo Jung, Seonghee Jung, and Seonglip Jung, whose support keep me grounded and motivated, from distant South Korea through this doctoral program.

I also thank Ritwika Biswas, Susan Kum, Minju Choi, Wanhee Kim, and the other friends in Philadelphia for providing sincere support and advice through this challenging time. I feel indeed blessed to have the support from such generous and talented friends in Philadelphia. I would like to thank a number of important individuals as well, Sanho Seok, Kyunghae Jung, Jaemin Lee, Jinwon Bae, Namsook Kim, Dongwook Yoon, Sunhyuk Gang, and Dongwan Han, keeping me concrete and stable with their support and belief towards me through my life.

Lastly, my dissertation has benefited from the financial support of Temple University, which allowed me to solely focus on conducting my fieldwork in Seoul, South Korea, and writing this dissertation.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION
   - Background                                   | 1  
   - Rationale for Study                          | 3  
   - Research Questions                            | 7  
   - Research method                               | 7  
   - The outline of the dissertation               | 8  

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
   - Introduction                                  | 10  
   - Urban Sustainability                          | 11  
   - The Three Pillars of Sustainability          | 11  
   - Defining Sustainability in the Context of Urban Area | 12  
   - Measuring Sustainability                      | 14  
   - Connecting Urban Sustainability to Urban Strategy | 17  
   - Urban Revitalization and Sustainability       | 17  
   - Selective Sustainability and Green Washing Strategies | 19  

v
Globalization and Competitive Urban Policy ........................................ 21
Growth Machine and Urban Sustainability ......................................... 23
Just Cities .......................................................................................... 26
Urban Sustainability in Asian Cities .................................................. 27
Urban Politics in Seoul ....................................................................... 32
Seoul As a Global City ........................................................................ 32
Developmental State .......................................................................... 33
Growth Machine and Developmental States ...................................... 35

3. METHODOLOGY .............................................................................. 40
   Introduction ....................................................................................... 40
   Case Study as a Research Design ................................................... 41
      A Case Study of Seoul ................................................................. 42
      The Selection of Cases: Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project and Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project ........................................... 44
   Mixed Method Analysis .................................................................... 47
   Archival Analysis ............................................................................. 48
   Qualitative Analysis ........................................................................ 48
   Cross-case Analysis ......................................................................... 52

4. HISTORY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERN IN KOREA .......... 58
   Introduction ....................................................................................... 58
   An Overview of the Urbanization .................................................... 58
   Urbanization Challenges Facing Seoul .......................................... 60
   Democratization in Korea ............................................................... 61
Late Development of Urban Policy.................................................................64

History of Urban Development in Korea.....................................................67
  The 1960s: The First Institutional Measure for Urban Planning
  Introduced to Manage Population Growth and Rapid Urbanization........67
  The 1970s: Expansion of Basic Infrastructure and
  the Emergence of South Seoul...............................................................68
  The 1980s: Government’s Intervention on Housing
  Development and Downtown Seoul Decline.............................................71
  The 1990s: New Towns and Democratization...........................................74
  The 2000s: Sustainable Urban Development...........................................76

Greenbelt...............................................................................................79

Seoul Mayors Characteristics for this research.............................................84

5. THE CHEONGGYEcheon RESTORATION PROJECT...............................88

  Introduction............................................................................................88
  Main Findings.........................................................................................90

History and Background of the Cheonggyecheon Project............................93

  Project Overview.....................................................................................93
  History of Cheonggyecheon.................................................................96
  Stream deterioration after the War.........................................................100

Urban Politics Surrounding the Cheonggyecheon Restoration.....................100

  Origin of the idea for the project..........................................................103
  Contending forces at the beginning of the project..................................106
  Restoring the Image of the City............................................................110
  Setting Up the Organization.................................................................115
Making the Master Plan.................................................................................119
Conflict Management.................................................................................121
Stakeholders..............................................................................................122
Urban Politics and Contested Restoration................................................133
How Sustainable the Cheonggyecheon is?..............................................137
Environment: Is it really environmentally sustainable?............................137
Equity: Gentrification...............................................................................141
Sustainability Fix and Selling a City..........................................................144

6. THE SEWOON SANGGA REGENERATION PROJECT..........................148
   Introduction............................................................................................148
   Main Findings.........................................................................................150
   Historical Background of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan..............152
   Historical Background of Sewoon Sangga.............................................152
   Discussion on the Demolition of the Sewoon Sangga..............................156
   The First Phase of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan:
   Greenway Project..................................................................................159
   Overview.................................................................................................159
   Economic Development Through the Greenway Project.........................163
   Creating Green Spaces in Compact City................................................166
   Public-Private Partnerships for the Greenway Project............................168
   Conflict Managements Among Stakeholders...........................................173
   Urban Regeneration in a Developmental State: Growth Machine Theory
   Application..............................................................................................178
   Partial Realization of the Greenway Project............................................183
The Second Phase of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan:
Remaking Sewoon Project..............................................................185

Overview.........................................................................................185
Contending Forces Around the Project.............................................187
Transforming Seoul into a Walkable City.........................................194
Focus on Social Aspect of Sustainability in Urban Policy..............197

7. CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS................................................................201
Overview.........................................................................................201
Cross-Case Analysis Results by Factor for General Characteristics
of the Projects..................................................................................202

Global City.......................................................................................204
Historical Recovery..........................................................................206
Use of Megaproject...........................................................................210
Reference to Other Policies...............................................................210
Process and Public Participation.......................................................215
Project Outcomes............................................................................219

Cross-case Analysis Results Based on the Observable Implications
for Assessing the Sustainability of the Plans....................................221

Democratic participation.................................................................223
Access to city amenities and creating vibrant urban spaces............223
Prevention of gentrification effects................................................224
Preservation of nature in a city........................................................224
Reducing the ecological footprint....................................................226

Cross-case Analysis Results for Growth Coalition..........................226
E. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE GREEN NETWORK PLAN............................................ 296
<ul><li>The classification of interview participants.................................50</li><li>Observable implications to evaluate the effectiveness of the sustainability projects....57</li><li>South Korean Governments and major characteristics since the 1960s..................63</li><li>The construction periods and the populations of five new towns.........................74</li><li>Mode shares for commuting trips in the Seoul Metropolitan area........................75</li><li>Seoul Mayors and their major characteristics.................................................85</li><li>History of plans regarding Sewoon Sangga regeneration.................................157</li><li>Business operation method comparison for the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project..........................................................................................................................171</li><li>Cross-case analysis results by factor for general characteristics of the projects.....203</li><li>Comparison between Co-op City in NY and Greenway Project Plan in Seoul.......213</li><li>Cross-case analysis results using observable implications for assessing the sustainability....................................................................................................................222</li><li>Stakeholders’ benefits and costs by the implementation of each project.........227</li></ul>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The locations of Cheonggyecheon project and Remaking Sewoon project</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Prohibited Areas in Seoul Metropolitan Area in the 1970s</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The locations of the five new towns developed between 1989 and 1995</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greenbelt Zone around Seoul Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Location of the Cheonggyecheon</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Before and after of Cheonggyecheon Project</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strategic location of Hanyang (Ancient Seoul)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Cheonggyecheon and its Tributaries</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cheonggyecheon served as a public space in 1883</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cheonggyecheon covered by a highway in the 1970s</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cheonggyecheon as a public space</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The triangular governance structure of the project</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sewoon Sangga in 1967</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Green network plan in Seoul</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The location of the Sewoon Sangga and a Greenway Project on the site in 2006</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District in 2004</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Central Park of the master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District in 2004</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The locations of Jung-Gu administrative district</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High-rise landmark plan suggested by Jung-gu office and Award winning</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Demolition of Hyundai Sangga.................................................................184
22. The Seoullo 7017 plan presented by SMG..................................................195
23. Pedestrian bridge plan crossing over the Cheonggyecheon.............................196
24. Diagram for ‘Garden City’ by Ebenezer Howard............................................212
25. Green roof plan of the Remaking Sewoon Project suggested by SMG...............225
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

We live in an urbanized world. Over half of the world’s population lives in dense urban areas today (UN, 2014). Since the world is increasingly urban, cities are the key to a sustainable future (Pickett et al., 2001; Rees and Wackernagel, 2008; Farr, 2008; Wheeler, 2013). Today’s cities consume more than two-thirds of the world’s energy and account for more than 70 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions (Cities, 2011; Birol, 2008). Urban development has been accompanied by economic growth and prosperity, yet it has generated many environmental and social problems. Therefore, the sustainability of urban development is one of the essential issues facing humankind.

While cities across the world are adopting urban sustainability plans and pursuing ‘sustainable development’ instead of ‘development,’ the question of how these urban sustainability plans have made our cities indeed sustainable in terms of economically, environmentally, and socially, is a subject of debate. Some scholars are skeptical about whether urban sustainability planning challenges or reproduces existing power imbalance in the growth politics in cities. Kruger and Gibbs (2007) pointed out that the urban politics of sustainability has become instrumental in the process of sustainability planning, in which political realities force a focus on ‘pro-growth.’ McKendry (2008) argued that urban sustainability planning did not adequately address environmental and social justice and operated within a framework of the market theory. Given the current trend that the concept of sustainability has become embedded in our culture, we need to rigorously examine the urban politics around urban sustainability planning and the effectiveness of urban
sustainability plans in promoting the balanced sustainability in cities (Isenhour, McDonogh, & Checker, 2015). As sustainability becomes a pervasive framework, it concentrates on specific appealing issues such as environmental amenities, such as green open spaces and climate change, yet these policies leave out environmental justice issues (Checker, 2011; Finn & McCormick, 2011). This contradictory relationship between sustainable policies and inequitable urban redevelopment become more problematized as cities are becoming competitive global cities (Balibrea, 2001; While, Jonas, and Gibbs, 2004; Cho 2010).

While the most rapid urbanization is occurring in Asia (Demographia, 2013), most of the study on urban sustainability has been developed from US and European experiences, and Western urban planning concepts have been applied to the Asian megacities to enhance urban sustainability (Yokohari et al., 2000; Roy & Ong, 2011). Following rapid industrialization and urbanization in many Asian cities since the 1960s, the accumulation of capital and resources within cities has brought parallel issues of growth and sustainable development to the fore. Marcotullio (2001) argue that the “functional city system” within the Asia-Pacific increasingly is both the engine of urban growth and the force behind differentiating urban environmental and social issues. While globalization forces have been particularly strong within cities in the Asia-Pacific, Marcotullio (2001) emphasizes the role of locality in shaping urban development, arguing that “localization and globalization-driven progress have not translated into a particular path of development rather localities have demonstrated contextually specific paths” (Marcotullio, 2001, p. 578). Also, Yeah (2005) points out that culture-led urban regenerations have been a significant force of changes in many south-east Asian cities as the urban dynamics that
growth and sustainable development issues are increasingly prevailing in the urban politics in the context of Asia as well. Therefore, Asian cities are seemingly experiencing the emergence of the growth politics using the concept of sustainability with urban sustainability plans in their context. However, little is known about the urban politics around urban sustainability plans and their effectiveness in promoting balanced sustainability in Asian cities. Also, the recent socio-economic changes Asian cities are experiencing, such as rapid industrialization, globalization, decentralization, and rapid democratization, may provide different urban dynamics for the emergence of the combined effects of growth and sustainability development, which is not rigorously studied yet.

This study attempts to fill this gap in the field of the growth politics around sustainability in the Asian context by examining the urban dynamics around two recent urban sustainability case study projects in Seoul and their effectiveness in adequately addressing economic, environmental, and social issues. Knowing how this recent socio-economic transformation in Asian cities affect the urban politics around urban sustainability plans and the effectiveness of those plans will give useful insights to other Asian cities’ policymakers that are trying to improve the balanced sustainability and contribute to the academic literature on urban politics and sustainability.

Rationale for Study

This case of Seoul study examines the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of sustainability plans in Seoul paying attention to how growth coalitions have formed around the decision-making process of sustainability plans, critically examining how sustainable the plans are developed. For the case studies, two
urban sustainability projects, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project in 2005, turning a historic stream covered by a deteriorating highway into a public waterway, and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project, which was started as a Greenway Project in 2006 and converted to an adaptive-reuse project in 2015, preserving an old symbolic structure, were examined for this study. These two urban sustainability case projects were chosen considering their representativeness and contrasting features. The similar and different characteristics between two urban sustainability plans offer essential sources to explain the unique characteristics of the urban politics around sustainability plans in Seoul and how urban sustainability is evolving and changing in Seoul along with the social changes of rapid democratization and decentralization.

While there is considerable literature on urban sustainability, this research will add to the existing literature in several ways. First, while the most dramatic urban growth is occurring in Asia (Demographia, 2013), urban planning concepts that have developed from US and European experiences have been applied to the Asian cities (Yokohari et al., 2000; Roy & Ong, 2011), and little study is done exploring the generalization of Western theories in the Asian context. In particular, this study will examine whether a pro-growth coalition (Logan and Molotch, 1987), which has been prevailed in urban politics in the Western context, is applicable in the Korean context or not. How the balance of state powers and competencies, pressures and incentives variously enable and constrain urban environmental policies in different national-urban contexts is critical. As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state, known for its centralized governmental power along with its foremost state goal in economic development (Bae and Sellers, 2007), Korea offers an essential source of insight
into the meaning that these transformations are likely to have for the urban politics of sustainability policies in other Asian countries. The characteristics of developmental states have been influential in the politics especially around urban policies in Asian cities, including Korea, Japan, China, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong (Amsden, 1989). With specific attention to these transformations, such as globalization, decentralization, democratization, and their implications, theories from the Western settings can shed light on the recent politics of urban policy in Korea by providing frameworks to compare. A closer look at the applicability of these theories, however, suggests reasons why this politics might differ from as well as resemble the patterns from the United States.

Second, this research will examine urban sustainability more critically focusing on the social sustainability of urban sustainability plans in Seoul paying attention to how urban sustainability plans are implemented and the impacts they have on communities in Seoul. While numerous urban mega-projects and sustainability plans have attempted to reshape and regenerate the City of Seoul by enhancing urban environmental quality and the quality and functionality of public spaces (Hwang, 2014; Lim et al., 2013; Choi, 2007), those plans were mainly driven by top-down policies, considered to be the engine for the economic and spatial transformation of declining neighborhoods (Inroy, 2000; Couch et al., 2011). As sustainability has become a pervasive framework in Seoul like other cities, the centralized government utilized urban sustainability plans to refurbish the deteriorated areas at a local level and to promote the city of Seoul as a global city by emphasizing specific appealing issues of sustainability plans at a global level, leaving out justice issues. These negative social impacts by the implementation of urban sustainability plan have been problematized in Seoul as the Korean society has become democratized rapidly. However,
few studies (Schuetze, T., Chelleri, L., & Je, J. H., 2016) about the effectiveness of urban sustainability plans focusing on ‘just sustainability’ are done in Asian city context. In this context, a study on the planning process and the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project, an on-going project with a bottom-up approach focusing on social aspects of sustainability, may imply the need for more studies addressing social aspects of sustainability and explain the changing urban dynamics around urban sustainability plans by democratization in Seoul. The concept of “just sustainability” (Agyeman & Evans, 2003; Zeemering, 2009) will be emphasized in building a series of observable implications to evaluate the sustainability of the implementations of the case study projects in this research. Therefore, this research contributes to this literature by exploring how the urban politics and the impacts of the two urban sustainability plans have changed reflecting the changing socio-economic paradigm in Seoul.

Lastly, while most urban sustainability scholars on Asian megacities have focused on individual projects by using data from secondary datasets and available published reports and documentation (Bemgston & Youn, 2006; Chen, 2013, Shin & Lee 2006, Schuetze & Chelleri, 2015), this study will be one of the first detailed and critical studies examining two urban sustainability projects in an Asian city using a mixed method approach including in-depth interviews to explore the relationship between the urban politics and sustainability in Seoul.
Research Questions

The central research question this study aims to answer is:

- What were the dynamics of urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of urban sustainability megaprojects in Seoul and how effective were the megaprojects in promoting ‘just sustainability’?

In addition, this study addresses the following sub-questions:

- What visions and goals of the sustainability planning were reflected in the case sustainability projects in Seoul?
- What are the driving forces affecting the decision-making processes around urban sustainability planning in Seoul?
- Was the implementation of the urban sustainability megaprojects used as a ‘Sustainability fix’ to promote the City of Seoul as a global city?
- Are there growth coalitions among various stakeholders in the planning processes of urban greening projects in Seoul? How are they different or similar with the ones in the US cities?

Research method

This study examines the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of sustainability plans in Seoul. A case study was considered to be the most appropriate method of studying in-depth and multifaceted phenomena in a context which the researcher would rarely be able to control (de Vaus, 2001; Yin, 2009; Swanborn, 2010). Drawing on the relevant literature from Korea, two case study projects were selected: the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Remaking Sewoon Project.
These two urban sustainability projects were chosen considering the representativeness and contrasting features to explain both the characteristics of the urban politics around urban sustainability planning and the changes facing urban sustainability in Seoul.

The case studies for this study are conducted based on a mixed-method approach that includes process-driven qualitative analysis and outcome-driven quantitative analysis (Bryman, 2008). As a primary data collection method, the in-depth interviews were performed with key participants in the study cases. The governmental officials, academic experts, government research center researchers, NGO professionals, and residents were interviewed to uncover the urban politics behind the decision-making for urban sustainability plans and socio-economic impacts of the plans on local communities. Also, other data were collected from both qualitative and quantitative sources, such as relevant planning documents, statistical reports, and media publications. In addition, a set of observable implications to examine discourses around the sustainability plans and to assess plans' impacts on sustainability are developed, and the study cases are evaluated based on the developed implications using a cross-case analysis.

The outline of the dissertation

The dissertation is divided into eight chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the background, rationales for study, research questions, methodology and layout of the research. Chapter 2 consists of a comprehensive literature review covering the topics of the history of urban sustainability, urban revitalization, an urban policy as a greenwashing strategy, globalization's impacts on urban planning, characteristics of developmental states, just city, and the relationship between growth machine, developmental state, and urban
sustainability. Chapter 3 presents the methodological framework for the research. It explains the research methods to be used and details how the cases were selected, and the case studies conducted. Chapter 4 provide the history of urban development patterns in Korea, contextualizing how the central government has gained a strong power over urban policy in Korea. Chapter 5 examines the first case study project of this research, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project. This chapter explores the planning process of the plan, including the main actors, dominant forces, and contested stakeholders around the project, and evaluate the sustainability of the restoration plan. Chapter 6 explores the second case study project of the research, the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project. Since the project was divided into two phases, the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan (Greenway Project) and the second phase of the plan (Remaking Sewoon Project), both phases of the project will be examined about the urban politics of the decision-making process of and the impacts of the plans. Chapter 7 provides the cross-case analysis results to identify the similarities and differences among the case study projects, explaining the characteristics of urban sustainability plans since the 2000s and how the plans in the different timeline have evolved in Seoul. Finally, Chapter 8 concludes the dissertation, with summaries of the main findings of the study, the contribution of the research to the urban sustainability literature, and its limitations and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter is largely divided into four sections. The first section provides the introduction of urban sustainability, addressing the origins of the sustainability and sustainable development concepts, three pillars of sustainability, how to define sustainability in the context of the urban area, and how to measure sustainability. The second section covers the literature about connecting urban sustainability to urban strategies. This section started with the introduction of the relationship between urban revitalization and sustainability, and some arguments about the use of selective sustainability in urban strategies and the globalization's impacts on urban sustainability plans to make competitive urban policy will be followed. Then the relationship between the growth machine and urban sustainability will be introduced at the end of the second section. The third section addresses the emergence of literature on “just sustainability” and just cities, which will guide the framework to evaluate the effectiveness of case study sustainability projects in this research. The forth section provides literature on the urban politics in Seoul. After introducing the impacts of the globalization on the urban politics in Seoul, the literature on the characteristics of the development states will be introduced. Finally, the fourth section will be finished with the discussion on the growth machines in developmental states.
Urban Sustainability

The Origins of the Sustainability and Sustainable Development Concepts

Sustainable development has emerged as a new planning agenda (Beatley and Manning, 1998). The 1987 report, Our Common Future, from the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) set forth the most widely accepted definition of the concept: “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p. 45). The central goal of sustainable development is intergenerational equity, which implies fairness to coming generations. To help nations achieve this goal, the commission attempted to weave together multiple societal values to face the challenges of reducing overconsumption and poverty. These values are sometimes referred to as the three pillars of sustainable development: environment, economy, and equity. The WCED emphasized that the conventional economic imperative to maximize economic profits must be accountable to an ecological imperative to protect the ecosphere, and a social equity imperative to minimize human suffering.

The Three Pillars of Sustainability

Sustainability is a state of dynamic equilibrium achieved by taking responsibility for balancing long-term economic, environmental, and social health. The concept of sustainability has emerged from a global political process that has tried to bring together, simultaneously, the most powerful needs of our time: (1) the need for economic development to overcome poverty; (2) the need for environmental protection of air, water, soil, and biodiversity, upon which we all ultimately depend; and (3) the need for social
justice and cultural diversity to enable local communities to express their values in solving these issues (Newman and Kenworthy, 1999).

A widely accepted recognition of sustainable development in planning practice and urban governance is that it should simultaneously meet goals in the areas of environment, economy, and equity which are usually referred to as the “three Es” (Beatley, 1995; Beatley & Manning, 1997; Berke, 2002; Berke & Conroy, 2000; Campbell, 1996; Godschalk, 2004; Roseland, 2005; Wheeler, 2013). This combination is favored for its usefulness in addressing the complex nature of social and economic conflicts in environmental disputes (Campbell, 1996). Elkington (1998) denotes them as the three pillars of sustainability and emphasizes that responsible development practice requires consideration of profit in the three ways. Schoolman et al. (2012) argue that sustainability research should draw from the three pillars to live up to its interdisciplinary ideals.

Despite the universal agreement on the three pillars in sustainable development, there are arguments that certain aspects have precedence over others. Bithas and Christofakis (2006) argue that environmental sustainability is of primary importance over social and economic sustainability. The challenge is, however, that economic development gets the greatest attention when sustainability plans are actually put into practice (Tsenkova, 1999). The equity aspect of sustainability is seen as not getting the attention that is afforded to the other two (Agyeman & Evans, 2004; Dale & Newman, 2009).

**Defining Sustainability in the Context of Urban Area**

On the surface, sustainability is a simple concept: current and future generations must strive to achieve a decent standard of living for all people and live within the limits of natural systems. Despite this simplicity, there is no general agreement on how the
concept should be translated into practice. While no one is against the concept of sustainability itself, across different fields, its implementation is not immediately apparent. Even though there is a general agreement on the three pillars – environment, economy, and equity – some have suggested that certain aspects have precedence over others. Fernando (2003) claims that the Brundtland Commission definition focuses on development and does not call for a fundamental shift away from capitalist structure. Daly’s (1973) notion of steady-state economics suggests that economic systems should only grow at a rate such that natural resources can replenish themselves. This development represents a breakthrough in valuing the environment in ways that traditional economists have not. Some scholars prioritize environmental sustainability by arguing that environmental sustainability is of primary importance because neither social nor economic sustainability can be achieved without it (Goodland 1995; Bithas and Christofakis, 2006).

However, there is no consensus on how to define sustainability as to what city size, form, and spatial distribution of activities best facilitate the rational allocation of natural resources and minimize environmental impacts (Crane 1996; Munda, 2006; Shen et al., 2011). Thus, the concept of term of sustainability is hard to generalize, in turn, there is no single universal definition applicable to all communities. Sustainability also urges a more holistic approach in terms of scale – recognizing that social or economic processes at one scale may well be felt at multiple and different scales, and that these differences across scales need to be taken into consideration as well.

Ecologists look at the impact of the emergence of urbanization through an ecological approach in explaining how human-dominated ecosystems emerge from interactions between humans and ecological processes (Alberti et al., 2010). In contrast,
urbanists often focus on social and economic processes, paying little attention to environmental issues (Heynen, Kaika, and Swyngedouw, 2005). However, there has been a growing argument that the sharp separation between city and nature is false since they affect each other. Thus urban ecologists seek to integrate social economic processes into ecology and environmental perspectives into urbanism (Alberti et al., 2010; Spirn, 1984, McIntyre et al., 2000). Practically, planners approach to their city plans considering the interaction between environmental process and urban design, and paying attention to carrying capacity, protection of sensitive land, and watershed planning (McHarg, 1967; Schneider et al., 1978; Spirn, 1984; Steiner, 2012). As Roseland observes, “cities provide enormous, untapped opportunities to solve environmental challenges, and local governments must and can pioneer new approaches to sustainable development and urban management” (Roseland, 1992, p. 22), scholars see cities where we can have a significant impact on the environment by our practices.

**Measuring Sustainability**

Another way to define sustainability is in how it is measured. Indeed, despite sustainability’s creative ambiguity, there have been serious efforts to define it coming in the form of indicators. Having measuring tools is useful not only to define the concept, but to see how we progress toward sustainability, educate the public about the directions of current trends, and develop political support to change.

From the ecologists’ perspective, there is a strong need to acknowledge the fundamental limits of ecological systems – the finite limits on land, water, air, biological diversity, and other elements of the natural environment. Clearly, cities and urban development have tremendous ecological impacts. Concerns for environmental protection
and conservation are not new to the planning fields (McHarg, 1967). What is different is the commitment and priority given to respecting ecological limits in planning. Williams Rees (1992) developed an indicator, ecological footprint, measuring resources that are needed to sustain human demand on the earth.

The major strength of ecological footprint analysis is its conceptual simplicity, visualizing the impact of unsustainable current economic activities on the earth. In this context, ecological footprint analysis provides a tool to compare the relative effectiveness of alternative urban development patterns, transportation technologies, etc., in reducing urban ecological impacts. Lyle A. Walker (1995), for instance, has shown that the increased density associated with high-rise apartments, compared to single-family houses, dramatically reduces those components of the per capita ecological footprint associated with housing type and urban transportation. Marina Alberti (1999) also draws on the concept of carrying capacity and ecological footprint to investigate environmentally appropriate urban form. From this ecological footprint analysis, it is important to have an international agreement to preserve the nature and the natural resources and recognize the remaining common-pool natural capital in a wide view for sustainability (Rees and Wackernagel, 2008).

Indicators are known to be valuable for tracking changes over time, making comparisons, keeping stakeholders with different objectives focused on common tasks (Rusk, 2009). They successfully reduce the amount of data required to describe a situation fully and facilitate communication with diverse audiences (Keirstead & Leach, 2008). Although there is no single set of indicators of sustainability that build on universal consensus in terms of its scope, timeline, and level (G. Mitchell, 1996; Pope, Annandale,
& Morrison-Saunders, 2004), there are a range of attempts to use indicators in assessing sustainability in cities. An influential set of indicators is by the United Nations that base on the three Es of sustainable development. It includes 96 indicators on economic structure, consumption and production patterns, biodiversity, air and water quality, equity, health, and education (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2007). Another set of sustainability indicators by Turcu (2013) integrates expert and citizen knowledge of sustainability to reflect professional standards and community values. In this way, many researchers carry out sustainability assessments using sets of indicators of neighborhoods, areas, and systems in cities around the world (Huang, Wong, & Chen, 1998; Mansourianfar & Haghshenas, 2018; Mcalpine & Birnie, 2005; Moreno Pires, Fidélis, & Ramos, 2014; Moussiopoulos, Achillas, Vlachokostas, Spyridi, & Nikolaou, 2010).

However, there are drawbacks in using indicators. Critics point out the highly subjective selection process which may reflect issues of great concern for specific stakeholders (Astleithner & Hamedinger, 2003; Astleithner, Hamedinger, Holman, & Rydin, 2004; Gahin, Velena, & Hart, 2003; Meadows, 1996). Others argue that the indicators are chosen based on the ease of measurability and policy relevance rather than their intrinsic sustainability (Keirstead & Leach, 2008).

In Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously, Portney (2003) has carefully reviewed what 24 United States cities have implemented as their concepts of sustainable cities. He creates a set of 24 indicators that are used to measure sustainability. This book provides a vast range of data associated with pollution level, energy management, transportation, land use, and social movement for sustainability. Even though Portney does not present rigorous
theoretical frameworks for his selection of variables, his findings reveal that a growing number of cities are developing sustainability initiatives. Also, the valuable findings from Portney’s investigation is the fact that many cities in the U.S. are creating these initiatives, pursuing sustainability actively, and that plans produced with community input are better at improving the environment.

Instead of providing specific indicators for sustainability, Virginia Maclaren (1996) proposes a process for developing urban sustainability indicators and preparing sustainability reports as a methodological approach. Alberti (1996) also discusses how to best structure the process for selecting indicators to ensure that the collected information is policy relevant, scientifically founded, readily implementable, and usable for planning, focusing on the process of indicator development. This approach emphasizes a use of the concept of sustainability as a framework rather than just final outcomes.

Connecting Urban Sustainability to Urban Strategy

*Urban Revitalization and Sustainability*

A substantial body of literature focuses on the corresponding relationship between the discourse on urban revitalization and urban sustainability. Urban revitalization, smart growth, and new urbanism are seen as central to combating sprawl and promoting economic and environmental sustainability (Katz et al., 1994; Daniels, 2001; Gillham, 2002). Scholars have argued that sprawling urban and suburban development patterns are creating negative impacts including habitat fragmentation, loss of open space, water and air pollution, increased infrastructure costs, inequality, and social homogeneity (Ewing 1997; Downs, 1999). In contrast, higher density development with mixed-land use are seen
as encouraging smaller living spaces and consequently lower rates of consumption, while also making walking, biking, and public transit viable alternatives to cars (Jacobs, 1961; Owen, 2009). Therefore, it is seen that decreasing sprawl and increasing population density within mixed-use communities is an efficient way to lower consumption and reduce energy use (Dagger, 2003). Researchers have also found that carbon footprints in suburban areas are higher than those in cities in the US (Glaeser & Kahn, 2008). Thus, there is a shared argument that urban revitalization is central to make future cities more sustainable in the US.

Beyond the idea on stopping sprawl to create sustainable regions, sustainability has also been suggested as a possible remedy to urban decline. Linking sustainability and urban revitalization, urban revitalization aims at solving a series of urban problems, including urban function deterioration, social exclusion in urban areas, and environmental pollution. It is regarded as a sound approach to promoting land values, improving environmental quality (Adams & Hastings, 2001), and to improving the urban decay problem and meeting various socioeconomic objectives (Lee & Chan, 2008). In particular, urban revitalization improves housing quality and residents’ health in the community (Krieger & Higgins, 2002) and make the effective use of land resources in cities (Ho et al., 2012). In this respect, urban revitalization may significantly contribute to sustainable urban development. However, most urban regeneration policies have tended to focus on economic regeneration rather than on environmental or social regeneration (Couch & Dennemann, 2000). Also, numerous studies argue that a focus on the built environment leaves out social concerns and policy processes (Neuman, 2005; Chan & Lee, 2008;
Nallathiga, 2008; Parkin, 2015). Thus, although the relationship between sustainability and urban renewal is complex, it does provide a direction for a sustainable urban future.

**Selective Sustainability and Green Washing Strategies**

Some scholars are skeptical about whether urban sustainability planning in US cities challenges or reproduces existing power imbalances in cities. Rob Krueger and David Gibbs (2007) raise a critical question: how can we discuss achieving a state of sustainability under the current economic system? They point out that the politics of sustainability becomes essential in the process of sustainability, in which political realities force a focus on economic development. This means that the success of sustainability efforts along environmental and social dimensions may be particularly tied to their ability to articulate how these environmental or social efforts are integrated with clear economic goals.

Campbell (1996) boldly claims that “in the battle of big public ideas, sustainability has won: the task of the coming years is simply to work out the details, and to narrow the gap between its theory and practice,” regarding the “state of sustainability” (Campbell, 1996, p.312). Scholars argue that urban sustainability planning does not adequately address environmental and social justice and operates within a framework of neoliberalism, which is a process of restructuring the public and private sectors to promote a growth first approach to urban change (McKendry 2008). There was an increasing pressure on protected open space, regulatory dumping, increased levels of consumption, and negative environmental externalities, often at the expense of poorer residents and communities. Given the current trend that the concept of sustainability has become embedded in our culture, we need to rigorously examine the different components of the concept (Isenhour, McDonogh, & Checker, 2015).
Bloomsberg’s “PlanNYC: A Greener, Greater New York,” which was released in 2007, could be a good example of the use of selective sustainability. The plan promotes sustainable goals, including increasing affordable housing, improving park access, and reducing citywide carbon emissions by 2030. However, numerous scholars criticize that the plan’s goals and the city’s redevelopment strategies are somewhat contradictory. For instance, Mason (2013) points out that the New York City approved large-scale redevelopment projects destroying hundreds of existing trees while the plan included the planting of one million street trees by 2030. Rosan (2012) assesses how New York’s 2007 PlaNYC addresses concerns about equity and environmental justice, by examining how PlaNYC has changed the City’s planning framework to promote environmental justice. Rosan (2012) found that PlaNYC did not comprehensively deal with concerns about environmental justice while PlaNYC made some important first steps for promoting environmental justice through sustainability planning.

An emerging literature is exploring the gentrification processes induced from greening practices (Anguelovski, 2014; Checker, 2011; Chen, 2013). For instance, in Portland, the production of green spaces appealed to particular elitist visions of “livability” while displacing low-income housing within the area (Hagerman, 2007). In addition, three major US cities’ climate change plans fail to deal with issues of equitable economic development and environmental justice (Finn & McCormick, 2011). Therefore, sustainability becomes a pervasive framework, as Bloomsberg tried to position New York City as a top contender in the competition among global cities that are trying to make their cities sustainable, it concentrates on certain appealing issues such as environmental amenities (green open space) and climate change. However, these policies leave out
environmental justice issues. This contradictory relationship between sustainable policies and inequitable urban redevelopment become more problematized as cities are becoming competitive global cities.

*Globalization and Competitive Urban Policy*

There have been substantial studies on globalization of cities and its impacts on the society (Sassen, 2001; Smith, 2002; Short, 2004; Smith, 2005). The metropolitan government tries to improve economic competitiveness and global appeal of the city. Cities are seen as the engines global economy and they reproduce the global order, becoming increasingly autonomous economic and political agents that actively respond to pressures and opportunities of globalization (Sassen, 2001). Therefore, the urban policy of cities is becoming the main source of socio-economic change in cities today rather than the global forces outside the cities (Smith, 2002; Short, 2004).

Competition of cities affects their urban policy, noting that a city improves its position against other cities by marketing itself to attract potential investors and visitors to a particular city. Therefore, city marketing has become an essential part of competitive urban policy to promote a city as a place, offering attractive business environments to the investors and pleasant experiences to the visitors (Smith, 2005). Even though cities get some benefits, including economic growth, job creation, and better quality of everyday life, by attracting foreign investments and tourists, there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating that the benefits of economic growth are distributed in an uneven way (Smith, 2002; Perrons, 2004). Benefits from competitive urban policy include creation of new public spaces, infrastructure, and regenerated neighborhoods, improving the quality of everyday life. However, most of beneficiaries of long-term economic growth generated
by successful city marketing are often a few political elite and private developers, known as “growth coalitions” (Logan and Molotch, 2007).

One of the main goals of city marketing is “to construct a new image of the city to replace either vague or negative images previously held by current or potential residents, investors and visitors” (Holcomb, 1993, p. 133). Therefore, cities are becoming increasingly commodified and the emphasis is more on selling city’ image and reconstructing meaning of a particular place. Short (1998) argued that city marketing through reconstructing the meaning of place legitimates interests of dominant economic or political groups. Social groups and individuals that do not fit or oppose the symbolic reconstruction of a particular place are marginalized or even excluded from the public life (Balibrea, 2001). Symbolic reconstruction of cities as an instrument of competitive urban policy thus serves as a new form of social and political domination and affects growing social polarization and denied political rights in cities (Balibrea, 2001; Cho, 2010). Also, While, Jonas, and Gibbs (2004) argued that the metropolitan government tries to improve the image of the city by implementing sustainability policies.

Many cities therefore implement large-scale urban regeneration strategies, which aim to replace traditional and seemingly rundown urban areas with new places of global spectacle. Such urban development transforms a city into an attraction for tourists deprived of historic authenticity and meaning (Urry, 2002). For residents, urban redevelopment may generate new jobs and improve environmental or living conditions, but it can also lead to gentrification, social segregation, community collapses or decline of local places and cultures (Smith, 2002; Križnik, 2009). Uršič and Križnik (2012) argue that the Cheonggyecheon restoration project operates as an important instrument of Seoul’s policy.
by which the metropolitan government tries to improve economic competitiveness and global appeal of the city. Based on the literature developed so far, this study will seek to answer whether two sustainability case projects in Seoul, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and Sewoon Sangga regeneration project, use the concept of sustainability selectively to make the city more competitive and appealing to other cities and nations in the globalization era.

_Growth Machine and Urban Sustainability_

Across the cities in the world, we have witnessed transformations in the socio-economic conditions of cities along with spectacular conversions in their built environments over the past decades. Several notable trends accompanied by a rapid urbanization include: 1) megaprojects of iconic development and associated infrastructures have been developed (Graham and Marvin, 2001; Young and Keil, 2010); 2) downtown developments have been developed through the constructions of high-rise corporate plazas, hotels and convention centers (Connell, 1999; Turner, 2002); and 3) former industrial downtown cities have converted into mixed-use commercial districts, cultural districts, and gentrified apartments (Fainstein, 2004; Porter and Shaw, 2009). Behind these diverse trends, such projects and planning have been driven by state-led coalitions and special-purpose agencies whose aim is to vitalize urban economics in the globalizing capitalism. In turn, glittering landscapes through a branding of a city’s image would attract international mobile investments and a creative class of professionals (Peterson, 1981; Florida, 2002). These phenomena have been explained by recognizable terms — ‘urban revitalization’, ‘place marketing’, ‘growth coalitions’, ‘entrepreneurialism’— in academic
and urban planning debates over the past decades (Harvey, 1989; Stone, 1989; Cox, 1995; Jonas and Wilson, 1999; Ward, 2009; Ribera-Fumaz, 2009).

Substantial literature developed in the West highlighted how ‘place-based' urban elites and coalitions drove public initiatives to expand the local economy and accumulate wealth. John Logan and Harvey Molotch published *Urban Fortunes* (1987) which describes the combination of entrepreneurs and urban politicians as a ‘growth machine’ — a robust, pro-growth network of business interests and local politicians who favor increased economic development at the expense of neighborhood residents and other vulnerable stakeholders. The primary concern of growth machine theorists is analyzing the urban development process. The formation of coalitions in pursuit of growth permeates all facets of local life, including the political system, local utility companies, unions, media, cultural institutions, and universities (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987).

Regime theory (Stone, 1989) has been predominant in the literature on the urban politics for decades in western societies (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001). The concepts of the urban regime include a perspective informed by a political economy that “rejects both pluralist assumptions that governmental authority is adequate to make and carry out policies, as well as structuralist assumptions that economic forces determine policy” (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001, p. 812). A regime is an informal yet relatively stable coalition that provides other actors access to institutional resources. Growth machine and urban regime analyses provided the two most prominent strands among a large set of theories that sought to explain coalition building through its links to urban development politics (Harding, 1994).
Superficially the ideology of ‘growth first’ seems to conflict ideologically with the principles and practices of urban sustainability; that is, notions of ecological limits, intergenerational equity, the integration of economic, social and environmental priorities, and widening involvement in decision-making (Haughton, 1999a; Bridge and Jonas, 2002). However, urban leaders have little option but to promote cities to attract more global capital at the expense of broader social and ecological goals. Active environmental policies and interventions such as river restoration, the cleaning up of old industrial sites, or ‘eco-investment’ in public transport have been significant not only in re-imaging cities but have also been influential in opening up actual urban spaces for new waves of investment and bringing back the middle classes in the city or stabilizing working-class communities (Keil and Desfor, 1996). Hackworth and Smith (2001) highlighted the increasingly influential role played by states and local governments in making decisions for the current gentrification process. Gentrification came to be viewed as a positive economic redevelopment policy based on this rationale, and many scholars argue that this came out as a growth machine from the political-economic coalition. This paradigm especially prevailed in postwar American urban politics. Therefore, the growth machine theory has been a useful framework to explain the urban political-economic patterns around urban planning over the past three decades in American cities. Further, many scholars have argued that there has been growth politics around urban sustainability planning in the context of West (Keil and Desfor, 1996; Strom, 2008).
Just Cities

Importantly, we need to ask, sustainability for whom? Sustainability is about creating a more equitable and just society as well. As a whole, contemporary pattern of cities in the U.S. raise questions about social justice and fairness. Perpetuating sprawl and suburbanization has led to sharp separation and isolation of the poor and minorities (Goldsmith and Blakely, 2010; Downs 1994). Land use patterns have served to separate groups by income and race, with an accompanying inequitable distribution of opportunities (Downs 1994; Jackson 1985). A sustainable city is one where diversity is encouraged, where there is no sharp spatial separation or isolation of income and racial groups, where all individuals and groups have access to basic and essential services and facilities, and where residents have a fair equality of opportunity (Beatley 1993). The underlying tension between the associated aspects of sustainability – environmental, social, economic – needs to be balanced.

There is a growing body of literature focusing on social justice related to urban sustainability. Agyeman and Evans introduced the term “just sustainability” (Agyeman and Evans 2004) emphasizing environmental justice, equity, and civic engagement in the planning field. While the social aspect of sustainability, equity, is being incorporated into the language of many city plans, Agyeman pointed out that equity is often not the focus of sustainability plans (Agymen, 2005). Also, researchers argue that we know little about how the concept of sustainability is implemented in daily life in the context of cities, particularly with regard to questions of social justice and equity (Isenhour, McDonogh, & Checker, 2015). Hess and Winner (2007) developed 30 case studies on urban sustainability searching for evidence that cities were addressing environmental justice by using urban greening as
a mechanism for promoting social justice goals. However, they point out that many urban sustainability efforts fail to make social justice a key concern; even when social justice is specifically mentioned in plans, there remains an ambiguity about how to best promote it. This study uses the framework ‘just sustainability,’ which is interpreted as meaning ‘the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems’ (Agyeman et al. 2003, p. 5) to critically examine how sustainable sustainability plans are in Seoul. These areas of concerns move away from the dominant orientation of ‘economic sustainability’ and ‘environmental sustainability’ to represent ‘just sustainability,’ through a balanced approach focusing on justice, equity, and environment together. Based on the definition of ‘just sustainability’ provided by Agyeman et al., a set of observable implications (King et al. 1995, King 2000) to assess the effectiveness of urban sustainability plans will be developed and used to guide the evaluations for this research.

Urban Sustainability in Asian Cities

Application and practice of sustainability principles are likely to vary between cities. Asian megacities face different issues than do the cities of North America or Europe. Worldwide forces, such as globalization and urbanization, act differently across cities and nations. While some cities have benefited from increasing articulation to the world economic system, others have been marginalized and excluded from those benefits under the current economic system (Harvey, 2005). In turn, cities have diverse sustainability challenges.
Asian cities at the beginning of the 21st century faced a particular challenge because their development cycle has been compressed and accelerated. Asian urban development has been so rapid that they are still building basic infrastructures, such as water supply and sewer system, while western cities began to invest in them during the 19th century. Also, levels of GDP per capita of Asian cities, except in Japan, Korea, and Singapore, are much lower than in western cities (Amsden, 1989). Thus, it was hard to secure stable budgets for necessary infrastructure investment and maintenance due to their insufficient tax base. In many nations, capacities to manage urban change and structures of urban governance are much weaker; thus the current power of land management and development control are inadequate to ensure that new development is either adequately serviced or appropriately designed (Marcotullio, 2017).

At the same time, they face globally common pressing problems as well. The rapid spread of private car ownership, which has quickly extended the land development frontier far from the original high-density metropolitan cores, creates mounting problems in exurban areas. Urban economic development is decentralizing at ever greater distances into what McGee has described as ‘extended metropolitan regions,’ in which the diffusion of development into rural areas is creating vast semi-urban areas (McGee, 1991; McGee and Robinson, 1995). Due to a chronic shortage of construction sites, the Korean government renewed the national land-use planning system in 1993; the main substance of this was to introduce ‘quasi-agricultural areas’ in the zoning system. It implies that a higher priority was given to development over nature conservation at that time. A study in South Korea shows that concerns about urban forests are increasing among the citizens and they are willing to shoulder the burden to conserve urban forests (Kwak et al., 2003).
Most Asian cities were built at extremely high densities with little need to provide for private car use. Increasing affluence is creating distinctive problems at the beginning of the 21st century, as it suddenly puts private car ownership within reach of a rising proportion of households (Marcotullio, 2017). High population densities, escalating car ownership, and growing demand for better housing combine to create explosive pressure for decentralization. This dynamic generates great difficulties in managing land development in formerly rural areas surrounding metropolitan centers (Hack 2000; Kwak et al., 2003). The increased environmental load from the anticipated increase of automobile traffic was if particular concern in Asian megacities in the 2000s. Some scholars propose a framework for an inter-city comparison of Asian megacities to evaluate their states of urban spatial structure, transport and environmental situation (Kato et al., 2005). Kato et al. suggested five topics to resolve the surged environmental load from the increased automobile uses as follow: 1) induced vehicle traffic due to road improvement, 2) the relationship between vehicle-related taxation and road budget, 3) the relationship between public transport improvement and motorization, 4) the impact of urban planning and land use management, and 5) public consensus for enforcing policy measures for Environmentally Sustainable Transport (Kato et al., 2005).

Marcotullio (2001) argue that the process of achieving urban sustainability should address the economic, environmental and social aspects and this task can only be accomplished by approaching each of those issues at different scales. Using the Asia-Pacific region as a case study, the “functional city system” within the Asia-Pacific increasingly is both the engine of urban growth and the force behind differentiating urban environmental and social issues. While globalization forces have been particularly strong
within cities in the Asia-Pacific, Marcotullio (2001) emphasizes the role of locality in shaping urban development, arguing that “localization and globalization-driven progress have not translated into a particular path of development rather localities have demonstrated contextually specific paths” (Marcotullio, 2001, p. 578).

Bai et al. (2010) examine common patterns and pathways found among 30 urban practices in Asian cities from a system innovation perspective in a purpose of broader application of effective sustainability practices. Bai et al. (2010) argue that the policy changes and cumulative effects were significant; local government, community and international agencies were the main actors; and the role of political and institutional barriers was critical in urban sustainability experiment in Asian cities. However, technology was not a major barrier in the urban sustainability experiment in Asia. Xiang et al. (2011) argue that numerous ecological and social issues have been marginalized at the expense of outstanding economic growth in the practice of urban sustainability in China, leading to problems in public safety, health, and social equity over the last three decades through urbanization. Therefore, Xiang et al. (2011) advocate a holistic and pragmatic approach to the research and practice of urban sustainability in China.

While most literature on urban sustainability in Asian cities is concentrated around indicator-based outcome evaluation researches, some researchers address urban politics around sustainability planning in Asian cities. Yigitcanlar and Lee (2014) question whether ubiquitous-eco-city, one of the eco-city types Korea is promoting, is a sustainable urban form that constitutes an ideal 21st-century city model or just a branding hoax. The principal purposes of a ubiquitous-eco-city are “to provide a high quality of life and place to residents, workers and visitors with low-to-no negative impacts on the natural environment
by using state-of-the-art technologies in the planning, development and management stages” (Yigitcanlar and Lee, 2014, p.1). Their analysis results show that—mainly since the u-eco-city concept has not produced any comprehensive u-eco-spaces yet—at this stage it is not possible to prove or disprove either of the claims. A significant number of studies on the Cheonggyecheon restoration project emphasized a criticism that the restored stream was an important tool in aggressive marketing that has been instrumental in selling ‘Global Seoul’ and has resulted in ongoing gentrification, decline of traditional industrial sectors, and disappearance of local cultures (Kriznik, 2011; Lee & Anderson, 2014; Schuetze, T., & Chelleri, L., 2015).

Many scholars have emphasized the governments’ focus on economic growth around urban sustainability planning in Asian cities, as Marcotullio (2001) emphasizes the “functional city system” within the Asia-Pacific. While some researchers address urban politics around sustainability planning in Asian cities (Kriznik, 2011; Lee & Anderson, 2014; Yigitcanlar and Lee, 2014; Schuetze, T., & Chelleri, L., 2015), there is a need to further examine the dynamics of urban politics around urban sustainability planning in Asian cities. Using a case study of Seoul, with a focus on the role of rapid democratization occurring in numerous Asian cities, this study attempts to fill this gap of literature on urban sustainability planning in the Asian context. In addition, this study aims to fill the gap between the Asian city’s effort to promote their cities as a global city and the urban politics around urban sustainability planning in Asian cities by examining the linkage between them.
Urban Politics in Seoul

*Seoul As a Global City*

Numerous scholars pay attention to the world-system perspective, as the global economy influenced cities in the late twentieth century (Davis, 2005). The rapid movement of capital across the globe due to technological developments, saturated national markets, and increased competition of capitalism, led to the increased importance of the control capability of cities amid the international geographical dispersion of capital. A body of literature on the "world city hypothesis" emphasized certain critical cities as basing points of the globally flowing capital (Friedmann, 1986; Friedmann and Wolff, 1982). In particular, Sassen (1991) shed light on the advanced capitalist core metropolitan cities, such as New York, London, and Tokyo, that became the main centers of financial and producer services. While some scholars pointed out that this new global competition among cities caused problems of the global cities' socio-economic polarization (Fainstein, 2001; Sassen, 1998), dominating cities' global impacts and their relationship to the economy became critical in the contemporary era.

Seoul's powerful dominance in Korea can be understood as its becoming a global city in the period of Korea's successful development of Export-oriented industrialization. As Castells (1998) described as the "space of flows," the contemporary globalization includes multi-directional capital flows among more diverse countries participating in the global economy. Even though Korea had been a periphery country during the Imperialist era without a historical foundation for being a global center, it has been actively integrated into the global economy since its export-oriented industrialization (Amsden, 1989). In turn, its overall economic growth success has contributed to making its capital city, Seoul, one
of the global urban nodes of East Asia. However, Seoul demonstrates some differences from other global cities, as the city differed in how it became a global city under a developmental state. A study suggests a list of Seoul's characteristics, which make Seoul diverge from the world city theory, including its economic base primarily comprising Korean trans-national corporations, little foreign migration, and relatively low-income disparities among families within Seoul (Hill & Kim, 2000). They also argue that Seoul was unique from other global cities developed around the market liberalism ideology, as the city had historically developed under a different political economy.

**Developmental State**

A developmental state sets economic development as the foremost state goal and has the autonomy and capacity to enforce its economic policies (Johnson, 1982; Rueschemeyer and Evans, 1985). The extraordinary economic growth of the East Asian economies, including Korea, has been attributed to the developmental state (Johnson, 1981; Alam, 1989; Evans, 1989; Amsden, 1989; Chibber, 1999). The developmental states in East Asia includes Japan, South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Taiwan (Amsden, 1989). The standard arguments regarding exponential East Asian economic growth were that the countries thoroughly follow market principles for their industrialization. However, unlike other leading industrializers in the West, the states in these late-developing countries actively intervened in the markets. It turned out to be exceptionally efficient to subsidize, monitor, and guide the private sectors in pursuing economic development (Amsden, 1989; Pempel, 1999; Woo-Cumings, 1995).

While the UK and US relied upon continuous invention and innovation of technological knowledge since the last eighteenth century, ‘backward countries' did not
have such foundations of technological advancement. Therefore, those without technical foundations borrowed knowledge from the earlier industrialized countries to increase productivity (Amsden, 1989). In applying this borrowed knowledge to the development of production technology and capital resources, the intervention of a powerful state played an essential role to maximize the efficiency (Gershenkron, 1962; Hill and Kim, 2000). The developmental states took on the risks in launching industry in the international market instead of individual capitalists. Therefore, late industrializers rapidly emerged in the global market and brought strong challenges to earlier establishers with cheaper labor forces and competitive products (Gershenkronian, 1962)

Among them, Korea stands out for its successful export-oriented industrialization (Van, Linnemann & Verbruggen, 1987). Its unprecedented economic growth began in 1961 when the Park Chung Hee military regime came to power and drove for the national economic development as its primary policy goal. Elite bureaucrats allocated money and resources to selected companies, especially EOI companies, for their competitive advantage against industry sectors in developed countries (Evans, 1992). The state seized power over the monetary system through the Economic Planning Bureau (EPB) and the Korea Bank. The EPB set up economic policy, ‘Five Year Economic Development Plans,' every five years between the 1960s and 1980s and supported highly competitive export-oriented industries through administrative aids. During this time, Seoul and Pusan became growth nodes where socio-economic infrastructure for further industrial activities was developed (Chung and Kirby, 2002; Hill and Kim, 2000).

Korea's urban landscape and development patterns, which have been mostly newly determined since its industrialization, cannot be interpreted separately from the country's
economic policies, and Korea's developmental state guided both. Given Korea's limited infrastructure and capital, the state had to have firm control on spatial policies and development during the rapid state-led industrialization to maximize efficiency by providing its inputs of land, labor, and capital. Therefore, focusing on EOI made the city building possible in the context of Korea's mostly rural and underdeveloped as well as economic growth.

In responding to the globalization, the East Asian countries actively started to target the global market for their state-led industries activities. In particular, Japan and Korea have been searching for avenues for economic reform since the 1990s; therefore, they have attempted to shift from manufacturing industries into more technology-based industry sectors that are not as compatible with state-led economic growth (Hahm and Plein, 1995). The government's strategy for economic growth changed to promoting high-tech industries since the early 1990s (Chung and Kirby, 2002). Even though the developmental state was established in the period of export-oriented industrialization, its legacy remained deeply embedded in the politico-economic structure of the nation (Moon and Prasad, 1994). How this legacy of developmental state embedded in the urban politics around planning has been critical in Korea will be further discussed in the Chapter 4 later.

*Growth Machine and Developmental States*

The politics of urban development in the Korean context has involved the dominance of the nation-state and a hierarchy between the government and businesses. Especially for mega-city projects, the nation-state has controlled hiring or actively intervened in the activities of businesses (La Grange and Jung, 2004; Kim and Kim, 2000). Based on the weakness of the private sector and working classes in the processes of
industrialization, the state enacted the Land Expropriation Act in 1962. The act enabled the state to access or take over land for its industrial and urban development projects. National economic growth has been a prevailing ideology in Korea for decades ever since the end of World War II. The hostile division between South and North Korea after the Korean War motivated and strengthened discourses of national competitiveness.

According to Korea's characteristics during the state-led industrialization periods after the 1960s, some scholars have examined the politics of urban development in South Korea from within the framework of the developmental state as explained in the previous section (Bae and Sellers, 2007; Kong, 2000; Park, 2003; Saito, 2003; Sonn, 2007). A developmental state receives public support for spatial strategies based on national competitiveness (Harvey, 2005). Even though developmental state theory is criticized for its overly simplified view of an autonomous state system (Chang, 2003), there is little doubt that the political economy of postwar South Korea was in fact at least state-led. However, since the 1990s, there have been some significant changes in the operation of the state mainly due to the internationalization of business activities and labor movements (Minns, 2001). The changes reduced control over the domestic market (Pempel, 1999) and produced a shift to knowledge, service, and high-tech oriented sectors (Chung and Kirby, 2002; Hahm and Plein, 1995). This change suggests that new leadership and partnerships would emerge that are more decentralized, partnership-based, and internationalized.

In the Korean context, the transition from the highly centralized developmental state to partially decentralized urban development policies took place simultaneously with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the nation-state to the embedded dominance of the nation-state (Park, 2008; Sonn, 2010). Also, Korea had to go through
turbulent social condition changes, such as the rise of urban middle class and the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics, as well as economic prosperity and urban growth within a short-time (Park et al., 1999; Shatkin, 2004; Wu, 2003). Some scholars suggest that local business elites and economic agents are crucial to local growth in developing countries, but in a different manner from U.S. and Western Europe (Evans, 2002; Wu, 2003). Urban entrepreneurialism (Harvey, 1989) emerged in 1994 globally. At the same time, direct elections for local governments began in Korea. Many local governments started the growth-oriented place marketing strategies reflected in urban plans. A legacy of the developmental state, however, remains embedded in the political-economic structure (Moon and Prasad, 1994).

The Korean case can manifest a set of conditions that seemingly favors the emergence of an urban growth politics that are still prevalent in the West today since Korea has been focusing on economic development after the Korean War (1950-1953). Alongside democratization and decentralization, the rapid industrialization and urban growth in cities might appear to strengthen the emergence of an economic growth coalition. However, the transformations in the Korean socio-economy and urban politics helped to consolidate more restricted policies (e.g., Greenbelt policy), reflecting the developmental state legacy, toward urban growth than in the U.S. or Western Europe. This study will closely examine transformations at national and local levels in Korea to explain why considering the shifting global context and Korea's unique urban politics.

Most of the emerging body of international comparative research on urban politics has explained merely whether there is growth coalition or not like those of Western settings in a different context. A deeper understanding on why these cases differ need to take into
account a set of local, national, and global variables (Sellers, 2002). Closer scrutiny on urban dynamics of Korea, experiencing recent rapid transformations, such as the comparatively late timing of the processes of industrialization, democratization and urban policy development based on the developmental state, need to be taken into account.

Growth machine theory from the United States consist of several crucial sets of actors as follow (Harding, 1995; Logan and Molotch, 1987): 1) business interests supporting urban economic and property development, 2) public officials playing an important but often secondary role in support of business interests, and 3) residents asserting use values and residential property values against new economic and property development. With occasional exceptions, the U.S. authors have generally portrayed pro-growth coalitions as dominant. Comparative analysis of recent growth politics in other developed countries has often pointed out essential limitations to this illustration. According to some studies done in Europe, more statist systems of local government, stronger national government, and more extensive national land use and transportation policies have shifted the balance of local interests in favor of constraints on urban development (Fainstein, 2001; Levine, 1994; Sellers, 2002). However, most such comparative analysis remains confined to developed societies, such as the U.S. and Western Europe.

As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state, Korea offers an essential source of insight into the meaning that these transformations are likely to have for the politics of urban growth in other developing countries. With specific attention to these transformations and their implications, theories from the Western settings can shed light on the recent politics of urban policy in Korea. A
closer look at the applicability of these theories, however, suggests reasons why this politics might differ from as well as resemble the patterns from the United States.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology used for this research. A case study is introduced as a research design for this research, and the reasons why two urban sustainability projects in Seoul were selected for case studies are addressed in the following section. A case study with two mini cases for this study are conducted based on a mixed-method approach that includes process-driven qualitative analysis and outcome-driven quantitative analysis (Bryman, 2008). A process-driven qualitative analysis is used to examine the urban politics around the sustainability planning in Seoul and an outcome-driven quantitative analysis is used to assess the sustainability of the mini cases for this research. As a primary data collection method, the in-depth interviews were performed with key participants in the study cases. Also, other data were collected from both qualitative and quantitative sources, such as relevant planning documents, statistical reports, and media publications. For the cross-case analysis, a series of factors to examine the essential characteristics of the process and the implementation of the sustainability plans and another set of observable implications to assess plans' impacts on sustainability were developed, and the study cases were evaluated based on the developed implications. Lastly, the benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project were compared.
Case Study as a Research Design

The case study is the most flexible of all research designs, allowing the researcher to retain the holistic characteristics of real-life events while investigating empirical events. Case studies are only one of many ways of doing social science research, with experimentation, observation, surveys and archival information each suited to a particular type of research problem, a degree of experimenter control over events and historical/contemporary perspective and focus. However, the case study is the most favored techniques for studying in-depth and multifaceted phenomena in the context of real cases (Swanborn, 2010). The case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. Anchored in real-life situations, the case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. Because of its strengths, a case study is a particularly appealing design for social science studies, and the field's processes, problems, and policy programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and improve practice.

Robert Yin tried to define a case study, as part of his defense of the method, as an attempt to examine a contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not evident (Yin, 2013). Miles (1979) suggested that one of the most severe criticisms is that unlike quantitative research, there are few conventions the researchers can rely upon to defend themselves against self-delusion or the presentation of 'unreliable' or 'invalid' conclusions. Critics also claim that there is little basis for scientific generalization - especially with single cases - Something also true of single experiments. Critics suggest that the lack of defined methodology is lamentable, especially considering the very highly skilled and specialized task of
interviewing of informants and professionals. Yin (2013) agrees to some extent that there are shortcomings in the methodology of case study research but contends that these shortcomings are not innate, and represent opportunities for development within the research strategy, or even more importantly, recognition of methodological constructs which are already known.

Flyvbjerg (2006) sets up five "misunderstandings" about case study research, which he then dismantles, substituting a more accurate statement about the issue underlying each misunderstanding. The second misunderstanding, for example, "that one cannot generalize on the basis of a single case is usually considered to be devastating to the case study as a scientific method" (Flyvbjerg 2006, p.224). However, citing single cases, experiments, and experiences of Galileo, Newton, Einstein, Bohr, Darwin, Marx, and Freud, Flyvbjerg makes the point that both human and natural sciences can be advanced by a single case. The true value of a case study is that it helps us to understand the complicated dynamics and processes in specific cases (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

_A Case Study of Seoul_

Seoul is a useful case study to examine urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of sustainability policies paying attention to how growth coalition and discourses have formed around the decision-making process of sustainability plans, and to critically examine how sustainable the plans that are implemented based on this urban politics are. The reason why Seoul is a useful case study is that of its context of characteristics of late yet rapid industrialization, recent decentralization, and democratization on the one hand, and the legacy of strong state intervention and late policy development on the other hand. These conditions have created a local context for urban
planning and the implementation of sustainability policies in Korea that differs from the Western countries where most of the urban planning theory has developed.

Globalization is an on-going force affecting the countries across the world in the contemporary era, and the Korean society is in a turbulent transition influenced by rapid democratization. The impeachment of Park Geun-Hye, the former President of Korea, in March 2017 made by the public is evidence of rapid democratization occurring in Korean society where the central government has been historically dominant. Therefore, Korea is a useful case study to examine how globalization and rapid democratization affects urban politics and discourses around the decision-making process of sustainability plans, in particular to other developmental state Asian countries.

In addition, while the most dramatic urban growth is occurring in Asia (DESA, 2014), urban planning concepts that have developed from US and European experiences have been applied to the Asian cities (Yokohari et al., 2000; Roy & Ong, 2011), and little study is done exploring the generalization of Western theories in the Asian context. In particular, this study will examine whether a pro-growth coalition, which has been prevailed in urban politics in the Western context, is applicable in the Korean context or not. As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state, Korea offers an essential source of insight into the meaning that these transformations are likely to have for the urban politics of sustainability policies in other developing countries. With specific attention to these transformations, such as globalization, decentralization, democratization, and their implications, theories from the Western settings can shed light on the recent politics of urban policy in Korea. A closer
look at the applicability of these theories, however, suggests reasons why this politics might differ from as well as resemble the patterns from the United States.

The Selection of Cases: Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project and Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project

For the sub-case studies, two urban sustainability projects, Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project were chosen for this study. These two mini cases are selected with a strategic intention, to represent the characteristics of urban politics and driving forces around urban sustainability plans and to demonstrate that urban sustainability is in transformation in Seoul now. The two mini cases under a case study are comparable with each other in offering examples of the urban politics around the Seoul Metropolitan Government’s efforts to revitalize depressed areas in downtown Seoul through urban regeneration plans, planning process, and their impacts on both neighborhoods and the city of Seoul. Both projects are located in in the historical part of central Seoul, northern-eastside of the city center and each project's site is crossing each other as below (Figure 1).
The restoration of Cheonggyecheon, began in 2003 and completed in 2005, was sensational in the history of urban development in Korea, turning a historic stream covered by a deteriorating highway into an environmentally-friendly and pedestrian-oriented public waterfront through restoration (O'Byrne et al., 2014). Influenced by the current forces of combining sustainable development and urban regeneration and addressing city branding for global competition, the restoration of Chenggyecheon has sought to combine the recovery of the natural environment and historic preservation with a rehabilitation of the urban economy. On the other hand, the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project started as a Greenway Project in 2006 and converted to an adaptive-reuse project in 2015, preserving an old symbolic structure - the first multi-purpose commercial-residential complexes built in 1968 - instead of demolishing it, to improve walkability, connect communities and nurture creative growth in downtown Seoul.

The case study projects were chosen considering the representativeness and contrasting features. Both projects shared many common goals, such as revitalizing depressed areas in downtown Seoul through an urban regeneration project, historical
recovery, providing pedestrian-oriented public spaces, and enhancing the competitiveness of Seoul as a global city. Also, both projects were implemented by the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG). However, they are different from each other in many ways. First, two leaders for both projects, the former Mayor of Seoul (Myung-Bak Lee) and the current Mayor of Seoul (Won-Soon Park), came from different political backgrounds, conservative and progressive respectively, causing them to have different visions about urban sustainability plans. Second, the Cheonggyecheon Project was completed through the demolition of an old urban structure of Seoul from the industrialization era in Korea while the Remaking Sewoon Project decided to preserve a symbolic megastructure of the same period to regenerate the areas. Third, the restoration project was an outcome-oriented project, through a top-down approach to complete the construction within a fixed timeline, ignoring criticism and the civil society’s voices for the project. On the other hand, the Remaking Sewoon Project was a process-oriented project, emphasizing public participation to the project development with a focus on community development than changing physical environments. Therefore, these similar and different characteristics between two urban sustainability plans offer essential sources to explain the unique characteristics of the urban politics around sustainability plans in Seoul and how urban sustainability is evolving and changing in Seoul along with the social changes of rapid democratization and decentralization.
Mixed Method Analysis

A case study commonly employs an interview method to gain data, as this study's primary data resources are from interviews. However, a case study frequently addresses embedded cases, and inquiries on these embedded cases dependent on diverse research methods, including quantitative analysis, since a case study seeks to build up a fuller explanation of a case and its sub-cases (De Vaus, 2001). Therefore, the case studies for this study are conducted based on a mixed-method approach that includes process-driven qualitative analysis and outcome-driven quantitative analysis, even though the division is not always distinct (Bryman, 2008). A mixed method approach is a more powerful device for researching since both qualitative and quantitative analysis have merits and limitations (Creswell, 2009). Instead of examining only the final outcomes of the projects, this study looks at both processes and outcomes of the case projects (Koontz and Thomas, 2006). As a primary data collection method, the in-depth interviews were performed with key participants in the study cases. Also, other data were collected from both qualitative and quantitative sources, such as relevant planning documents, statistical reports, and media publications. Most of the secondary data for the quantitative analysis are mainly driven from the Korea's Statistical Information Service (Statistics Korea, 2015) provided by the government of Korea. For the cross-case analysis, a series of factors to examine the essential characteristics of the process and the implementation of the sustainability plans and another set of observable implications to assess plans' impacts on sustainability were developed, and the study cases were evaluated based on the developed implications. Lastly, the benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project were
compared. However, this study is heavily focus on the qualitative analysis over quantitative analysis.

*Archival Analysis*

An extensive review on the relevant documents, such as urban planning documents (master plans, maps, project development plans, and project implementation plans), academic studies, relevant reports, press releases from the City, published discussions, and materials released through the media, is conducted for the archival analysis. Triangulation, which is the use of a single approach to researching a question, is used in this study. The purpose of the use of triangulation is to increase confidence in the findings through the confirmation of a proposition using two or more independent measures, providing more a comprehensive picture of the results (Bryman, 2006).

*Qualitative Analysis*

Qualitative methods like interviews are commonly used for a case study than quantitative methods, in particular for small-scale case studies (Swanborn, 2010). Qualitative methods through semi-structured or unstructured interviews provide more in-depth and rich explanations of phenomena than quantitative methods may offer. In addition, data collection by a ‘survey’ approach with structure questionnaires may allow the researchers to conduct quantitative analysis. However, such data have limitations in that answers might be biased or given without serious considerations if the questionnaires are not carefully designed (Bryman, 2008). Considering these limitations and the purpose of this study in seeking rich explanations around urban sustainability plans in Seoul, a semi-structured and open-ended interview method is chosen as a primary research method for
This research. Also, face-to-face interviews are more suitable for obtaining information in complex and dynamic circumstances (Arksey, 2004), meeting the purpose of this research.

*Interviews Recruitment*

Purposive sampling was conducted to achieve a desirable correspondence between the research questions and the interviews for the recruitment of interviews (Bryman, 2008). Interviewees are classified into two groups according to their interests and roles associated with two case plans, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project, and the Remaking Sewoon Project. The first group is chosen from the public sector, including government officials, local officials, public institute researchers, and professionals such as urban planners and Architects. The second group includes residents, merchants who were operating their business in the designated project sites, and civic and environmental advocates.

This research designated sub-categories and searched for participants who fitted the desired profile to interview a range of participants from various groups (Weiss, 1994). Most of the interview participants were chosen based on the relevant literature, such as official documents and the websites of relevant institutions, and directly contacted by the researcher. In some cases, interview participants recommended other suitable interviewees who have a good fit with the purpose of the study. The total number of interviewees is 33, consisting of 21 from the public sector and 12 from residents and Civic groups (Table 1). For interviewees from the public sector, the interview participants consist of Central governmental officials (8), Municipal government officials (2), Academic experts who were on advisory boards for the case projects (4), Government Research Center researchers (4), and Architects (3). Residents and civic groups interviewees consist of 7 members from various civic groups, including environment NGOs and civic coalitions, and 5 existing or
pre-existing residents and merchants who were operating their businesses within the designated project sites.

Table 1. The classification of interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public sectors (21)</th>
<th>Residents &amp; Civic groups (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of interviews</td>
<td>No. of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Civic groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal government officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents &amp; merchants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic experts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Research Center researchers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Sector Interviews

Interviewees from the public sector, many of whom participated in the decision-making processes and the implementations of case projects, were interviewed to gain an in-depth understanding of their experiences, perceptions, and understanding about the processes and outcomes of the case projects. Based on their positions associated with the case projects and their rich knowledge about the processes of the projects implementations, interviewees from the public sector provided useful information and deeper insight into the urban politics and urban dynamics around the case projects for this research. These interviewees from the public sectors were interviewed with an open-ended, semi-structured interview guide to collect the following information: a) main factors that shape the decision-making process for urban sustainability plans, b) main actors who were influential
over others for decision-making process, c) the prioritized principles of sustainability determine the urban strategies for the case project, d) who were the beneficiaries and losers by the case projects, e) the effectiveness of the case projects in enhancing sustainability in Seoul, and f) how the planning authorities allow the public engaged with their urban decision-making (See APPENDIX A).

However, interviews were guided in different ways depending on interviewees’ positions and expertise in the field. For those involved with the projects, especially the government officials, they were tended to accept current plans’ outcomes without criticism, considering the plans are already socially agreed. Therefore, the interviewer raised questions on the other sides of interviewees’ perceptions or understandings to draw out the underlying factors behind the more obvious data. On the other hand, for the key informants’ interviews, the interview allowed interviewees more choices in the direction their answers took by using an open-ended style to utilize their rich and full understandings about the cases (Gilham, 2005).

Residents and Civic groups Interviews

Interviews with the residents, merchants, and civic groups associated with the plans provided an in-depth understanding of their experiences, perceptions, and opinions about the economic, environmental, and social impacts of the case projects in Seoul and their participation status in conjunction with and after the plans. They were interviewed with an open-ended, semi-structured interview guide to collect the following information: a) the economic, environmental, and social impacts of the urban sustainability plans in Seoul, b) who were the economic beneficiaries of the plans’ implementations, c) who were the people negatively affected by the plans’ implementations, d) how the residents and
merchants participated in the processes of policy making of the plans, e) their main concerns or criticism towards the case projects, and f) the effectiveness of the project case in enhancing sustainability in Seoul (APPENDIX B).

All the interviews, including the Public sector interviews and the residents’ and civic groups’ interviews, were performed within the year of 2017, between March 8, 2017, and December 22, 2017, and the length of each interview varies from 30 minutes to 2 hours.

Transcription and Coding

Interviews were audio recorded with the permission of the interviewees and transcribed to create a rich set of qualitative data. Also, the interviewer had field notes to document some visual record, such as hand-drawn maps and sketches, from the interviewees. A commonly used qualitative data analysis software, Atlas.ti, is used for the purpose of coding the interview transcripts and field notes into respective themes. Coding is “the assigning of interpretive tags to text (or other materials) based on categories or themes that are relevant to research” and its purpose is to evaluate and organize data to understand meanings in the text (Kwan & Ding, 2008, p 454). The use of the data analysis software for coding the textual data helped figure out common patterns or different ones by different theme in the responses of different participants and was useful in identifying points in dispute and emerging issues around the implementation of the case projects.

Cross-case Analysis

A cross-case analysis is a research method that facilitates the comparison of commonalities and difference in the events, activities, and processes that are the units of analyses in case studies. The term cross-case analysis is sometimes used as a general umbrella term for the analysis of two or more case studies to produce a synthesized
outcome (Khan and VanWynsberghe 2008). By comparing the results from three plans using two sets of observable implications for categorizing, a cross-case analysis is useful to understand how relationships may exist among discrete cases, accumulate knowledge from the original case, (Ragin, 1997); develop insights that are both context-specific and more general.

In Chapter 7 for the cross-case analysis for this research, the chapter will provide the results of cross-case analysis of two mini case studies for this research: Cheonggyechon restoration project and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project. The Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a dramatic change of the plan in 2015, from creating green corridor project to historic preservation project. Therefore, the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project is divided into two plans, the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan (Greenway Project) and the second phase of the plan (Remaking Sewoon Project), and each phase will be examined separately. The purpose of the cross-case analysis is the identification of similarities and differences among three plans to explain the characteristics of urban sustainability plans since the 2000s and how the plans in the different timeline have evolved in Seoul. First, a series of factors explaining the essential characteristics of the process and the implementation of urban sustainability plan is used to compare and analyze each plan. Second, using a set of observable implications developed for this research based on ‘just sustainability' framework, sustainability of each plan will be assessed. Third, the benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project will be compared.
A Series of Factors for General Characteristics of the Projects

To develop the essential factors to explain the main characteristics of the process and the impacts of the projects, a variety of literature on the urban politics of urban policy was reviewed. According to the literature: 1) Sassen (1991) shed light on the global city’s role, emphasizing the international impacts and their relationship to the economy have become critical in the contemporary era. Some scholars argued that urban regeneration and city marketing could be used as an instrument of urban policy to increase competition among cities (Balibrea, 2001; Smith, 2005), which means a city’s aspiration to enhance its competitiveness among other cities can be affected in the urban sustainability plans’ planning process. 2) As urban policymakers sought to use mega-projects to revitalize cities, urban regeneration projects have become a part of that (Altshuler and Luberoff, 2004). In addition, 3) as city policymakers sought to use cultural policy as a strategy of urban regeneration, the use of the historical recovery as a part of place-making and city-image initiatives has become increasingly evident (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Pendlebury et al., 2004). However, 4) a legacy of developmental state’s characteristics in the centralized-government is expected to be embedded in the politico-economic structure in the nation, affecting the decision-making process of urban sustainability plans as well.

On top of these factors mentioned above, including global city, use of megaprojects, historical recovery, and developmental state influence, it is essential to inquire into the following aspects of the projects to explain the main characteristics of the process and outcomes of the projects: 1) the time taken to complete the project, 2) the project’s reference to other policies, 3) implementation process way taken by the authority, 4) degree of public participation, 5) and the positive and negative impacts of the project’s
implementation. Therefore, the first set of factors for general characteristics of the urban sustainability plans consist of global city, historical recovery, use of megaprojects, reference to other policies, timeline, process, public participation, developmental state influence, and the positive/ negative impacts of the plans.

*Stakeholders for the Growth Coalition*

The benefits and costs for each stakeholder of the implementation of each project were compared to see if there were growth coalitions around the case projects, using a cross-case analysis in this research. Stakeholders for each project to be compared include the following: Central government (Seoul Metropolitan Government), local governments, civic organizations, residents, and merchants. Since the conflict arrangement issue among various stakeholders was one of the main controversial issues around the sustainability planning in Seoul, a conflict assessment (Susskind & Thomas-Larmer, 1999) is conducted in this research, exploring how a consensus building has been facilitated to resolve complex disputes around sustainability planning in Seoul.

*Observable Implications for Assessing the Sustainability of the Projects*

In order to assess the process and performances of the two urban sustainability projects in Seoul, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Remaking Sewoon Project, for this research, this research uses a series of “observable implications” (King et al. 1995, King 2000). Based on a variety of scholarship on qualitative methodology, it is argued that invisible mechanisms can provide observable implications (King et al. 1994; George and Bennett 2005; Collier et al. 2011). By creating an initial catalog of the observable signs of these processes and outcomes of the urban sustainability projects, each case project can be evaluated, and the characteristics of each project can be more distinct.
A series of implications for assessing the sustainability of the projects were developed in this research. To develop the observable implications of the enhanced urban sustainability in a city, this study uses the framework ‘just sustainability,’ which is interpreted as meaning ‘the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems’ (Agyeman et al. 2003, p. 5). If the implementations of the urban sustainability plans in Seoul were effective in enhancing ‘just sustainability,’ we would expect to see democratic participation for the process of decision-making (Pierson, 2002) and fair access to city amenities, such as public open spaces and parks (Agyeman & Evans, 2003). Also, we look to have vibrant and pedestrian-friendly urban environment with the mixing of land uses (Katz et al., 1994) without a severe economic polarization by gentrification effects (Anguelovski, 2014; Checker, 2011). In addition, we can anticipate seeing preserved nature within cities, such as waterways and greenways (McHarg, 1967; Sprin, 1984; Steiner, 2012) and efforts to reduce the ecological footprint to support current ecosystems (Alberti et al., 2010).

Therefore, using this approach, a set of observable implications of progress on urban sustainability of the projects in Seoul include the following: (1) democratic participation for the process of decision-making; (2) providing fair access to city amenities; (3) creating vibrant and active urban spaces; (4) prevention of gentrification effects; (5) reducing the ecological footprint; and (6) preservation of nature in a city (Table 2).
Table 2. Observable implications to evaluate the effectiveness of the sustainability projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observable implications developed for this research based on ‘Just Sustainability’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Democratic participation for the process of decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Providing fair access to city amenities (park and square)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Creating vibrant and active urban spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prevention of gentrification effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Reducing the ecological footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Preservation of nature in a city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
HISTORY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERN IN KOREA

Introduction

This chapter addresses the historical context and characteristics of urban development to contextualize how the central government has gained a consolidated power over urban policy and to introduce which issues have emerged that are associated with urban sustainability planning in Korea. First, the general features of the urbanization in Korea will be introduced. After addressing challenges facing Seoul in terms of urbanization, a brief description about Korean society’s transition to democracy will be introduced since the emergence of citizen groups and the rapid democratization have affected the urban politics around urban policies in Korea. The context of the late development of urban policy will be followed after that. In addition, key characteristics of urbanization patterns, urban planning, and sustainability in Korea by the decade will be presented in detail from the 1960s to 2000s. As one of the most significant urban sustainability policies in Korea, the Greenbelt policy's historical background and the contested debate over the implementation of the policy will be drawn. Finally, a brief description of the characteristics of the recent three Seoul Mayors who have been directly engaged with two case projects for this research will be presented.

An Overview of the Urbanization

South Korea has experienced dramatic urbanization and modernization over the last half century. The urban population had increased from 39.1 percent in 1960 to 90.9 percent in 2010 and the country’s total population has increased approximately from 25
million to 50.5 million (MLTL, 2011). The total territory size of South Korea is 100,210 km², with the population density per square kilometer was 505 in 2010, which is higher than the figure of Japan (336 persons) in 2008 (UN, 2011).

The Seoul Metropolitan area covers 605 km², 0.61 percent of total territory of South Korea, and spans an area 30.30 km north-to-south and 34.78 km west-to-east. The population in Seoul soared from 2.45 million in 1960 to 10.1 million in 2018, with the total population density is 16,714 persons/km² in 2018 (Seoul Solution, 2018). Over one-fifth of the national total population lives in Seoul, which only affects 0.61 percent of South Korea. As results of natural and policy constraints, Seoul is a city with one of the highest population densities in the world. Over one-third of the national territory, 237 km, cannot be used for development due to geographical features such as rivers and mountains (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2006, p. 166). The Han River flows horizontally across Seoul, dividing the city into two sections lying north and south of the river. The Greenbelt, which was introduced in 1971 following the example of London, constrains urban sprawl in Seoul and help preserving the natural environment (Kwon, 2000).

Seoul is the center of Korea’s domestic economy and plays a leading role in the global economy. The GDP of Seoul was $317 billion in 2016, according to the Statistics provided by the SMG (Seoul Solution, 2018). Seoul contributes 21 percent of Korea’s national GDP, while comprising only 0.6 percent of the nation’s land area (Korea Tripartite Commission, 2009). Recent industrial trends in Seoul have led to a switch in emphasis from manufacturing to creative industries, which include office sectors, finance, insurance, real estate, and corporate service, and this shift in the industry affected the development of
infrastructures, influencing on the built-environments in Seoul. Also, green space surrounds Seoul as a result of Korea’s strict land-use regulation (e.g., its greenbelt policy).

Urbanization Challenges Facing Seoul

This rapid urban concentration of population has caused many problems, such as congestion, pollution, substandard transport and housing, and a high rate of urban poverty. As Seoul has experienced rapid economic and demographic growth, a critical debate was how to resolve diverse urban issues such as traffic congestion, insufficient housing, deteriorating environments, and low quality of life. Although the Korean government developed South Seoul and New Towns outside Seoul to disperse the concentration of people and firms, the public policies increased commuting distance and worsened traffic congestion (Jun and Hur, 2001).

The main cause of these problems was the insufficient land area to accommodate increasing population in Seoul and the increasing price of land as well. Since the 1960s, urbanization in Korea required a significant amount of urban land for new settlements, yet the transformation of natural land into urbanized area has been strictly restricted by laws, including the Greenbelt Policy. As a result, only 6.6 percent of the Korea’s territory was urbanized in 2009 (MLTM, 2010a). Therefore, Seoul has suffered from insufficient urban areas and the increasing population density and rapid migration has exacerbated the problems, such as traffic congestion, housing insufficiency, and environmental degradation (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009a).
Democratization in Korea

Along with numerous other countries around the world, Korea was a part of the ‘third wave’ of international democratization during the 1980s and 1990s (Huntington, 1993). In particular, the practice of democratic governance was late in Korea due to a lengthy period of authoritarian governance by the legacy of the colonial period by Japan (1910-1945). However, the end of Cold War and global market economy promoted circumstances where a democracy would take root (Huntington, 1993; O’Donnell and Schmitter, 1986). As numerous countries around the world, including Korea, experienced ‘third wave’ of international democratization during the 1980s and 1990s (Huntington, 1993), Korean society had a turning point in 1987 as the civil society went through the democratic transition. Korea has been ruled by the military governments from 1962 to 1987. However, the June Democracy Movement, from June 10th to June 29th in 1987, was a nationwide democracy movement against the military government to hold direct presidency elections and establish other democratic reforms. On June 29, 1982, the regime finally announced dramatic concessions, including adopting a direct presidential election system and that time became a critical moment in the history of democracy in Korea.

There were a series of fundamental changes in governing institutions. The direct presidential election and the process of amending the Constitution were constitutionally guaranteed, and several basic political rights, such as freedom of press and speech and freedom of association and assembly, were significantly promoted. On top of that, the enactment of Local Autonomy Act has led to local government reforms in 1991 and 1994, diversifying political channels to local society from the central government. In 1995, local officials, local mayors and council members, who had previously implemented the central
authority’s policies started to seize autonomous decision-making powers. Even though local autonomy has been legally mandated since 1948, military authorities between the 1960s and the 1980s did not allow local autonomy (Oh, 1999, p. 152-161).

Democratic value and cultural changes in the Korean mass public promoted additional resources for democratic consolidation since 1987 as well. Pressures and challenges from the bottom for democratic governance helped bring about democratization (Flanagan and Lee, 2000). Civic activism focusing on diverse urban policy issues has emerged (Kim, 2000), and the political voices of middle-class groups and citizens were increasingly raised as Korean society is awaken by democratization.

Therefore, Korean governments from the 1960s on can be divided into before and after the 1987 Democracy Movement. During the first period, planning was an instrument for economic development. Even after the democracy movement in 1987, growth politics affected the urbanization patterns at both the national and local level in Korea. However, it is clear that rapid democratization and decentralization in Korea led to substantial changes in the dynamics of urban politics around urban policies (Table 3).
Table 3. South Korean Governments and major characteristics since the 1960s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Political stance</th>
<th>Major characteristics and urban policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park, Chung-hee</td>
<td>1962-1979</td>
<td>Military Government</td>
<td>Strong central government, Economic development plans, Greenbelt policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh, Tae-woo</td>
<td>1988-1992</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Construction of 2 million housing units, Acceptance of the public concept of land ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Dae-jung</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Efforts to recover the economy after the IMF shock, Greenbelt release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh, Moo-hyun</td>
<td>2003-2007</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Promotion of balanced regional policy and real estate market stabilization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Myung-bak</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Global financial crisis, Four large rivers refurbishment project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Geun-hye</td>
<td>2013-March 2017</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Globalization through cultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon, Jae-in</td>
<td>May 2017-</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Urban regeneration through preservation, People-oriented policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, the authorities of Young-sam Kim (1993-1997) and Dae-Jung Kim (1998-2002) were represented as a period profoundly affected by the forces of devolution, decentralization, deregulation, and globalization. During this time, the 25 local administrative districts in Seoul were given more authority, in line with democratic and decentralized governance (The Seoul Institute, 2017). Most of the urban planning authority held by the Construction & Transportation Minister was transferred to the City Mayors or the Provincial Governors. Along with this, Yeong-Sam Kim government of 1993-1997 changed direction towards deregulation under the name of ‘global standards,’ following the trend towards neoliberalism, which is a process of restructuring the public and private sectors to promote a growth first approach to urban change. The relaxation of land regulation caused a tremendous amount of disorderly development, especially in the CBD region. Also, one of the most significant changes in urban policy during this time was the partial release of Greenbelt under the Dae-Jung Kim’s authority. The primary purpose of the Greenbelt cancelation was to protect individual property rights over the greenbelt regulations, reflecting Dae-Jung Kim’s political will (Hankyoreh, 2018).

Late Development of Urban Policy

After the liberation from Japanese rule in 1945 and the Korean War (1950-1953), Korea had to establish a government system that was suitable for modern society. There was a disconnect between Korean’s modern history and the past due to the colonial period by Japan (1910-1945). There were no strong middle-class groups in Korea until the 1980s. Therefore, Korean society did not have enough time to establish its own government and legal systems based on the negotiation between the state and civil society. In addition, the civil society was too weak to stand against the state, allowing military force to dominate...
the power easily till the demographic movement in 1987 (Table 3). In this context, the Korean central government initiated the ‘Five Year Economic Development Plans,' every five years between the 1960s and 1980s (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009a). Additionally, when the first Urban Planning Act was enacted in 1962, zoning systems was adopted to restrain the disorderly development of cities and develop national land efficiently (Yoo, 2000).

The five-year economic development plans resulted in the migration of the population from rural areas to urban areas by the development of labor-intensive industries in major cities in Korea. The rapid population increase in urban areas, especially in Seoul, led to the uncontrolled growth on the outskirts of the areas. Also, the rapid urbanization had occurred along with industrial development. The Korean government had to make efficient national urban policy choices regarding urban setting development, such as infrastructure, placement of new urban residents, and the shaping of urban land use, within a short time. As a result, the state drew well-established planning tools, such as zoning system, from other developed countries those already experienced industrialization and modernization earlier.

In making these choices, the Korean administrations of the 1960s-1970s put into place a set of policies similar to those carried out in the UK following World War II. A key strategy for the control of land use in metropolitan areas was the Greenbelt, facilitating the containment of agricultural and regulating new development. With the rapid expansion of urban population and territory, urban and regional planning in the 1970s focused on restricting urban growth and intensifying the utilization of inner cities (Chung and Kirby, 2002). The restricted development zone (Greenbelt) was introduced in 1971 to prevent the
further expansion of metropolitan areas until contemporary era in Korea (Kwon, 2000). While Japan failed to implant the concept of restricted development in the 1960s, the Korean government successfully implemented the British model of Green Belt under the centralized power of the authoritarian regime.

In order to control urban expansion, the Restricted Development Zone (or Green Belt) was introduced in 1971, which strictly managed the expansion of metropolitan areas until contemporary Korea (Kwon, 2000). Although Japan failed to root the concept of restricted development in the 1960s, the Korean authority successfully implemented the British model of Greenbelt under the authoritarian rule. Korea has strictly controlled a wide range of development activities by individuals within its greenbelt, causing a persistent stream of complaints from the region’s residents since its introduction. With the rapid democratization and the shift toward local developmental strategies, seemingly the Greenbelt could have been released to make way for emerging local development across the nation. However, the rise of civic activism after the democratic transition in urban areas in Korea contributed to reinforce the growth management policies that were adopted by authoritarian rule until the Dae-jung Kim administration decided to release the greenbelt in the late 1990s. While there are a significant body of the region’s residents complaining about the restricted development (Hankyoreh, 2018), the democratization in Korea led to the rise of civic activism advocating the Greenbelt policy and the decentralization of governance led to strong oppositions from local policymakers, especially Seoul mayor, for deregulation of greenbelt policy.
History of Urban Development in Korea

The 1960s: The First Institutional Measure for Urban Planning Introduced to Manage Population Growth and Rapid Urbanization

Economic development plans launched in the 1960s resulted in a massive population migration to Seoul, with approximately 500,000 people within two years (The Seoul Institute, 2017). The addition of Gangnam (southern part of Han River) to the city in 1963 caused a further growth of population (3 million) and led to severe traffic congestion, environmental pollution, an overburdened public transit system, overcrowded residential areas, and rampant development of unauthorized settlements. Substantial roads and highways were built to address traffic congestion issue and Chyeonggye highway was built, covering the Cheoggye stream at that time. The SMG started to clean up city slums and department stores and large commercial/residential complexes, including Sewoon Sangga, were built instead.

In the 1960s, there was a need for new urban planning legislation to deal with the issues of housing, transportation, and infrastructure. The Joseon Town Planning Ordinance, introduced by the Japanese government in Korea to promote the national interests of colonial Japan, was divided into the ‘Urban Planning Act’ and the ‘Construction Act’ in 1962. The ‘Urban Planning Act,’ providing provisions for the improvement of poor districts, was the first institutional measure for urban planning taken by South Korea. The Land Readjustment Program Act to develop basic infrastructure, such as roads and parks, was enacted in 1966 at minimum public cost (The Seoul Institute, 2017).

As mentioned in the literature review before, land and housing development in Korea was led by a ‘developmental state’ (Bae and Sellers, 2007; Flynn, 1999). The central
government of Korea enacted the Land Expropriation Act in 1962 to manage urban land efficiently to promote industrialization. However, the Land Expropriation Act allowed the government to secure land widely not only for industrial development but also for residential and commercial development, empowering the government’s control on land and housing management (Kim and Ahn, 2002). As a result, the monopolized public sector could gain enormous development gain from the implementation of the Land Expropriation Act (Grange and Jung, 2004).

The 1970s: Expansion of Basic Infrastructure and the Emergence of South Seoul

In the 1970s, South Korea experience an exponential economic growth mainly through the development in export-oriented light industries, with the increase in the per-capita income from $250 in 1970 to $1,000 in 1977 (The Seoul Institute, 2017). In 1975, the population in Seoul reached 6 million with a significantly increase from 1.5 million in 1950. During that time, the authority of Seoul needed a spatial strategy to protect Seoul as tension between North and South increased. Seoul’s proximity to the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) made the Korean government anxious about the safety of its primary city (Kim, 2003). Accordingly, a land readjustment program was introduced to the agricultural Gangnam (southern part of Han River) area to decentralize the city’s economic functions away from the downtown Gangbuk area. New towns in Gangnam area were set up based on a grid of arterial roads and was occupied with new housings (detached houses for the social upper class and large-scale apartments), high-rise office buildings, the relocated top high schools and public offices, and shopping centers. Gangnam areas in Seoul became the new subcenters for the headquarters of private companies, high-rise condominium complexes, and dense retail functions. Further, the central and Seoul governments
continued to construct bridges over the Han River and relocated public facilities, such as
the supreme courts, the public prosecutor’s office, and the national library, to South Seoul
(Lee, 2003). The administrative districts in Seoul were expanded to 605 km², similar to its

The 1970s in Korea was marked as an era for rapid industrialization and economic
growth, leading to further urbanization. Accordingly, there were demands for a new
administrative framework capable of dealing with urban planning and relevant legislation
across various sectors. The ‘Urban Planning Act’ went through a full revision in 1971,
introducing the concept of ‘development prohibited areas’ to control disordered urban
expansion (The Seoul Institute, 2017). Between July 1971 and April 1977, 14 city areas
including Seoul were designated for development bans to prevent the uncontrolled
expansion of urban areas in Korea. The total land area affected was 5,397 km²,
approximately 5.4% of the nation’s territory. Of this total, 1,566.8 km² was in the Seoul
metropolitan area, and 166.8 km² in the city (figure 2). As one of the strongest controls on
land use to enhance urban sustainability in Korea, development prohibitions play a crucial
role in preventing urban expansion in the capital area, preserving the natural environment
around large cities, and providing green spaces for urban dwellers.
New developments in the Gangnam areas attracted many residents and firms, which moved from old towns in North Seoul to the newly developed communities in South Seoul. Despite the necessity of this new development in South Seoul, the urban growth resulted in unbalanced spatial and social outcomes between areas of the city. As a result, downtown Seoul has suffered from a ‘hollowing’ of residents and firms. This issue provided the ground for the Urban Redevelopment Act, which was launched in 1976, to establish an institutional framework to prevent the deterioration of the downtown Seoul and improve the areas with unauthorized housings built. Both the Act on Utilization and Management of the National Territory towards management and planning efficiency and the Housing Construction Promotion Act for fundamental resolution of housing issues were followed in 1973 (The Seoul Institute, 2017).
Since the Land Expropriation Act began in 1962, the government could not afford to pay sufficient compensation for expropriation due to lack of financial resource. In 1972, therefore, the government introduced the ‘basic price system’ by enacting the National Land Use and Management Act (NLUMA) to reduce the compensation price for the expropriation much lower than market price (Kim and Ahn, 2002). Based on this land allocation system, the central government could sustain two government-owned corporations, the Korea Housing Corporation and Korea Land Corporation.

The 1980s: Government’s Intervention on Housing Development and Downtown Seoul Decline

In the 1980s, the concentration of residents and employers in Seoul still required more space to live and work. The continuous trends compelled the central and Seoul governments to expand the size of Seoul. Meanwhile, numerous large corporations and middle-class residents emerged along with rapid economic growth around this time. At the same time, many redevelopment projects for downtown city became active by the government’s efforts to beautify and modernize the city (The Seoul Institute, 2017). The extensive farmlands and forests around the outskirt of Seoul were replaced by large apartment complexes, which changed the face of Seoul entirely. In 1981, the government amended the Urban Planning Act. With the Basic Urban Plan in place, the 3-phase urban planning system, including the Basic urban plan, urban plan overhaul, and yearly execution plan, was implemented. The central government also introduced an urban design system to provide more detailed guidelines and information on managing land use (The Seoul Institute, 2017).
The government’s management system for residential land development was established by enacting the Housing Site Development Promotion Act in 1980 (MLTM, 2010b). Also, the Capital Region Management Act was enacted in 1984 to restrict uncontrolled development by private sectors in Seoul (MLTM, 2010a). Since overcoming absolute poverty was given priority by the Korean government at that time (Policy Briefing, 2007), there were strong policy demands for development gains to be subject to public restitution.

At the end of the 1980s, the city of Seoul experienced a large-scale change of the region’s spatial structure. A pressing shortage of affordable housing and burdensome housing costs spurred labor strikes (Jun and Hur, 2001). In 1988, the central government under the Tae-woo Roh’s administration announced an ambitious national housing plan, ‘Two Million Dwellings Construction Project,’ constructing new towns within 30 kilometers of the downtown Seoul that would provide 2 million housing units in the short term by 1992 (Jun and Hur, 2001). The new towns inevitably were located far from the center city because Seoul had little undeveloped land left and was constrained by a strict Greenbelt policy that governed its surrounding area. The government decided to build these substantial new towns primarily to provide affordable housing options to the Seoul dwellers. However, in terms of urban sustainability, the creation of the new towns had negative influences, such as further urbanization outside of Seoul, increased energy consumption by the traffic between the jobs in Seoul and the home in new towns, and the loss of natural resources by the urbanization. Figure 3 shows the locations of five new towns that were constructed between 1989 and 1995 and Table 4 below provides
information about the construction periods and planned population densities of five new towns.

Figure 3. The locations of the five new towns developed between 1989 and 1995

Source: Jun, Kim, Kwon & Jeong, 2013
Table 4. The construction periods and the populations of five new towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Towns</th>
<th>Distance to CBD</th>
<th>Construction period</th>
<th>Project area (km²)</th>
<th>Population density in 1996 (per km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundang</td>
<td>25 km</td>
<td>1989-1995</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIsan</td>
<td>28 km</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungdong</td>
<td>25 km</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyungchon</td>
<td>20 km</td>
<td>1989-1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanbon</td>
<td>25 km</td>
<td>1989-1995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jun and Hur (2001)

The ‘Two Million Dwellings Project’ was one of the most aggressive projects in the history of urban development in Korea, and its goals were over-fulfilled (MLTM, 2010a). This substantial project was conducted through the central government’s direct intervention for national housing market with mass production of dwellings and restriction on transactions. This mass project was supported by the public since this urban policy was seen as government’s efforts to be more responsive to the needs of the people (Policy Briefing, 2007).

The 1990s: New Towns and Democratization

Newly developed New Towns outside of Seoul attracted population from downtown Seoul. Approximately two million residents, twenty percent of Seoul’s population, migrated to five new towns, (Bundang, IIsan, Jungdon, Pyunchon, and Sanbon) causing excess commuting problems, traffic congestion, and environmental pollution.

Source: Jun and Hur (2001). While the development of New Towns stabilized housing prices in Seoul, the average commuting distance between home and work increased significantly since the new towns had been developed mainly as ‘bedroom towns’ without
industry sectors. Due to the lack of public transit between Seoul and the New Towns, most commuters in the towns depended on automobiles (Table 5).

Table 5. Mode shares for commuting trips in the Seoul Metropolitan area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/walk</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>18,586,128</td>
<td>22,754,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5 demonstrates dramatic changes in commuting mode shares for the last 15 years: a sharp growth in automobile shares from 17% to 40.6%, a rapid decline in bus shares from 45.7% to 20.3% and a modest increase in subway shares from 10.7% to 15.1%. However, population have increased only 22.4% over the period. These data imply that a significant mode shift has occurred in Seoul from transit to automobile commuting between 1990 and 2015. This is related to increases in car ownership and other factors, such as the lack of public transit between Seoul and the New Towns. Therefore, the new town policy has contributed to the suburbanization around Seoul, increasing the automobile dependency for the dwellers.

The outflow of population and companies from North to South Seoul and the development of New Towns led to the decline of the downtown Seoul. While the population of Seoul overall increased by 18.3 percent between 1980 and 2000, the population in Jongro-gu and Joong-gu (main districts in downtown Seoul) decreased by 43 percent from 1980 to 2000 (Statistics Korea, 2015). The loss of residents in downtown
Seoul hindered real estate development and infrastructure investment in the area (Yang, 2001). Also, the number of employees decreased by 30.12 percent from 1993 to 2004 (Jeong, 2006). All in all, Seoul’s downtown has suffered from the exodus of households and companies and a deterioration of the built environment. Unlike the United States, the main driver of the declining downtown was a policy effort to decentralize people and jobs, and to relocate housing provisions outside Seoul.

Meanwhile, the government started to recognize the significance of restoring Seoul’s identity and cultural heritage that was damaged by urban growth and development. In 1990, the Namsan Mountain Restoration program was initiated to protect this mountain in the middle of the city. Accordingly, the first high-rise residential complex built in 1974 that stood in front of the Mountain Namsan was demolished to clear up the view. Around that time, the public started to appreciate the significance of managing the old city center with historical heritage (The Seoul Institute, 2017).

While downtown Seoul experienced a decline, new developments under went in South Seoul and outskirt of Seoul. The Seoul subway network was expanded by adding four lines (line 5,6,7, and 8). In particular, numerous high-rise buildings were constructed by the private sectors in Gangnam area. The increased ownership of private cars (see table 5 above) and the construction of highway networks contributed to urban expansion beyond the development prohibited areas.

The 2000s: Sustainable Urban Development

The Seoul Metropolitan Government enacted the Urban Planning Ordinance in July 2000, in which the matters commissioned to local autonomous governments were specifically regulated. In the 2000s, the government began to focus on sustainable
development in Seoul through the implementations of urban policies. Numerous plans focusing on restoring the history of Seoul were launched, including the City Center Management Plan (1999), the City Center Development Plan (2004), the Comprehensive City Center Recreation Plan (2008), and the Historical City Center Management Plan (2010) (The Seoul Institute, 2017). A series of historical royal palace restoration projects were implemented to provide public spaces to the citizens, such as Gyeongbok Palace, Changdeok Palace, and Deoksu Palace. On top of that, the authority attempted to create some eco-friendly and pedestrian friendly urban environments in the downtown Seoul, including the restoration of Cheonggyecheon and the transformation of the Dongdaemun Stadium into a city park. Other public spaces, such as Seoul Plaza, Sungnye Gate Plaza, and Gwanghwamun Square, were constructed as well. The SMG also sought to strengthen the city’s identity by restoring its historical and cultural heritage, such as the Bukchon Village Beautification program and the restoration of ancient city walls.

Another New Town Project, after the one in 1988, was launched in 2002 for the Eunpyeong, Gireum, and Wangsimni region, to develop Gangbuk area with the construction of high-rise apartment complexes and region refurbishment (The Seoul Institute, 2017). Between 2002 and 2007, a total of 26 regions in Gangbuk area were assigned to be a part of the New Town Project (The Seoul Institute, 2017). In the 2000s, it became particularly important to encourage public participation in decision-making towards social consensus as Korean society became democratized. To develop the 2030 Seoul Plan, a citizen board was organized to participate in the plan developing process for the first time. The institutional framework associated with urban planning was greatly affected by the social conditions of the time and changed accordingly. The ‘Plan first,
develop later’ system launched by the SMG prevented some reckless development in Seoul. Some regulations on restricted development areas, which was enacted from the 1970s, were separately addressed and managed by the Act on Special Measures on the Designation & Management of Development Prohibited Areas (2000) (The Seoul Institute, 2017). All in all, these legislation changes reflect that the paradigm where priority was on development and growth changed to a greater emphasis on the environment and sustainability.

The Urban Planning Act (for urban areas) and the Act on Utilization & Management of National Territory (for non-urban areas) were integrated to unify the land use management system in Korea in 2002. The provisions on urban development projects in the Urban Planning Act were combined with the Land Readjustment Program Act to create the new Urban Development Act (2000), while the Urban Redevelopment Act (1976) and the Act on Temporary Measures for the Improvement of Dwellings & Other Living Conditions for Low-Income Urban Residents (1984) were merged into a new Act on Maintenance & Improvement of Urban Areas and Dwelling Conditions for Residents (2003) (The Seoul Institute, 2017). As such, in the 2000s, related or overlapping urban plans were brought together to simplify the system and add more details to the provisions.

In the early 2000s, the Dae-jung Kim authority started to put an emphasis on conservation of the environment in urban development, as confirmed by the enactment of the National Land Use and Management Act (NLUMA) in 2002. Also, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) system was reinforced and integrated into the Act dealing with the Assessment of the impact of developments on the environment, traffic, and citizens in 1999. However, at that time, the government had to focus on policies for economic
recovery after the Asian economic crisis exploded in December 1997. Concrete policy moves towards environmental conservation were implemented in the mid 2000s and the framework act on sustainable development was passed in 2007 (The Seoul Institute, 2017). In this period, many substantive standards and guides were established relating to sustainable development. The sustainable new city planning standard in 2005 introduced the concepts of ‘sustainability’ into planning rules for the first time.

Greenbelt

Countries around the world have responded to growing concern about the problems associated with rapid urbanization patterns by creating a wide range of policy instruments designed to manage urban growth and protect open space (Bengston et al. 2004; Richardson and Bae 2004). Out of many growth management tools, urban containment policies have been considered by some to be a promising approach (Bengston et al. 2004; Hack, 2012). National urban containment policies have been in place for many decades in a few countries, including the United Kingdom and Korea. The introduction of the Greenbelt policy in Korea was a critical factor in shaping urbanization patterns particularly of Seoul. Therefore, the Greenbelt policy has been regarded as one of the most important urban sustainability tools used in urban planning in Korea.

Ever since the concept of a greenbelt was introduced by Ebenezer Howard in his 1902 book Garden Cities of Tomorrow (Howard, 1902), his utopian idea, creating radical cities with the land surrounding the city that would be an area reserved primarily for agricultural uses preventing further urban expansion, has been internationally accepted to manage urban growth. Despite its wide support from the public, environmentalist and
heritage preservation groups, there was a growing realization of some disadvantages inherent to greenbelt policy. Amati and Yokohari (2006) pointed out that there were three major faults in greenbelt policy from the London case as follow: 1) greenbelts contribute to metropolitan housing shortages; 2) the greenbelt fails to properly account for the ecological and amenity value of urban land that goes unprotected; and 3) it fails to achieve a compact city, leading instead to leapfrog development (Amati and Yokohari 2006).

A greenbelt policy was introduced in 1971 in Seoul with three main objectives: prevent urban sprawl, preserve nature near urban centers, and promote national security. Although Seoul’s greenbelt had similar objectives to those of other countries when it was created, it has evolved uniquely. Originally, a total of 5,397.1 km² of land was set aside for greenbelts, which accounted for 5.4 percent of the entire land area of South Korea (South Korea Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, 2011). Currently, about one quarter of the greenbelt lands (1416 km²) is located around the Seoul Metropolitan Area (SMA) where approximately half of the nation’s population resides (Figure 4).
Figure 4. Greenbelt Zone around Seoul Metropolitan Area

The Korean greenbelt experience show the similar side effects with what Amati and Yokohari (2006) pointed out. In particular, the greenbelt policy around Seoul has inadvertently resulted in unwanted effects, such as unaffordable housing, leapfrog development, and high commuting costs. Due to the rapid population increase in Seoul, the speed of Seoul’s growth and the resulting increase in its density were not comparable to that experienced by other cities with designated greenbelt areas (Lee, 1999). Seoul expanded beyond its greenbelt. For instance, Seoul’s greenbelt accounts for 13.1 percent of the total SMA, while the population within it accounts for only 1.5 percent of the SMA’s population (Lee, 1999). The New Towns for the ‘Two Million Dwellings Construction Project’ in 1988 had to be located far from the center city because Seoul was constrained by a strict Greenbelt policy.

To deal with these side effects, some have suggested that controlled and gradual relaxation of the greenbelt to allow for new development would allow city residents to periodically reevaluate how the benefits of maintaining the greenbelt compare to the costs (Hack 2012; Amati and Taylor 2010; Amati 2008; Morrison 2010). Among the countries that have implemented greenbelts, Korea was the first to relax the policy to allow developments on the greenbelt lands in response to the side effects. In 1998, the Constitutional Court upheld individual property rights over the greenbelt regulations along with the strong political will of the previous president, Dae-Jung Kim. As a result, the Greenbelt reform council was organized in 1999 and decided to release a total of 446.2 km² of the greenbelt areas, 7.7 percent of the original greenbelt area (Bae, Richardson, and Jun, 2011). After that, the government released 9 percent of the greenbelt land in the SMA (144.3 km²) between 2000 and 2011. To mitigate the exponentially increasing housing
costs in Seoul, the Korean government has initiated several large-scale housing development projects on the released lands to add 1.5 million housing units between 2009 and 2018 (South Korea Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, 2011; Bae, Jun, and Richardson, 2011). All in all, since the late twentieth century, the central government has released 1543 km$^2$ of the total greenbelt area (approximately 30 percent of original greenbelt designated areas) for residential use till the year of 2016 (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport, 2017).

Seoul’s greenbelt has generated both significant costs and benefits. Many have contended that the greenbelt should continue to exist, because its benefits in enhancing urban sustainability are substantial. Bengston and Youn (2006) point out that the greenbelt contributes to purifying air, protecting biodiversity and habitat, controlling flood, and improving the water quality in Seoul. However, another study pointed out that the greenbelt had negative impacts on the environment in terms of increased energy consumption and air pollution due to the increased commuting distances and further leap frog residential development (Jun and Hur 2001). Some studies found that the greenbelt has led to increased land values inside of Seoul, resulting shortage of affordable housing within the city (Lee and Linneman, 1998; Lee, 1999; Jun, 2011). Ha (Ha 2004) implies that a small segment of the population has been forced to locate in squatter settlements and Bae (1998) has also argued that those living within the greenbelt suffer numerous disadvantages, such as severely stifled property values, poor sanitation, and underdeveloped community facilities.

Unlike other countries, Korea has strictly controlled a wide range of development activities by individuals within its greenbelt. That has led to a persistent stream of
complaints from the region’s residents since its introduction in Korea. Given the fact that the greenbelt has generated significant costs and benefits in Korea, it is still controversial over the management way of greenbelts. Recently, the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport announced their plan to provide 50,000 housing units on the released lands in Seoul by 2022 and the SMG is strongly opposing the further release of greenbelt around Seoul (Hankyoreh, 2018). Also, an emerging body of civic activism are opposing the government’s plan to release the greenbelt. All in all, the Seoul greenbelt is one of the most controversial and pressing urban policy related issues in Korea now.

Seoul Mayors Characteristics for this research

As sustainable development has become a focus of urban development in Korea, especially in Seoul, since the early-2000s, this research explores how growth politics forms around the urban sustainability project and how sustainable the projects are, where the state has historically played a predominant role in urban policy, by examining two urban sustainability projects in Korea, the Choenggyecheon restoration project and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project. As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations, such as late industrialization, rapid democratization, and decentralization, with a legacy of a developmental state, Seoul offers an essential source of insight into the meaning that these transformations are likely to have for the politics of urban growth around sustainability plans. Considering the importance of the major policymaker’s role in urban politics in Seoul, Table 6 summarizes the characteristics of Seoul mayors that were directly engaged with two urban sustainability projects for this research: Myung-bak Lee (Cheonggyecheon restoration project), Se-hoon Oh (the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga
regeneration project) and Won-soon Park (the second phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project).

Table 6. Seoul Mayors and their major characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seoul Mayor</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Political stance</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Major urban policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Myung-bak</td>
<td>July 2002 - June 2006</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Economic development, increasing the competitiveness of Seoul</td>
<td>Cheonggyecheon restoration project, bus rapid transit improvement plan, New town development for the balanced regional policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, Se-hoon</td>
<td>July 2006 – August 2011</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Design city, tourism promotion, increasing the competitiveness of Seoul</td>
<td>Dongdaemoon Design Park Plaza construction, Sewoon Greenway park creation, Infrastructure promotion for tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Won-soon</td>
<td>October 2011 ~</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Public participation, people-centered, sustainable development through historical preservation</td>
<td>Seoullo 7017 (pedestrian-oriented highway preservation project), Developing 2030 Seoul master plan through public participation, Remaking Sewoon Project through historical preservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, Myung-Bak Lee, the former Mayor of Seoul between 2002 and 2006, nicknamed "Bulldozer," with his pushing working ethic. He was once praised for his single-minded approach and perseverance as a successful businessman before becoming the Mayor of Seoul. Myung-Bak Lee has been known for his powerful leadership since he served as a CEO of one of the biggest corporations in Korea, Hyundai Engineering and Construction. With a conservative political stance, he took up the Cheonggyecheon restoration project as his flagship project for this Mayor election campaign. He also
campaign on a pro-market platform, favoring the vested interests groups. During his mayorship term, his main focuses were concentrated on economic development and increasing the competitiveness of Seoul, with an efficiency-driven approach. These characteristics of Myung-Bak Lee acted as a critical role in the decision-making process and the implementation of the Chenggyecheon restoration project.

Second, Se-Hoon Oh, the former Mayor of Seoul between 2006 and 2011, also was a member of the conservative party. He attempted to make Seoul a creative city by implementing design-based policies, including Dongdaemoon Design Park Plaza construction and the Greenway Project (the first phases of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan). While Oh sought to upgrade Seoul by creating a design city and establishing a more extensive international appeal and recognition, the Seoul's design-based policies have failed to achieve their desired effect due to miscommunication, political instability, increasing debt, and resistance from civil groups (Lee & Hwang, 2012; Lee, 2015).

Lastly, the current Mayor of Seoul since 2011, Won-soon Park, has discarded Oh’s design plans and instead aims to use cultural policy to enact tangible change for local citizens. Park change the direction of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan from redevelopment by demolishing the Sewoon Sangga to regeneration through preserving the Sewoon Sangga. He had a clear vision towards the Remaking Sewoon Project, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches, and actively accommodated residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. His first term as a Seoul mayor began from October 2011, and he recently entered his third term of mayorship in this June 2018. Before he was elected as a Seoul mayor, Won-Soon Park had worked mainly for NGOs for the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, which predicts his direction
in his political career. With a political stance in progressive, he has criticized that Seoul's rapid growth brought about a culture of demolishing the old and rebuilding. His vision of Seoul is making the city more pedestrian-friendly and where possible to adapt the existing fabric rather than erase it in favor of grand new structures (Cities Today, 2016). Therefore, the current Remaking Sewoon Project presented by the SMG in 2013 reflects Park's strong will preserving the historical, cultural values of the neighborhoods through the public participation.
CHAPTER 5
THE CHEONGGYECHEON RESTORATION PROJECT

Introduction

This chapter asks about the dynamics of urban politics of the Choenggyecheon Restoration project and examining the sustainability of the project. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section deals with the history and background of the Cheonggyecheon project, including the overview of the project, the historical meaning of the Cheonggyecheon from the Joseon Dynasty period, and the social/environmental context of a need for the restoration project.

Based on the Cheonggyecheon restoration project, the second section explores the central research question for this study: What were the dynamics of urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of urban sustainability megaprojects in Seoul and how effective were the megaprojects in promoting ‘just sustainability’? The planning process of the Cheonggyecheon project, from the origin of the plan to the completion of the plan, is examined to answer these research questions.

This study contributes to the literature on the use of urban sustainability plans as ‘sustainability fix,’ which is defined as “selective incorporation of environmental goals, determined by the balance or pressures for and against environmental policy within and across the city” (Jonas & Gibbs, 2004, p. 552) by Jonas & Gibbs, by critically examine if the Cheonggyecheon restoration project challenge or reproduce existing power imbalance by the growth politics in Seoul. As sustainability becomes a pervasive framework, it concentrates on specific appealing issues such as environmental amenities, such as green open spaces and climate change, yet these policies leave out environmental justice issues
(Checker, 2011; Finn & McCormick, 2011). This contradictory relationship between sustainable policies and inequitable urban redevelopment become more problematized as cities are becoming competitive global cities (Sassen, 1991). Given the urban dynamics that growth and sustainable development issues are increasingly prevailing, accelerated by the ongoing forces of globalization, the Asian context can manifest a set of conditions that seemingly favor the emergence of the growth politics using the concept of sustainability with urban sustainability plans to enhance the competitiveness of their cities as a global city. However, little is known about the growth politics around urban sustainability plans in Asian cities. Therefore, this section critically examines the Cheonggyecheon project, questioning if the implementation of the project was used as a ‘Sustainability fix’ to promote the City of Seoul as a global city.

Also, this case study contributes to the development of the urban theory of ‘Growth machine’ (Logan and Molotch, 1987) by situating the growth machine theory in the local context of Seoul, characterized as a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations, such as globalization and democratization with the legacy of a developmental state (Bae and Sellers, 2007), to analyze how growth coalitions have formed around urban sustainability planning in Seoul and how the coalitions were differ or similar with the growth models experienced in the US cities. How the balance of state powers and competencies, pressures and incentives variously enable and constrain urban sustainability policy in different national-urban contexts is critical. Therefore, this research using the Cheonggyecheon project case contributes to building up a variation of that growth politics that has proven in the Western context in the context of the Asian city.
Finally, the last section examines the effectiveness of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project in promoting urban sustainability, focusing on the just sustainability. The economic, environmental, and social impacts of the Cheonggyecheon project are critically examined in this section. This study not only assesses the consequences of the plan based on the previously done studies, reports, and in-depth interviews regarding the plan but also critically examine how sustainable this plan was in the process of the decision-making and the implementation of the project. This study uses the framework of ‘just sustainability’ suggested by Agyeman and Evans (2004) to evaluate how sustainable the project was.

Main finding

This case study found that the forces of globalization and the Mayor-centered coalition have been the most critical factors determining the dynamics of the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project in 2003. The city of Seoul actively uses the concept of sustainability to revitalize the depressed downtown Seoul and appeal a positive image of Seoul as an ‘ecocity’ globally. Also, the mayor of Seoul at that time, Myung-Bak Lee had a strong political drive to complete the project within his mayoral term. Lee had a clear vision about the project, a justification to proceed that plan with concrete support from the public for historic restoration, and a strong power provided as a Seoul mayor in one of the developmental states. Based on this foundation, he has been known for his powerful leadership since he served as a CEO for one of the biggest corporations in Korea, Hyundai Construction Company. As a successful former businessman, he knew that the completion of the Cheonggyecheon project would be marketable to citizens and other global cities.
Most importantly, Lee wanted to complete this project within his mayoral term – between 2002 and 2006 – to utilize this vast achievement to prepare the presidential election in 2008. Therefore, this combined effects by the city authority’s aim to enhance the competitiveness of the city as a global city with an ‘eco-friendly’ image and the Mayor’s strong power with a legacy of developmental state led to the creation of the main drive for the implementation of the project. Therefore, this case manifests itself how the city of Seoul uses the urban sustainability plans as a ‘sustainability fix.’

When testing the applicability of the growth machine theory, we could observe the formation of the growth coalition around the project. By emphasizing ‘Revitalization of the economy’ as one of the objectives of the master plan of the Cheonggyecheon project, the authority of Seoul sought to re-image cities to attract more global capital. The SMG believed that by providing attractive urban amenities, they could bring positive long-term economic effects and improve the economic competitiveness and the global appeal of the city. Also, the city of Seoul prioritized attracting foreign investments and tourists to downtown Seoul through the implementation of the restoration project, while they exclude the local business sector from the decision-making process for the project. This can be seen as a form of growth coalition around the project. However, the project was driven by the authority of Seoul with limited influences from the private developers for this project. Blanc-Brude and Strage (1993) saw the public-private partnership as a process toward developing a regime as the local authorities consider market-led growth not only positive but also necessary, yet, public-private partnerships formed for the Cheonggyecheon case were bureaucratic structures operating under the strong central government control. Despite its useful explanatory power for urban revitalization in the Western context,
conventional theories of urban growth machine have a limitation in terms of providing a theoretical framework useful for the Cheonggyecheon case. While there was the growth politics around the stream restoration project affected by the globalization, the central government provided authority based on its dominant power and its reputation as predominant from its past status as a state-led regime.

As results, the completed project was neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable as the plan claimed in the beginning because the Cheonggyecheon restoration was realized through a technocratic-approach by using an artificial water pumping system to flow the water in the stream and the project ignored the social aspects of sustainability by allowing little room for public participation without any consideration of the gentrification effects after the project implementation. Since Myung-Bak Lee fixed the completion date from the beginning of the project, the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) allowed little room for criticism and modifications of the project. To shorten the total construction period, the total working site was divided into three work districts, and construction period could be dramatically deducted, reducing the room for the other stakeholders’ participation and causing substantial controversy over the way to recover ecological and historical authenticity of the stream. The water flows for the restored Cheonggyecheon was based on an artificial pumping system. While the natural water flow was the part of the restoration that was the most put forward by the SMG when promoting the project, the SMG changed the plan from natural stream restoration to using an artificial pumping system to circulate the water in the stream in a purpose to complete the project within before the deadline.
As a whole, the Cheonggyecheon project was not a sustainable project based on the framework of ‘just sustainability,’ (Agyeman and Evans, 2004) only focusing on the ‘pro-growth’ aspect of sustainability by the project implementation and ignoring both ecological and social aspects of sustainability. However, the concept of sustainability was actively used to promote the project and the city of Seoul globally. Therefore, the combined effects of the mayor-centered coalition and the force of the globalization acted as critical drives to implement the Cheonggyechon restoration project in Seoul. This case study serves as a lesson for how the implementation of a sustainability plan is used as a sustainability fix in the developmental states with the centralized governance system, the plan’s implementation results are likely to be detrimental in promoting ‘just sustainability’ because they have a ‘pro-growth’ frame.

History and Background of the Cheonggyecheon Project

Project Overview

The restoration of Cheonggyecheon, an urban stream in the historic capital city of Seoul, became the focus of world attention when the project was first announced and then completed in 2005. The project aimed to restore an old public space to create a waterfront in the downtown, improve the environment and restore the historical value. The Cheonggyecheon restoration project was sensational in the history of urban development in Korea, turning a historic stream covered by a deteriorating highway into an environmentally-friendly and pedestrian-oriented public waterfront through restoration (O'Byrne et al., 2014). Historically, this is the third urban development phase for Cheonggyecheon. It was first designated as an urban drainage facility in the 14th century
and then was covered by a highway in the 1960s. Influenced by the current forces of combining sustainable development and urban regeneration and addressing city branding for global competition, the third phase has sought to combine the recovery of the natural environment and historic preservation with a rehabilitation of the urban economy.

Before the restoration works, Cheonggyecheon was covered by 6km long and 50-80m long road structure, with 5.86km long and 16m wide of Cheonggye elevated highway over the road (Figure 6). The Cheonggyecheon was opened to the public on 1 October 2005, spending a total of 346 million dollars for the construction, after 28 months of construction work since 2003 (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005). This achievement was rendered possible by the active involvement of the Seoul Metropolitan Government and especially the Mayor of that time, Myung-Bak Lee. Today, the restored Cheonggyecheon stream flows west to east in central Seoul, passing through 13 districts (the smallest municipal administrative units) in four different wards of the city. After the restoration, the number of passengers’ car heading downtown fell by 2.3 percent, while the number of metro bus users grew by 1.4 percent, and the number of subway users grew by 4.3 percent to 430,000 thousand users daily (Lah, T. J., 2011). The most significant change, however, was the millions of visitors to the restored Cheonggyecheon, where varied cultural events have been held almost every day in the Cheonggye Plaza, which is located at the starting point of the waterway. The Plaza has now become the most attractive civic space in central Seoul (Cho, 2003a; 2007) and visitors have been found to be highly satisfied with their experience (Seoul Development Institute, 2005; Kim, 2007).
Figure 5. Location of the Cheonggyecheon

Source: Seoul Development Institute, 2007, p. 23

Figure 6. Before and after of Cheonggyecheon Project

Source: Kim and Han, 2012, p. 152
History of Cheonggyecheon

The Joseon Dynasty was founded in 1392 and moved its capital from Gaegyeong to Hanyang in 1394. Based upon the feng shui theory\(^1\), Hanyang had been regarded as an ideal spot for new capital for residence, military, and defense for strategic reasons. Hanyang was surrounded by four mountains in the four cardinal directions (Figure 7). Hanyang’s four inner mountains are Bukak-san (Mt.) to the north, Nak-san (Mt.) to the east, Inwang-san (Mt.) to the west, and Nam-san (Mt.) to the south.

Figure 7. Strategic location of Hanyang (Ancient Seoul)

Source: Seoul Development Institute, 2007, p.9

The city planning of Hanyang basically followed the model of Zhou li (Kim, J. B., 1999). The grand palace Gyeongbok-palace is located at the center. The royal ancestral shrine Jongmyo is located on the left side of the grand palace while the altar to the gods of

\(^1\) In East Asia, the locations of palaces and the layout of buildings have been a matter of concern when constructing a capital. The models and philosophical ideas suggested by three Chinese classical works, *Zhou Li*, *Guan Ji*, and *Yi Jing*, were the most influential for city planning in East Asia (Kim, J. B., 1999).
earth and grain Sajikdan is located on the right side of the grand palace. Hanyang was fortified along the ridge of the four inner mountains. There were four main gates standing at four cardinal points. A stream running through the inner space from west to east was called Gaechon and later Chenggyecheon. The term “Chenggaecheon” had the meaning of “clear valley water.” The water resource is from the Mt. Inwangsan located in the northwest of Seoul. As an urban stream flowing from west to east converging the center of Seoul, the Cheonggyecheon was one of the most critical natural resources historically influencing the urban fabric of Seoul and the daily lives of its citizens. The branches of Cheonggyecheon generated the organic outline of nearby streets (Figure 8).

Figure 8. The Cheonggyecheon and its Tributaries

![Cheonggyecheon and its Tributaries](http://www.preservenet.com/freeways/FreewaysCheonggye.html)


The Cheonggyecheon was running through the heart of downtown, is a geographical boundary between the north and the south of the city. The shape of the stream
was a fundamental precondition limiting city planning. When the capital city was constructed, Cheonggyecheon was a key element to be taken into consideration for the layout of roads and buildings. Most of the main roads were paved along the Cheonggyecheon Stream (Institute of Seoul Studies, 2002). Most of the administrative organizations and the ruling class, such as palace, government offices, Jongmyo (royal ancestral shrine), Sajikdan (altar to the gods of earth and grain), and aristocrats’ houses, were located north of the stream. On the other hand, lower-class people were living south of the stream. The existence of Cheonggyecheon was a crucial factor in creating a spatial hierarchy, not only geographically but also socially and culturally. Therefore, there was an inevitable contrast between the north and the south—the north for the ruling class whereas the south for the ruled (Myeong-rae Cho, 2003b).

According to Lee (1973), merchants and technocrat class, such as translators and doctors, were wealthy and lived in the area around Gwangtong-gyo area, which was one of the most prosperous areas. Now, this area is essentially the CBD (central business district) of modern Seoul, filled with bank headquarters, retail shops, shopping centers, and the headquarters of business conglomerates. Therefore, the area surrounding the Cheonggyecheon in the Joseon Dynasty era provided the basic layout of the modern CBD of Seoul, and its influence has been continued historically (Cho, K., 2005, p.5). While many buildings and significant infrastructure were destroyed during the Japanese colonial period (1910 – 1945) and the Korean War (1950 – 1953), the overall urban configuration corresponding to Cheonggyecheon remained and shaped the modern city form of Seoul (Kim, 1996).
The Cheonggyecheon also played an essential role as a public space that facilitates integrated activities of different social groups. A significant number of merchants have settled near the stream, and it also provided opportunities for recreation for the residents living in the surrounding neighborhood during the Joseon Dynasty era (Lee, 2004). Therefore, the stream was a valuable public space where people could gather and interact together regardless of their classes. Even though the water was polluted by serving the daily activities of the citizens, streams were indispensable and precious for the citizens.

Figure 9. Cheonggyecheon served as a public space in 1883

Stream deterioration after the War

After the Korean War in 1950, the condition of the Cheonggyecheon significantly deteriorated due to the lack of proper maintenance. Garbage and sand accumulated in the stream and dirty water from informal refugee settlements near the stream rapidly polluted the water. The Cheonggyecheon area became a slum later, corresponding to the economic crisis of Seoul after the war. Also, in the 1960s, aggressive economic development plans launched by the central government of Korea resulted in a massive population migration to Seoul (The Seoul Institute, 2017). The inclusion of Gangnam (southern part of Han River) to the city in 1963 caused a further growth of population (3 million) and led to severe traffic congestion, environmental pollution, an overburdened public transit system, overcrowded residential areas, and rampant development of unauthorized settlements. Substantial roads and highways were built to address traffic congestion issues. Thus, the government constructed a 5.6 km-long, 16 m-wide elevated highway over the stream in August 1971 after four working years for the rehabilitation (Lee, 2004).

Around this time, the City of Seoul started to clean up deteriorated areas in Seoul to refurbish the downtown Seoul and constructed transpiration infrastructures to meet the needs for population migration and the increased industrial activities. Therefore, these socio-economic conditions provided a context to build the Cheonggye highway covering the historical Cheonggyecheon running across the center of Seoul. As the construction of Cheonggye highway was an epoch-marking event in the construction history of Seoul in terms of its length and the scale of work, it was the symbol of the development of Seoul at that time. It took 20 years after the beginning of the first covering work of the highway by Korean government (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005). As a result, this area lost its
role as a public space and became an automobile-dominated space instead. The elevated highway degraded the environmental condition of surrounding areas with air pollution and noise issue (Seoul Government Research Center, 2003). At the same time, the Cheonggyecheon disappeared in the history of Seoul after serving for citizens’ daily life for nearly 600 years.
Figure 10. Cheonggyecheon covered by a highway in the 1970s

Urban Politics Surrounding the Cheonggyecheon Restoration

*Origin of the idea for the project*

In 1991, Lee, H.D., a historian, raised an issue about Cheonggyecheon restoration with Nho, S.H., a professor of environmental science at Yeonsei University. Lee asked Nho about the feasibility of restoring Cheonggyecheon: “Can Cheonggyecheon be reopened and can clean water be circulated?” Started from this curiosity, Lee and Nho set up a study group and spread their idea (*The Munwha*, 2003). The professors met Gyeongri Park, one of the most influential and famous writers in Korea, and she joined their circle. She became a passionate advocate for the restoration of Cheonggyecheon and made significant contributions to spreading the idea (*The Seoul*, 2006). Organizing the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Forum, they started the full-scale activity by holding the first symposium in September 2000 and the second symposium in April 2001. Through these symposiums on the subject of restoring the Cheonggyecheon, a variety of topics were discussed such as the historicity of Cheonggyecheon restoration, the methods of water treatment, the environmental impact assessment, the traffic impact analysis, project cost, and nearby area development etc (*The Seoul*, 2006).

Also, there was a strong demand among the public motivating the Cheonggyecheon restoration project at that time. According to a survey by the Green Seoul Citizens Committee (one of the most well-known environmental NGOs in Korea), 86 percent of the residents supported this plan (*Green Seoul Citizens Committee*, 2003). The Cheonggyecheon project has historical importance in that it can revive historic spaces by peeling back the pavement covering the stream. The Seoul Metropolitan Government argued that this excavation of historical heritage helped to revive the pride of Korean
people in their 600-year old city (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008). As city policymakers sought to use cultural policy as a strategy of urban regeneration, the use of the historic environment as a part of place-making and city-image initiatives has become increasingly evident (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Pendlebury et al., 2004). The SMG sought to reinforce the identity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul as the capital of Korea by this place-based historical recovery project in old downtown in Seoul.

Since the 1990s, globalization has reduced control over the domestic market (Pempel, 1999) and produced a shift to knowledge, service, and high-tech oriented sectors. (Hahm and Plein, 1995; Chung and Kirby, 2002). Therefore, the old downtown Seoul became deteriorated with old urban structures developed for the industrialization in Korea. In addition, Seoul’s urban policy developing the Gangnam area led to the imbalance between Gangbuk and Gangnam areas, divided by the Han River.

This polarization has been a pressing urban issue in Seoul. The Cheonggyecheon restoration project emerged from the SMG’s efforts to revitalize the old downtown Seoul, in Gangbuk area, stressing the project implementation help return the stream to the public, thereby enriching their lives. Historic restoration projects give an impression of improving urban environmental quality. Thus, the government officials and planners could take advantage of the expectations of people who prefer cultural environments to live and visit. The authority of Seoul could use the historic restoration project as a mean to clean up the deteriorated Ganguk area. As results, despite some opposition of displaced merchants, an overwhelming majority of Seoul residents supported the project.

At a press conference on February 21, 2002, Myung-Bak Lee, a candidate for the city mayoral election, suggested the Cheonggyecheon restoration as a significant public
pledge. The Cheonggyecheon restoration emerged as a hot issue for debate among the candidates running for the city mayoral election slated for May 2002. During the run-up period, Myung-Bak Lee expressed the will to restore the Cheonggyecheon Stream strongly whereas his rival Min Seok Kim took a somewhat cautious approach to the project. Myung-Bak Lee had met the members of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Forum in September 2001 and announced the feasibility of adopting the restoration project as a public pledge (Seong and Kim, 2005). Finally, Myung-Bak Lee was elected mayor of Seoul on May 31, 2002. With a mandate for these proposals provided by his victory, Lee set about executing these projects, especially the symbolic Cheonggyecheon Stream, as quickly as possible (Cho, 2010). According to an interviewee:

The Cheonggyecheon Restoration Center was formed with elite technocrats in charge of civil engineering affairs and was commissioned to translate the Cheonggyecheon into a civil engineering accomplishment. In the election, Myung-Bak Lee took up Cheonggyecheon’s restoration as his flagship campaign promise, with the political calculation that the removal of the abominable Cheonggye structure would bring economic and environmental vitality to the inner city and thus help him gain political backing from the north side of Seoul, where his political foundation was particularly weak. The time frame of the project was set by his political ambition, as he aimed to complete the project before the end of his term (2002–2006) to run for the 2007 presidential election. These two conditions were critical to determining the dominant discourse surrounding the restoration project; technocratic and political. (Interviewee 2, June 21, 2017)

As the interview above said, the mayor-ship of Seoul is a significant position that is often considered as a path to the Presidency of South Korea and Myung-Bak Lee had a strong political interest in completing the restoration project within his term. Two interviewees from the public sector said respectively, “there was a shared common saying that the person who completes the Cheonggyechon restoration project will become the next president of Korea” (Interviewee 1, April 19, 2017). "As a successful former businessman,
Myung-Bak Lee exactly knew what citizens want to see for urban policy and how to push to get a project done promptly” (Interviewee 5, July 20, 2017). As a result, the stakes were very high for Lee's political career and were a strong incentive for him to finish the project before the end of his mandate so that he could benefit from this achievement. In fact, Myung-Bak Lee became President in December 2007 based on his achievement by the implementation of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project.

The Seoul Metropolitan Government held in-depth forums to discuss the urban core development plan of Seoul over two months ranging from October 2002 to November 2002, consisting of total 33 experts in the fields of urban planning, architecture, real-estate development, industrial economy, and citizen organizations. Some experts argued that the restoration of Cheonggyecheon would attract more tourists and investments into the urban core, emphasizing the development-oriented policy. On the other hand, others insisted the focus of the restoration should be on historical preservation and reinforcing the identity of Seoul. As a result, the SMG developed the first Urban area development and Cheonggyecheon restoration plan in November 2002, pursuing the harmony between the preservation and the development of the project (The Seoul Institute, 2004).

**Contending forces at the beginning of the project**

The new Seoul mayor’s public pledge for the restoration of Cheonggyecheon proved to be the main contribution to his victory. A survey conducted by the Green Seoul Citizens Committee indicated that 86% of the public supported the Cheonggyecheon revitalization (Green Seoul Citizens Committee, 2003). An interviewee said, “The Cheonggyecheon restoration project became the media sensation at that time. It is rare to see Seoul's urban plan on the front page of the main media in Korea, but the
Cheonggyecheon restoration was addressed on the front page of media multiple times. Also, the controversy over the project had brought more attention to the issue” (Interviewee 6, Sep 12, 2017).

The controversy over the Chenggyecheon project was concentrated around the expected traffic congestion issues during the construction periods and the oppositions from the existing merchants who were doing their old manufacturing businesses for decades within the project areas. The conflict issues with the merchants will be more specifically explained in the ‘conflict management’ section in this chapter later. Given the concentrated attention on the restoration project, Myung-Bak Lee was aware that he could meet Seoul citizen's aspirations to see a strong leadership that can save the city of Seoul from a recession by completing this seemingly impossible urban stream restoration project in the middle of the urban center. Myung-Bak Lee did not waste any time implementing this project. He was elected Seoul mayor in June 2001 and first reconfirmed the immediate implementation of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and established the Cheonggyecheon restoration project headquarters (Noh, 2009). A master plan for stream restoration was completed in February 2003. Freeway demolition began in June 2003 and was completed in September 2005. Stream restoration began in July 2003 and was completed in September 2005, at about the same time that Lee’s four-year term ended.

From the voters’ point of view, the idea of Cheonggyecheon’s restoration came as an attractive proposal and a pleasant surprise. In fact, the polls conducted during the election revealed that the majority of Seoul’s citizens supported the restoration, with the belief that it could contribute to the regeneration of the downtown economy. As it is explained in the Chapter 4 (the history of urban development patterns in Korea), new
developments in Gangnam areas driven by the central government attracted many residents and firms, which moved from old towns in North Seoul to the newly developed communities in South Seoul especially since the 1970s. Despite the necessity of this new development in South Seoul, the urban growth resulted in unbalanced spatial and social outcomes between areas of the city. As a result, downtown Seoul has suffered from a ‘hollowing’ of residents and firms. This issue provided the ground for the urban regeneration plans to prevent deterioration of the downtown Seoul and improve the built-environment of the areas (Seoul Institute, 2017).

Also, a majority of the public believed that urban greening projects in Korea have ecological importance, as they are likely to help revitalize Seoul, a city fatally suffering from the adverse effects, such as air pollution and water pollution problems, of the growth-first policy. As a result of the rapid rise of industrialization in South Korea, air pollution issues and water challenges including shortages and quality degradation have been severe problems since the 1990s (Choi et al., 2017). A study conducted in February of 2017 found that South Korea had the second worst air quality of all advanced nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (NPR, 2017). There was a keen awareness about the importance of environment protection among public and the government. The public believed that demolishing the highway and converting the area into a linear public park would reduce the traffic flow by the automobiles in the downtown of Seoul, reducing the air pollution issue in their daily life.

While most of the interviewees including Professors, NGO leaders, and citizens agreed that political purpose of Myung-Bak Lee was the leading force of the implementation of the project, some governmental officials of Seoul emphasize a strong
demand emerged from the public over political reason. There was a strong need for green space in Seoul. According to an interviewee:

We could start and finish this Cheonggyecheon restoration project because there was a strong need shared among the public to have green public spaces in Seoul. Most of the residents in Seoul were suffering from many pressing problems including serious air pollution, lack of green and public space, and traffic congestion. The early 2000s around, the public eagerly wanted to have people-oriented eco-friendly urban spaces, thereby ensuring harmonious coexistence of people and nature within the city of Seoul. Such a strong will from the public was critical for the implementations of Cheonggyecheon project in Seoul. Even though urban politics played a role in the processes of urban stream restoration project implementation, the government could not have started the project without strong political support from the public. We could have successfully finished this project wholly because of the strong demand and support from the public even though there were many barriers to overcome during the processes of the restoration project. (Interviewee 1, April 19, 2017)

Although people agreed on the necessity of Cheonggyecheon restoration, they had different opinions about what the restored stream should look alike. Some prioritized the historical values while others wanted to minimize the construction-related inconvenience in the vicinity. Transportation and flood prevention were also significant issues to consider, as were the practical issues such as construction period and cost. Besides, a further decision had to be made on the budget, phasing of implementation, project boundary, water supply and technical level of construction.

**Industrial shift in Korea**

Among developmental states in East Asia, Korea stands out for its successful Export-Oriented Industry. Its impressive economic development began in 1961, when the Chung-Hee Park military authority came to power, and drove for the national economic development as its main policy goal (Van, Linnemann & Verbruggen, 1987). The
explosive economic development was achieved by the combined effects between industrial development and urban policy promoting Export-Oriented Industry in the 1960s and 1970s. Given Korea’s limited capital and infrastructure and its largely rural background, the authority had to make active urban policies and development during the rapid state-led industrialization. The Cheonggye highway covering the Cheonggyecheon was built in this context in the industrialization era in Korea. However, as the main industry developments have shifted from the Export-Oriented Industry to high-technology oriented and service-oriented industry sectors in the 2000s in Korea, this Cheonggye highway did not fit into the vision of development around that time. Therefore, the industrial shift from the industrialization to the deindustrialization occurring in the 2000s in Korea also provided the critical context for the removal of Cheonggye highway.

Restoring the Image of the City

The sustainable discourse embedded in the Cheonggyecheon restoration project included an economic dimension. The urban policy of the metropolitan government used to be based on the assumption that the global position of the city possibly be significantly improved by efficient management and marketing of its strategic resources, which can eventually result in economic growth, urban development and higher quality of everyday life (SDI, 2003; OECD, 2005). Some scholars argued that urban renewal and city marketing could be used as an instrument of urban policy to increase competition among cities (Balibrea, 2001; Smith, 2005). One of the arguments of the Chenoggyechoen project was to create a positive image of an environmentally-friendly global city.

One of the main legitimizing arguments of the project was to create a positive image of an environmentally-friendly global city. The Cheonggyecheon reflected a belief
of the mayor Lee that the new image of the stream, culturally vibrant and environmentally pleasant, will make the city a business and financial hub of Northeast Asia (Kal, 2011). This is interpreted as the city of Seoul’s effort to attract more global business investments and tourists to the downtown Seoul by the implementation of the stream restoration project, rather than enhancing the area’s environment for the local residents and merchants. Noting on the fact that the SMG excluded the local business sector from the decision-making process for the restoration project in the section of Conflict management strategies by the SMG above, this evidence demonstrates that the city of Seoul prioritized attracting foreign investment over the self-sustainability of the local businesses in the neighborhoods.

The SMG believed that by providing attractive urban amenities, they could bring positive long-term economic effects and improve economic competitiveness and global appeal of the city. As implied in the terminology, ‘Future-oriented urban environment means where nature and mankind can co-exist in good balance and harmony with each other.’ (Objective 5) in the master plan for the project, the master plan tries to make the Cheonggyecheon project as a trendy future-oriented project, emphasizing the ‘greening’ part. As Myung-Bak Lee stated, “once the stream is restored, we want this area to stand out as a center of foreign investment. The ultimate goal is to make Seoul a great city, one that can compete as an attractive center of business with Shanghai, Tokyo, and Beijing” (Kane, 2003). In this sense, the restoration can be seen not only as an urban restoration project that tries to improve quality of everyday life and restore the nature of the stream in downtown Seoul but also as an initiative that wants to put into practice the competitive urban policy.
After its opening, the stream became one of the major tourist attractions in the city. O'Byrne et al. (2014), and Pan (2015) suggest Seoul as an example of successful creative city examining the potential of revitalized historical waterfronts to become urban creative hubs and creative tourism attractions. The Cheonggyecheon became a favorite public place in which people enjoy the water and green, gather, and communicate in the middle of downtown Seoul. Timur (2013) evaluated the restoration project as a successful case, emphasizing that this urban waterfront regeneration has various social, economic, and environmental benefits. Many other studies found that space offers positive emotions and satisfaction to the citizen (Kim and Lee, 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Jang (2009) supports this view by arguing that car-free streets along Cheonggyecheon resulted in boosting of the local economy, an increasing number of visitors, and establishing of a positive image of the city. The following respondent’s observation describes this positive effect of the restored urban stream:

The results were nothing short of spectacular. A 3.6-mile linear, green river park that beautified downtown Seoul and gave its residents a spectacular setting in which to walk, splash, linger, and truly enjoy the city. The stream shape also changes as it flows westward and becomes progressively more "natural" and marsh-like as it flows downstream. Open at all hours, the linear park is fully integrated into Seoul's urban fabric and is host to hundreds of events and art installations every year. The park is brimming with people, even late at night, making space an attractive, haven. Considered a flagship project, the completion of the Cheonggyecheon has spurred the development of various other river restoration projects around Korea. (Interviewee 7, December 8, 2017)
However, a significant number of studies on the Cheonggyecheon restoration project emphasized a criticism that the restored stream was an important tool in aggressive marketing that has been instrumental in selling ‘Global Seoul’ and has resulted in ongoing gentrification, decline of traditional industrial sectors, and disappearance of local cultures (Kriznik, 2011; Lee & Anderson, 2014; Schuetze, T., & Chelleri, L., 2015). The environmental organizations criticized the lacking “ecological authenticity” of the stream (Cho, 2010). Some of the interviewees from the NGO sector and professors showed concern about the fact that the emphasis is less on promoting the actual qualities of a place than on selling its image. The following respondent’s observation describes this seemingly superficial situation in pursuing urban sustainability in Seoul:
I have a huge concern on the use of urban sustainability as a trendy concept or appealing concept to the citizens, cities, or other nations. Especially for urban revitalization, we call it urban revitalization ‘project’ not ‘movement.’ When it comes to improving sustainability, it requires a relatively long-term period. Given this characteristic, this quick process for the showy results against purposiveness of urban sustainability policy. (Interviewee 3, March 8, 2017)

The interviewee above criticized the fact that the restoration project was more focused on the showy results with some visual effects by the refurbished built-environment with the creation of a linear park along with the Cheonggyecheon than meeting the purposiveness of urban sustainability policy. This concern was aligned with the criticism on the ecological restoration which will be more discussed in the following section.

The Cheonggyecheon restoration thus not only recovered urban stream or improved the quality of everyday life in Seoul but was also used to re-image the city and sell it as a clean and attractive global city (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2006). Some reports in foreign media showed that restoration successfully challenged the unfavorable international perception of Seoul as an urban concrete jungle (Walsh, 2006). The strategic goals were hidden by narratives representing Cheonggyecheon as the “new face of Seoul” while the environmental and historical importance of the restoration was well presented to the public. Seoul Metropolitan Government promoted the restoration as “a greater task that the entire nation is interested in as a symbolic project to revive an important part of Korea’s historical and natural heritage at the start of the 21st century” (SMG, 2005, p. 105). This promotion by the SMG can be interpreted as the SMG’s effort to re-image the city by the implementation of the project.
Among the tasks of the committee for preparing Myung-Bak Lee’s inauguration, he put the priority on the Cheonggyecheon restoration. Simultaneously with his inauguration on July 2, 2002, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter was established as the main body to move forward with the restoration project. The Cheonggyecheon Restoration Research Corps in the Seoul Development Institute was also established to carry out research regarding primary materials and schemes for successful completion of the restoration work for the Cheonggyecheon in cooperation with relevant businesses, universities, and government institutions (SMG, 2006). They provided the basic plan, the feasibility study for the project, and the transportation and redevelopment plans.

On September 18, 2002, the Citizens’ Committee for the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project was formed by the Seoul Metropolitan Government for policy deliberation, evaluation, and resolution. A citizen participation group, the Citizen’s Committee, evaluated public opinion related to the project and framed a consensus on the related issues. The total number of Citizen’s Committee members were 133 persons from civil groups, professors, specialists, journalists, and other persons nominated by the mayor. The leaders of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Forum, including Lee, H.D., and Nho, S.H., also participated in this committee (Seong and Kim, 2005). The SMG designated the Citizen’s Committee members who are not engaged with any interests associated with the restoration project. This Committee was initially designed to encourage participatory democracy in the restoration project. The Committee was performing its supposed role well in the beginning of the project. However, it began to clash frequently with the SMG,
resulting in its eventual dissolution. Conflicts between the Committee and the SMG will be addressed in detail in the third section of this chapter later.

A division of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Research Corps, and the Citizens’ Committee was organized to help create a master plan as well as guide the overall implementation of the project, characterized by its division into three categories of execution, deliberation, and research (Figure 12).

Figure 12. The triangular governance structure of the project

According to a respondent, he describes the cooperation among these three governmental schemes as below:

Various social elements in favor of the project were drawn to the governance scheme, thereby helping to ensure the social validity of the project as well as efficiency in its implementation. The three-pronged system also served as a symbolic model representing civic participation and cooperation between the public and private sectors. The triangular governance system is also designed to ensure opinions regarding the project are formed democratically through an institutionalized structure for
negotiations and conflict management with the implementing authority, and various interest groups in society. In other words, it represents a shift in local governance related to decision-making and project implementation from the decision models to a pragmatic model that can improve a democratic process for opinion formation and decision-making. (Interviewee 16, April 25, 2017)

Even though it is argued that this triangular governance system worked out properly, benefiting the implementation of the project from the governmental official’s perspective, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter was formed with elite technocrats in charge of civil engineering affairs and was nominated by Mayor Lee to translate the Cheonggyecheon into a civil engineering accomplishment. Therefore, the Project Headquarter serves as a municipal administration for the Cheonggyecheon’s restoration, exercising the power of civil engineering bureaucrats over the entire restoration process. Given the career background of Mayor Lee as a former CEO of Hyundai Construction Company between 1977 and 1988, he was known for an outcome-oriented manner of project management throughout his business career life. Therefore, the project headquarters primary task was to facilitate the stream restoration operation from a technocratic approach: dismantling the Cheonggye elevated expressway (5.48 km road), uncovering the road over the river, and shaping a waterway for fast water flow and pumping water from the Han River. This civil engineering-oriented approach is well shown in the interview with a respondent below:

For the SMG, this is a civil engineering project. The Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter decided to split the Cheonggyecheon construction range into three sections so they can proceed the operation at the same time to condense a construction period to a third. This is a typical working method in civil engineering. Also, Cheonggyecheon was a dry stream traditionally. The SMG wanted to supply sufficient water to it to create a flow. Therefore, they finally decided to supply daily 120,000 tons of water which were required to maintain a depth of 40 cm current speed on
average. They made this as an artificial stream using technocratic approaches. (Interviewee 4, September 4, 2017)

The interviewee above criticizes the SMG’s technocratic approach towards the restoring the stream instead of ecological restoration. This issue was problematized since the city of Seoul promoted this project as an ecological restoration project in the beginning. However, this change from the ecological restoration to the artificial restoration occurred with primary two reasons: to make a visual effect by making a substantial flow into the stream and to complete the project within the fixed deadline. A question, if we can regard this project as a natural restoration, will be examined deeply in the section for assessing the sustainability of the project in this chapter later. However, I would like to emphasize the fact that the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter was comprised of a technocrat group commissioned by Mayor Lee, which reflects Mayor Lee's intention and has a significant influence on the process of implementation of the Cheonggyecheon project in general.

Also, the principal provider of professional knowledge for the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Research Corps was the Seoul Development Institute, which is a municipal research organization under the control of the Seoul mayor. The Seoul Institute conducted basic research on Cheonggyecheon’s restoration such as feasibility studies and planning and project evaluations. Since it was under the control of Mayor Lee, it provided the theoretical justification for the SMG’s restoration. The results generated by the institute was distributed through workshops, public forum, and broadcasting, constituting the dominant discourse around the restoration.
Making the Master Plan

The SMG announced the master plan of Cheonggyecheon restoration, which is called ‘the Feasibility Study and Basic Plan of Cheonggyecheon Restoration,’ on February 11, 2003 (Seoul Development Institute, 2003). The main content of the master plan was composed of three parts. The first part addresses purposes of restoration, domestic and overseas cases, midtown revitalization plan, heritage restoration plan, and social cost/benefit analysis. The second part of the master plan contains technical issues related to the urban stream restoration. The third part finally deals with traffic control measures. The objectives of the Cheonggyecheon project are as follows: 1) restoration of a natural environment and enhancement of the quality of life, 2) restoration of history and culture, 3) revitalizing the economy, 4) achieving a sustainable development, and 5) creating a future-oriented urban environment (See APPENDIX C).

As shown well in the above purposes, the objectives of the master plan for the Cheonggyecheon restoration project were not only about a natural stream restoration project or heritage preservation. By using the terminology ‘Revitalization of the economy’ (Objective 3), the planners revealed the intention to develop the area near the Cheonggyecheon Stream. Superficially the ideology of ‘growth first’ seems to conflict ideologically with the principles and practices of urban sustainability; that is, notions of ecological limits, intergenerational equity, the integration of economic, social and environmental priorities, and widening involvement in decision-making (Haughton, 1999a; Bridge and Jonas, 2002). However, urban leaders have little option but to promote cities to attract more global capital at the expense of broader social and ecological goals. Active environmental policies and interventions such as river restoration, the cleaning up of old
industrial sites have been significant not only in re-imaging cities but have also been influential in opening up actual urban spaces for new waves of investment and bringing back the middle classes in the city or stabilizing working-class communities (Keil and Desfor, 1996). Hackworth and Smith (2001) highlighted the increasingly influential role played by states and local governments in making decisions for the current gentrification process. Gentrification came to be viewed as a positive economic redevelopment policy based on this rationale, and many scholars argue that this came out as a growth machine from the political-economic coalition. This paradigm especially prevailed in postwar American urban politics. However, we can observe the similar approach taken by the authority of Seoul for this project as sustainability becomes a pervasive framework in Seoul as well. Even though the creation of growth politics around the sustainability plans shows a similar pattern with the growth machines models in the US cities, the political coalition was more like the mayor-centered coalition in Seoul.

The plan declares that the midtown area crossed by Cheonggyecheon is underdeveloped. The planner states that the competitive edge of the midtown Seoul is considerably lower than the Gangnam Area (southern part of Han River) because of traffic, air pollution, and the deterioration of houses and buildings. For the previous ten years, the number of permanent residents and employees of the area decreased by 50,000 and 80,000, respectively. The number of head offices of businesses is only 63 percent of that of the Gangnam sub-center. This depressed condition of the midtown area where the Cheonggyecheon Stream runs through is detrimental to the overall growth of Seoul (SDI, 2003, p.7-9). Therefore, the restoration plan of the Cheonggyecheon was the main strategy for the revitalization of midtown area in Seoul, which was declared in the ‘Urban Area
Development and Cheonggyecheon Plan’ provided by the SMG as well (The Seoul Institute, 2004).

As we can see in the Appendix C (See objective 3 APPENDIX C), the SMG has a series of specific plans to revitalize the economy through the Cheonggyecheon project on top of its initial intention for natural stream restoration and heritage preservation. The future of the Cheonggyecheon area downtown Seoul is set as 1) a cultural center where we can experience history and tradition, 2) an international business center where Seoul can meet the world, 3) a shopping and tourism center that functions as the central space for the ‘Korea Wave,’ and 4) a civil life center where citizens can communicate with each other. The master plan stresses that the development of the midtown should be oriented to maintain the midtown’s economic vitality and strengthen its competitive edge without hurting its unique identity formed by the natural setting, history, and cultural resources. For this to be materialized, it is necessary for the Seoul Metropolitan Government to expand public investment, induce private sector investment, and utilize natural, historical, and cultural resources that the midtown owns (SDI, 2003, p.17). Therefore, it is noticeable in the master plan that the plan positioned the restoration project as a part of a redevelopment plan, not just an ecological and historical stream restoration plan.

**Conflict Management**

There were many of conflicts in the planning stage due to contradictions among many different factors to consider. Seoul Metropolitan Government, therefore, organized the citizens' commission to collect diverse opinions of citizens, experts, and stakeholders, and reflected them in the master plan (Seoul Development Institute, 2003). Given that it was a long-term project in nature, it was essential to set a long-term direction. However,
the city needed to conclude an optimal solution at that specific point to move forward. After a series of discussions, the Cheonggyecheon restoration master plan was completed in June 2003. Even after that, discussion of fine-tuning the project and developing a longer-term initiative continued.

Stakeholders

Cheonggyecheon Road is a road that stretches 5.8 km from Taepyeong Road in Jung District to the Sindap Railway Bridge in Dongdaemun District. There is a significant business community comprised of about 60,000 stores, which exist along both sides of the road. The number of shop owners and employees there exceeds 200,000 (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008). The types of business in the area are so varied that it is commonly said that there is nothing we cannot find at the markets along Cheonggyecheon historically. In the Cheonggye 2-ga through 4-ga area, the stores are mostly wholesalers dealing in industrial products, electrical goods, watches, and jewelry. Their chief customers are retailers from throughout the nation. In the Cheonggye 4-ga through 7-ga area, there are fabric, apparel and clothing subsidiaries, and footwear markets that have been formed over the decades. The 100-year-old Gwangjang Market is one of Seoul’s best-known traditional markets. A fashion district has been established in the apparel market around the now-closed Dongdaemun Stadium over the past ten years. Comprised of both retail and wholesale shops, the area was regarded as the mecca of the Korean textile industry. The Hwanghak Neighborhood area is renowned for a flea market dealing in various kinds of goods.

The commercial area surrounding the stream plays a central role in the nationwide industrial network and most merchants there are operating in leased stores. Typically, they
have been in business in the area for over 20 years since they began work as shop employees (The Korea Transport Institute, 2016). As such, they have a strong sense of solidarity among themselves and affection for their business community. The merchants had assumed that given the size and influence of their business community, it would not be easy for the city to decide to push ahead with the restoration project. However, they began to feel a sense of crisis after Myung-bak Lee took office as mayor of Seoul and put forth various policies aimed at implementing the project. The merchants saw the project as a threat to their business community. According to an interviewee:

We had many concerns over the stream restoration project. First of all, this area has been provided an eco-system for the old manufacture industry in Seoul, including industrial products, electrical goods, apparel and clothing subsidiaries, and lighting products. Therefore, this area is a symbol of these old manufacture industries in Seoul. We are already losing our position in the Korean economy with the industry change. If we lose this Cheonggyecheon area, there is no place we can continue our businesses. Also, the highway has been useful for us to transfer out products to the retail shops. Importantly, we won’t be able to afford the increased rent after the restoration project. (Interviewee 20, May 5, 2017)

As the interviewee claimed in the interview above, the primary reasons for the existing business community’s opposition towards the restoration project were as follow. First, the Cheonggyecheon area has been known as the symbol of the old manufacturing industry in Seoul. People knew they could find any electrical goods or textile products if they go to the business cluster located in the Cheonggyecheon area. The merchants were afraid of losing this symbolic market area especially when the industry shift from the manufacturing to the service-oriented industry is occurring in Korea. Second, the highway provided a good transport infrastructure to the shop owners in the Cheonggyecheon area. Therefore, they were afraid of losing the transportation infrastructure that has been benefiting their businesses. Lastly, it was evident that the restoration would increase the
increased property values would price them out.

The merchants formed the unions Cheonggyecheon Merchants’ Commercial Rights Protection Committee (CMCRPC), on August 12, 2002, representing seven shopping areas (Seun, Industrial Machine Tool, Asea, Gwang, Daerim, Hyundai, and Cheonggye) in Cheonggye 3-ga and 4-ga districts in order to oppose the restoration project (The Korea Transport Institute, 2016). The following is what a respondent said concerning the reason for forming the organization:

As a member of the Sewoon Shopping Area Merchants' Association, I attended advisory board meetings of various government organizations, and there, I heard people say that Mayor Lee would demolish the Cheonggye highway and start work to restore the stream. I could not keep quiet about such an important matter. Thus, we called the representatives of several merchants’ groups in the neighborhood and proposed holding a meeting about this issue. The first meeting was 28 people in attendance. People thought Mayor Lee would carry out the restoration project through whatever means necessary, as such, we had to meet regularly and exchange information to cope actively with relevant developments. The meeting served as the basis for later forming the committee. (Interviewee 21, June 20, 2017)

The merchants’ committee was a kind of an association of merchants’ clubs that had sprung up spontaneously by the business sector. So, it had limitations in ensuring internal solidarity because different sectors had different interests. While some of the shop owners within the project site could expect an affordable compensation fee for the demolition of their properties, the renters could only expect the increased rent they cannot afford after the project. Also, among the shop owners, some did not trust the government of Seoul to grant them reasonable compensation through negotiation. Despite the difficulty
Conflict Management Strategies by the SMG

The city exerted various efforts to ease conflicts with the local merchants whom it believed were the most influential force among the stakeholders related to the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project. The merchants were focused on the specific impacts this project would have on their stores and shopping areas. Thus, the city emphasized sufficiently accommodating the opinions of the merchants and persuading them into participating in the decision-making process in order to minimize the adverse impacts the project would have on the business communities along the stream. The city government’s initial conflict management strategies can be summed up as follows: 1) active Communication Efforts, 2) directions for Merchant Measures Set Through Preparation, 3) basic Principles for Taking Measures for Merchants, and 4) accommodation of Various Stakeholders’ Opinions (See APPENDIX D).

The Resident-Merchant Consultation Committee was organized at the request of the merchants, who complained that their opinions were not being adequately reflected in the decision-making process as they were not members of the Citizens' Committee for Cheonggyecheon Restoration (Seoul Development Institute, 2003). Even though the SMG had the Citizens’ Committee as a part of their triangular governance structure, the merchants were not included in the Citizens’ Committee. The following answer from a respondent explains why the merchants were not included for the Citizen’s Committee members:
The committee initially excluded merchants from its operation, noting the need to ensure its professionalism. As the merchants opposed to the project aggressively, however, it became clear that the merchants' opinions should be accommodated in order to ensure the smooth promotion of the project. Thus, one of its subcommittees which was responsible for accommodating public opinions was tasked to serve as a communication channel between the city and the merchants. Therefore, the subcommittee held a total of nine plenary and extraordinary meetings, receiving briefings, hearing opinions of interest groups, making field trips and attempting to persuade various stakeholders to reach an agreement with the city. (Interviewee 17, April 28, 2017)

Even though the interviewee above argues that they excluded the local business sectors from the Citizen’s Committee member to ensure its professionalism, it was mainly for the smooth operation of the project implementation excluding the local business sector’s participation to the process of the project. Also, this can be interpreted as the city of Seoul’s effort to attract more global business investments and tourists to the downtown Seoul by the implementation of the stream restoration project, rather than enhancing the area’s environment for the local residents and merchants. Competition of cities affects their urban policy, noting that a city improves its position against other cities by marketing itself to attract potential investors and visitors to a particular city. Therefore, city marketing has become an essential part of the competitive urban policy to promote a city as a place, offering attractive business environments to the investors and pleasant experiences to the visitors (Smith, 2005). Even though cities get some benefits, including economic growth, job creations, and better quality of everyday life, by attracting foreign investments and tourists, there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating that the benefits of economic growth are distributed in an uneven way (Smith, 2002; Perrons, 2004). Benefits from competitive urban policy include the creation of new public spaces, infrastructure, and regenerated neighborhoods, improving the quality of everyday life. However, most
beneficiaries of long-term economic growth generated by successful city marketing are often a few political elites and private developers, known as ‘growth coalitions’ (Logan and Molotch, 2007). Therefore, the exclusion of the local business sector from the decision-making process for the restoration project can be seen as a form of growth coalition around the project.

However, the project was driven by the authority of Seoul with limited influences from the private developers for this project. Davis (2003) explains that the growth machine groups should be autonomous institutions involving shared governing outcomes and financial purposes, not controlled by a central government. However, there was no autonomous financial coalition between the government and local private business around the stream restoration and key actors for the project were nominated by Mayor Lee. Blanc-Brude and Strage (1993) saw the public-private partnership as a process toward developing a regime as the local authorities consider market-led growth not only positive but also necessary, yet, public-private partnerships formed for the Cheonggyecheon case were bureaucratic structures operating under strong central government control. Despite its useful explanatory power for urban revitalization in the Western context, conventional theories of the urban growth machine have a limitation in terms of providing a theoretical framework useful for the Cheonggyecheon case. While there was the growth politics around the stream restoration project affected by the globalization, the central government provided authority based on its dominant power and its reputation as predominant from its past status as a state-led regime.

Meanwhile, the Resident-Merchant Consultation Committee was inaugurated on December 30, 2002. However, the Cheonggyecheon Merchants’ Commercial Rights
Protection Committee (CMCRPC) refused to join the consultation committee, "We found fault with its articles of association, which stipulated that it was intended to facilitate the implementation of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project. It could not participate in the activities of the consultation committee which it said was bound to support the project" (Interviewee 8, October 7, 2017). Thus, the CMCRPC decided not to join the committee on December 13, 2002 (Seoul Development Institute, 2003). Even it looks as though CMCRPC seemingly had an option to join the Resident-Merchant Consultation Committee to reflect their opinion in the decision-making process, in fact, CMCRPC could not have accesses to reflect their opinion due to the dominance discourse formed in the Resident-Merchant Consultation Committee. This can be interpreted again that there was a dominant growth politics around the project implementation where the local business sectors (CMCRPC) comprised of renters did not see any room to participate in the decision-making process.

**Opposing Civic Groups**

The city and the private sector organized the Citizens' Committee for Green Seoul in order to push for city restructuring centered on environmental values. The committee conducted a public opinion survey on the Cheonggyecheon project, but its plan to announce the survey results was aborted. The following is a news article on the aborted plan, which was disclosed through a press conference given by the committee on February 13, 2003:

The Citizens' Committee for Green Seoul, a consultative body, comprised of civic, government and business representatives, was slated to announce on February 11 the outcome of a public survey it had conducted for 500 Seoul residents concerning the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project. However, the plan was aborted by Mayor Lee, who demanded that changes be made in timing and contents in a way that suits the city’s official policy concerning the project. An overwhelming majority of Seoul residents were calling for sufficient accommodation of experts’ opinions before
commencing work on restoring Cheonggyecheon, even if it should lead to delays in the project schedule, according to the survey. Of the respondents, 88.8% were found to be in favor of this position, while 11.1% said the city should stick to its original plan to start the work in July. Regarding the direction for developing the area surrounding the stream, 63.5% said they wanted to see the creation of a “historical and ecological public space,” while just 19.4% said they were in favor of the city’s plan to foster a “zone-specific industrial complex” that would include a financial hub. (The Korea Transport Institute, 2016, p. 97, 98).

Opinion against the project spread among civic groups, academic circles and city councilors. A total of 109 figures representing various sectors of society, including civic organizations, held a press conference, demanding that the restoration project is appropriately implemented on April 8, 2003, since the authority of Seoul was pushing the construction of the project to complete it before the fixed deadline (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008). Environmental Sociology Association, Korea Planners Association and Environmental Impact Assessment Society organized as a series of academic debates that disclosed theoretical and practical drawbacks associated with the undemocratic and technocrat-oriented restoration. Debates focused on highlighting general issues surrounding insufficient ecological consideration, undemocratic procedures, excessive commercial re-development of the surroundings and unsustainable heritage preservation. All these issues were ascribed to the project’s overemphasis on urban economic development aspects rather than ecological recovery or heritage preservation aspects of the stream (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008).

Although they were in favor of the idea of restoring Cheonggyecheon, civic groups were opposed to the specific methods employed by the government. In June 2003, Korea’s major NGOs, such as Citizens’ Coalition for Economic Justice, Citizens’ Movement for Environmental Justice, Green Korea United, Korea Environmental Federation, Green
Transportation Movement and Citizens’ Network for Cultural Reform, formally announced their position against the project, calling for alternative actions (The Korea Transport Institute, 2016). By delivering the voice of civil society, the Coalition called upon Mayor Lee and his government to take more radical measures for a genuine and democratic restoration: more radical ecological recovery, more radical historical recovery, more radical preparation against traffic problems, more radical protection of merchants’ property rights among others. In reaction to these NGOs’ demands, the municipal government, especially the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Center, tried to meet with NGO leaders and persuade them of the government’ position, but negotiation wasn’t successful.

This came through an NGO coalition movement against what was regarded as an undemocratic, anti-environmental and politically manipulated restoration of Cheonggyecheon. This movement was organized by the Citizens’ Coalition for Correct Cheonggyecheon Restoration which involved Korea’s major NGOs like Citizens’ Coalition for Economic Justice, Citizens’ Movement for Environmental Justice, Green Korea United, Korea Environmental Federation, Green Transportation Movement and Citizens’ Network for Cultural Reform. By delivering the voice of civil society, the Coalition called upon Mayor Lee and his government to take more radical measures for a genuine and democratic restoration, including more considerations on the ecological recovery of the stream, the authentic historical recovery, and the democratic process for the negotiation with the merchants. In reaction to these NGOs’ demands, the municipal government, especially the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Center, tried to meet with NGO leaders and persuade them of the government’ position, but the negotiation was not
successful. The SMG, therefore, had not taken any steps regarding the association's demands (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008).

Conflicts Among Stakeholders

The Cheonggyecheon Merchants’ Commercial Rights Protection Committee (CMCRPC) became a staunch opponent to the stream project. As it is mentioned before, the members of the CMCRPC were afraid to lose the robust market-system for the old manufacturing industry in the Cheonggyecheon area and their transportation infrastructure for their business. Most importantly, they were worry about the increased rent after the restoration that they cannot afford. Simply put, the renters did not see any room for them by the implementation of the project. The CMCRPC conducted various resistance activities, including interviews, consultation meetings, distribution of leaflets, posting of placards, submission of petitions, and release of survey results. They carried out a survey within its community on pros and cons as well as the scope of desired compensation. The committee conducted its first survey from November 4 through 27 and the second between November 8 and 28 in 2002 (Seoul Government Research Center, 2008). Based on the results of the surveys, it delivered its position to the city, calling for the following measures: compensation for estimated business losses, business parking spaces, and three alternative land lots. The CMCRPC also organized five public demonstrations in favor of the compensations of the affected traders between June 2003 and July 2003. The protest movement intensively grew. Only 3,000 people were gathered for the first demonstration in June 2003, while more than 220,000 aggressive demonstrators were reunited for the last demonstration in July 2003 (Jeon, 2003).
The SMG finally proposed a so-called compromise and announced that a big commercial complex, named as “Garden Five,” would be constructed and priority would be given to the displaced vendors. The government also promised to offer financial compensation so that traders could afford such a move. The Garden Five commercial center, which was located far away from the Cheonggyecheon area at the edge of Southern part of Seoul, finally opened in 2010. However, the promises of the SMG to the affected shopkeepers remained largely unfulfilled. Only 40 percent of the 6,000 merchants could manage to obtain a shop in the new commercial center, and only 28 percent among total merchants are the owners of their newly acquired shop (Min, 2011). The fees for a shop in Garden Five would be extremely high due to the increase of land value in the area when the commercial center was built, and the financial support provided by the government was largely insufficient in comparison (The Choice News, August 26, 2014). The CMCRPC argued that most of the shopkeepers could not afford to move into Garden Five commercial center. Therefore, many merchants had to move to another part of the city or stop their business activity. Even for the merchants who could relocate to the Garden Five commercial center, the results were not successful. An interviewee describes the Garden Five’s business environment:

In the first month after the relocation, I could not sell any single product in the store. It failed to bring the customers to the Garden Five while some of the merchants from the Cheonggyecheon were relocated to this commercial center. The Cheonggyecheon area was known for its particular business market historically. People who used to shop at Cheonggyecheon area would not come down to here to shop since it is too far from there. As I know, there have been 5 business owners who suicided themselves due to the difficulties in proceeding their businesses so far. The authority killed the merchants who were obedient to the authority. (Interviewee 9, May 5, 2017)
This result demonstrates that the remedy provided by the SMG failed to address the merchants' requests and the merchants' concerns were not adequately reflected in the decision-making process of the project. Instead, the SMG provided this remedy as a temporary resolution so that they could proceed with the project without any barriers. This represents the undemocratic top-down approach that excluded the local merchants from the process for the project.

*Urban Politics and Contested Restoration*

After examining the whole process of the implementation of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project, including the original idea of the project, setting up organizations and the master plan, governing structure, and conflict management, we find that there was a dominantly influential actor throughout whole the process of the project, former Mayor Myung-Bak Lee. The Cheonggyecheon restoration project case does not demonstrate the general applicability of the growth machine theory (Logan and Molotch, 1987). This project was realized under an instrumental growth regime driven by former Mayor Lee, exerting the developmental state’s bureaucratic power. The original idea about the Cheonggyecheon restoration was formed and developed by scholars and civic leaders, including Lee, H.D., Nho, S.H., and Gyeongri Park, due to its historical meaning of the stream in Korea. Once this project got strong support among public, the former Mayor picked up this project as the flagship project of his campaign for the Seoul mayoral election with his political aim to be elected as a President in the next presidential election by completing the project. This strong power was given to the mayor of Seoul due to the legacy of the developmental state that remains embedded in the politics in Korea. One of the characteristics of developmental states include an inexplicit boundary between public
and private sectors, a focus on nationalistic collective interest, economic development as a primary logic of legitimacy, and a technocratic system (Saito, 2003). The process of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project manifests these characteristics of developmental states.

It is notable that the Cheonggyecheon project was implemented in only 28 months, initiated on July 2002 and finished on September 2005. As argued in previous sections, the SMG, under Myung-Bak Lee's leadership, played the central role for the implementation process. This top-down approach throughout the policy-making process brings concerns over the way in which conflicts and contestations within the project were handled, excluding many civic groups and merchants from the decision-making process of the project. I found that the Green Seoul Citizens' Committee was dismissed by the administration when it raised questions regarding the sustainability of the project. More significantly, Merchants' Commercial Rights Protection Committee (CMCRPC) became a staunch opponent to the stream project. However, there were no concessions made on the part of the public authority. A remedy suggested by the SMG, relocation to a commercial complex, turned out to be mostly a failure. The triangular governance system, consisting of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Research Corps, and the Citizens’ Committee, was organized to guide the overall implementation of the project. However, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter was, in fact, the bureaucratic power over the project process by the SMG instead of operating as a separated professional Headquarter for the project. Also, the research center helped to justify the project for the easiness of the SMG.
Throughout the construction process of the project, the SMG allowed little room for criticism and modifications of the project. While some scholars take the Cheonggyecheon project as a successful conflict resolution case, noting the management skills of the SMG through the triangular governance system (Hwang, 2013; Seong, 2005; Seo & Chung, 2012), I argue that the process of decision-making and implementation of the Cheonggyecheon project demonstrates the urban politics around urban sustainability plan was from a top-down approach with a technocratic system. This finding indicates that the characteristics of urban politics in Korea follow the political-economic characteristics of the developmental state. The way the SMG managed the construction workflow demonstrates the government’s strong control over the construction process. To shorten the total construction period, the extension of 5.84km was divided into three work districts and simultaneous tender was invited for both design and construction to carry our structure demolition and stream-restoration design side by side. Accordingly, total construction period could be dramatically deducted, reducing the room for the other stakeholders’ participation.

There are reasons Myung-Bak Lee decided to implement the Cheonggyecheon project. Most importantly, the restoration project had strong support from the public, not only because of its historical meaning of the Cheonggyecheon but also due to a strong demand for such a public place in the center of the city. Seoul has been urbanized along with an exponential economic growth within a short time after the industrialization period since the 1960s. This rapid urbanization led to a lack of public spaces affecting the quality of citizens' everyday life in Seoul. Therefore, the idea of transforming the existing concrete-encased stream into a waterfront public space was supported by the public, and the urban
revitalization projects were viewed positively by residents around the site with the hope that the real estate value would increase after the project. Myung-Bak Lee found a strong potential for his political interests from the implementation of the project. That is why the time frame of the project was set within his mayoral term, from 2002 to 2006, to run for the 2007 presidential election. Even though the government has such a strong control over the decision-making process of urban sustainability policy in Korea, policy maker needs to be elected by citizens to gain a power to implement policies. However, developing projects based on an election cycle makes a barrier for Seoul being a sustainable city. While an urban sustainability plan needs to be proceeded in a long-term to meet its initial intention, politicians in Korea rush in completing the plan within their term to show their achievement effectively. This remains as a fundamental problem of urban politics around urban sustainability policy in Korea.

For example, the following respondent’s opinion about the project suggest possible approach the project could have taken to minimize its negative impacts we see now:

After I got to know about this project, I have been in favor of the idea of restoring Cheonggyecheon which has been traditionally meaningful in the Seoul citizens' life. I think the only and the critical problem was the specific methods employed by the authority to complete this project within a fixed short timeline. It had to be implemented in a long-term project. Since the ecological and historical restoration of the stream is the primary purpose and the justification of the project, this project inherently requires a long-term period to complete. One organization should not conduct it, either within a fixed period. It also should reflect various perspectives from the following: public and private; government and citizen; stakeholders and civic organizations. When we focus on the showy results of the project, the project will never be sustainable. Instead of a centralized decision-making process, we need to take a process-oriented decision making and implementation way. (Interviewee 26, September 11, 2017)
As the interviewee emphasized in the interview above, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project needed a longer term to implement with careful approaches to restore the stream naturally as the plan claimed when it was launched. Indeed, this project brought many positive impacts. The most evident benefit was the creation of a linear park in the middle of downtown Seoul, providing a pleasant open space to Seoul citizens. After the completion of the project in 2005, the Cheonggyecheon became one of the most popular destinations in Seoul, increasing the pedestrian experience for residents and attracting more visitors to the area. Economic vitality was enhanced along with the refurbished built environment and increased tourists. Indeed, the urban environment was improved that before when an old highway covered the stream. However, this project could have been a more successful project if the stream was restored naturally as the plan claimed in the beginning and if the plan allowed the various stakeholders to participate in the process. This result calls on the change in the urban politics around the sustainability planning in Korea. Instead of using the implementation of the urban policy as a tool to show off the politician’s achievement, more careful approaches in enhancing the balanced sustainability are required in urban sustainability planning in Korea.

How Sustainable the Cheonggyecheon is?

*Environment: Is it really environmentally sustainable?*

The most important focus of the restoration project was the stream. The flow of water was the central concept encouraged to create habitats for the establishment of an ecosystem around the stream. A study shows evidence of a general improvement of Cheonggyecheon’s water quality (Kim et al., 2006) and some researchers found that the
numbers of annual and biennial plants continuously increased and stabilized after the restoration (Kim, 2012; Kim & Koo, 2010; Koo, 2013). Another study found the increased number of fish species and individuals with observations of some fishes spawning in the stream after the restoration (Yang, 2008), while some others argue that the improvements are not significant or cannot be assessed yet (Kim et al., 2006; Kang et al., 2012; Choe et al., 2014).

Concerning the preservation of nature, the research presents mixed findings. Bae (2011) argued that the increased natural value derived from transforming the existing concrete-encased stream into a natural state stream is higher than the increased recreational value by the restoration of Cheonggyecheon. On the other hand, some criticized that the new Cheonggyecheon is a piece of artificiality and superficiality rather than genuine preservation of nature in the city (An, 2003; Kang, 2007).

There were positive impacts on the air quality after the restoration. A study gives evidence of an improvement in air quality showing that major air pollutants, including carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and ozone, have significantly decreased between 2002 and 2005 (Hoe, 2006). Han and Hug (2008) found that the stream restoration had pulled down the daily mean temperature of the area by .31 Celsius degree between 2000 and 2010, and the intensity of urban heat island after the restoration has been weakened to reduce cooling load (Kim & Song, 2015; Lee & Anderson, 2013). Also, another study found that reducing travel-lane capacity by highway removal resulted in a decrease in vehicle traffic and increased the use of public transportation (Chung, Hwang & Bae, 2012). Therefore, the weakened intensity of urban heat island is regarded as a result of reduced vehicle traffic and the increase use of public transportation within the areas.
Despite some successes, both restoration process and results can be criticized from an environmental point of view. The sharpest criticism has been about the restoration of the water stream. The water flow was the part of the restoration that was the most put forward by the SMG when promoting the stream. An interviewee criticized the environmental aspect of water flows arguing that the restoration is not sustainable as follow:

I believe that circulation of water is a fundamental concept of sustainability for the Cheonggyecheon project. It is important to have the natural water keep flowing because it would allow the formation of habitats for living creatures. However, the SMG decided to supply the water for the stream by pumping it from a nearby water-treatment facility rather than for a long-term gradual restoration of the entire Cheonggyecheon water basin and its ecology, which could allow for a sufficient natural water inflow. Costly water pumping does not seem to have much in common with a supposedly ecological restoration of Cheonggyecheon. I see Cheonggyecheon as a public park decorated with the theme of nature. Restoring the natural stream was the main intention of the Cheonggyecheon project. This result totally against the initial intention of the project, losing its ecological authenticity, and the project became a huge fake fishbowl. (Interviewee 23, June 23, 2017)

As the interviewee above criticized, the water flows for the restored Cheonggyecheon were based on an artificial pumping system. The most controversial point is the source of water. A respondent defends the government’s decision on this artificial pumping and circulation system as follow:

It is impossible to make the water flow of the Cheonggyecheon in a natural manner. Basically, the annual rainfall is not consistent enough to keep water flow in Korea. The Cheonggyecheon used to be a dried stream historically even in Joseon Dynasty era as well. Today, the natural water sources which used to be the source of the Cheonggyecheon were all dried up. The Cheonggyecheon is an urban stream in which we find different purposes and values in it. I believe an urban stream should be a pedestrian-oriented public place. On top of that, the Cheonggyecheon is using water derived from the Han River and circulate it back to Han River. Therefore, it is hard to say it is entirely artificial. (Interviewee 10, March 27, 2017)
Indeed, the project transformed a highway-covered deteriorated stream into a pedestrian-centered urban space and promoted sustainable development in the middle of the city (Kim, 2007). There was a shared agreement on the demolition of the highway by various stakeholders if the removal of the highway did not contribute to worsening the traffic congestion in downtown Seoul. After the completion of the project, a study found that reducing travel-lane capacity by highway removal resulted in a decrease in vehicle traffic and increased the use of public transportation (Chung, Hwang & Bae, 2012). Jang and Kang (2015) observe a prominent expansion of commercial and mixed-use lands along the corridor and the variation of land use according to local contexts. They also emphasize that this dynamic change in land use along the stream demonstrate the need to incorporate urban infrastructure, land use, and transportation system into urban policy for a smarter growth of the city. A study interviewed 40 visitors to Cheonggyecheon and found that the presence of an urban waterway generates positive effects on citizens’ mental health (Kim et al., 2013).

However, to become an “ecological restoration” from the environmentalists’ perspective, not only should the stream water be composed of natural clean water but also the restored stream should be able to secure biodiversity and maintain “riparian buffer zone” so it can stabilize the amount of water and filter polluted materials coming from the land (Osborne & Kovacic, 1993). While the authority was focusing on keeping the water flow and cleaning the water quality based on technology-oriented approach, Cho (2005) insists that the Cheonggyecheon project, in reality, was just an urban redevelopment project disguising itself as an ecology and history restoration project. This critique is consistent with a statement made by an environmentalist, “the Cheonggyecheon was about the
construction of a public riverside park” (Interviewee 4, September 4, 2017). Therefore, the characteristic of the Cheonggyecheon project was more like the urban redevelopment plan focusing on economic revitalization through the improvement of the built-environment instead of an ecological project.

Equity: Gentrification

After the completion of the restoration project, we have seen increased land values nearly the area of the waterway as one of the effects of "urban entrepreneurialism." (Harvey, 1989) A study found evidence that the price of land increased by 30-50 percent for properties within 50 meters of the project right after the restoration project began (Kim 2006). Also, the restoration affected existing shop owners in the area and they failed to safeguard their interests and many of them were forced to relocate to the outskirts of Seoul without proper compensation (Choi, 2014; Kim and Kim 2015). Nearby offices and retail shops are requesting higher rents as well (Lee, 2007). The intricate ecosystem of traditional manufacturing businesses that resided in the area for decades has been forced to be transformed to accommodate the post-industrial economy after the restoration (Song 2003). While some project advocates frame these results as economic development, more critics perceive them as clear negative signs of gentrification (Anderson, 2013; Ryu & Kwon, 2016).

Before the restoration, the Chenggyecheon area was known for its retail local shops, ranging from electronics to textile products. Most of the shopkeepers earned relatively low income and were renters. The restoration project extensively affected 6,000 of merchants who used to be working around the area (Min, 2011). As it is mentioned in the previous section under conflicts among stakeholders, the promises of the SMG to
relocate the affected shopkeepers to the new commercial complex remained largely unfulfilled. As for the other merchants who could afford to stay in the Chenggyecheon area, the situation did not seem to be preferable. With the destruction of the highway and the reorganization of the area, the access to the shops for automobiles has become more difficult. Moreover, even though the crowds of pedestrians, potentially future customers, has exponentially increased in the streets adjunct to the stream, this new mass of pedestrians coming for cultural purposes did not benefit the traditional commercial activity of the place, namely electronics and textile products. The revenues of the local merchants decreased by 30 percent between 2003 and 2012 (Min, 2011). Thus, a new economic dynamism established in the area after the restoration did not include ancient traditional forms of commercial activities, such as electric products, lighting products, textile industry, and apparel and clothing subsidiaries, that used to prevail in the locality.

However, the SMG evaluates the processes of the conflict management with the merchants as successful. The following describes their perception on the process and the consequence of the stream restoration:

First of all, the street vendor’s business is illegal. Thus, it should not be an issue to implement the Cheonggyecheon project. The government still allowed some street vendors to relocate to the Dongdaemun stadium after the restoration started. Second, we can negotiate with landlords who are pursuing their businesses through tax investigation. Since most landlords do not report their sales honestly, there is a room where we can reach the agreement by investing their taxes. The Garden Five was an alternative mostly for the renters who used to do their businesses in Cheonggyecheon area. Even though the Garden Five case was not quite successful, it was a matter of choice. The businesses by the merchants who changed their business types quickly, enduring the increased renter prices, could thrive in the Choenggyecheon area. I do not see this result as a failure by the city of Seoul. Rather, the area became too attractive, so there was no merchant who wanted to move out. The arguments made by some merchants who related to the Garden Five that the government deceives them is not true. We offered some considerable alternatives, and they made a choice out of them.
Also, we see economic restoration after the project as well. Land values in the area significantly increased after the restoration and many old neighborhoods, such as Hwanghak, Wangsimni or Sinseol, become places of land speculation and urban redevelopment. This project revitalized the economy in Gangbuk area (Northern part of Han River in Seoul) which have been suffered from economic depression for a long time. (Interviewee 18, April 30, 2017)

The interviewee above only emphasizes the economic benefits from the city’s perspective, including creation of new public spaces, infrastructure, and regenerated neighborhoods, improving the quality of everyday life, economic growth, and job creations. However, most of beneficiaries of long-term economic growth generated by successful city marketing are often a few political elite and private developers, known as ‘growth coalitions’ (Logan and Molotch, 2007). Although the Cheonggyecheon restoration in general positively affects environmental and living conditions in downtown Seoul, its less desired outcomes became evident recently. The restoration affects the local economy. While some industrial or service sectors are flourishing, traditional manufacturing jobs are in decline. Places that used to play an essential role for reproduction of local economy and everyday life are about to disappear, while many small workshops and shops are closing down their business. The Cheonggyecheon flea market, one of the largest in Seoul, virtually disappeared after the restoration. The metropolitan government was aware of the negative consequences that the restoration may have on the local markets and allowed some street vendors to relocate to the Dongdaemun stadium after the restoration started. The majority of street vendors had to leave for other parts of Seoul or lose their jobs. Dongdaemun stadium was also demolished, and the remaining street vendors had to relocate again.
Even though the environmental and cultural civic organizations and merchant’s associations opposed the undemocratic process led by the metropolitan government, the dominant group, which most directly affected the Cheonggyecheon restoration, favored a rapid process, which the Seoul mayor Lee saw as an opportunity to improve economic competitiveness and get political support. A rapid and successful restoration process was also expected to demonstrate his managerial competence and strengthen his political position. Overall, the SMG put some efforts to accommodate diverse sector’s input to manage conflicts along with the Cheonggyecheon restoration project by utilizing the triangular governance scheme. However, the main problem seems that the project was initially narrowly focused on the restoration of stream alone and did not provide a long-term urban plan to address the various consequences of such a large-scale urban project. It is notable that the Cheonggyecheon project was implemented in three years only – it was initiated in July 2002 and finished on September 2005. This achievement was rendered possible by the active involvement of the SMG. In addition, this project was funded by the SMG, giving a strong control to the SMG. In order to implement this project within such a short time frame, the municipality had to adopt a centralized decision-making process, thus reducing room for the participation of actors belonging to civil society.

* Sustainability Fix and Selling a City*

A particular value or meaning tied to nature is identified and materialized by the way that it is discursively interpreted and politically appropriated by diverse social actors (Lefebvre, 1991). The way nature is incorporated into the city has tended to take on a specific form through new urban management such as urban regeneration (Brand, 2005). The extensive revival of waterway and green, interwoven with socio-economic fabric,
stimulates a range of discursive struggles around the way the value of nature is interpreted and articulated with political economic interests and ideology. Here, I raise a question of stream restoration in an urban context to understand how sustainability is conceived and implemented in Seoul: what is nature in Seoul, how was it brought back in and represented, how is political power articulated with nature and with what effect on politics?

Based on the restoration results and process of operation, the form of stream restored was an artificial urban stream using a pumping system for water flow. This result describes the convergence of central government, technocratic approach, city marketing, and selective sustainability. Before the restoration project, citizens supported the Cheonggyecheon project since it was intended to be a natural restoration. Despite this main justification for the project, the SMG changed the plan from restoring natural stream to artificial urban stream mainly complete the project within a fixed timeline. Even though there were diverse actors around the restoration, including environmental and cultural organizations criticizing the lacking “ecological and historical authenticity” of the stream and citizens supporting natural restoration, those against dominant party were excluded from the decision-making process. Also, the authority was focusing on keeping the water flow and cleaning the water quality based on a technology-oriented approach. The fact that the Cheonggyecheon Project Headquarters consisted of civil engineering experts demonstrates this approach well. From an environmentalist's perspective, the Cheonggyecheon project is an urban redevelopment project disguising itself as an ecology and history restoration project. It should be noted that stream restoration is not merely a matter of nature transformation, but rather a matter of interpretation or the discourse defining it (Katz, 1997). Therefore, the authority, specifically Myung-Bak Lee for this
project, won in the battle of the discourse defining the stream restoration translating his vision on it into practice, using a strong power by the developmental state.

The core political purpose of Myung-Bak Lee engaged in the implementation of the restoration project was gaining political support from the public through the achievement. Another important goal was promoting Seoul as a global city by restoring the image of the city through this project. This intention was evident based on Myung-Bak Lee’s statement “once the stream is restored, we want this area to stand out as a center of foreign investment. The ultimate goal is to make Seoul a great city, one that can compete as an attractive center of business with Shanghai, Tokyo, and Beijing” (Kane, 2003). Thus, the project can be regarded as a tool for city marketing to make Seoul a global city.

Also, I observed that the sustainable discourse embedded in the Cheonggyecheon restoration project focused on an economic dimension. From the planning stage, the SMG intended to implement the restoration project as a tool to revitalize the midtown Seoul, in which considerable underdeveloped than the Gangnam Area (southern part of Han River). The former merchants, who have run their businesses near the stream before the restoration, were displaced by new businesses. While the small business people and civic organizations were marginalized from the decision-making process, the SMG was focusing on revitalizing the mid-Seoul and selling a positive image of Seoul globally. This demonstrates how the government interprets “sustainability” and how they use the concept of sustainability selectively. The ideas of ‘sustainability’ were achieving prominence among local, national and international policymakers and politicians since the 1980s. This led to conflicting views over what the terms mean, what is to be sustained, by whom, and for whom. While, Jonas & Gibbs (2004) calls this “selective incorporation of
environmental goals, determined by the balance or pressures for and against environmental policy within and across the city” (p. 552) as ‘sustainability fix.’ I argue that the authority in Korea is using the ideas of sustainability to appeal to both the citizens internally and other cities globally when the specific ways taken along with the implementation process is hard to be seen as sustainable. I agree that:

Sustainability . . . cannot be simply a ‘green’ or ‘environmental’ concern, important though ‘environmental’ aspects of sustainability are. A truly sustainable society is one where wider questions of social needs and welfare, and economic opportunity are integrally related to environmental limits imposed by supporting ecosystems. (Agyeman et al. 2002, p. 78)

They emphasize a balanced approach including an explicit focus on justice, equity, and environment together. Based on the definition of ‘just sustainability' by Agyeman, I assert that the Cheonggyecheon project was in fact neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable. This case study serves as an example of how a sustainability plan is used as a ‘sustainability fix' in the developmental states with the centralized governance system. In addition, the plan's implementation results are likely to be detrimental in promoting ‘just sustainability' with a heavy focus on ‘pro-growth.' In particular, urban sustainability plans can be used as an important instrumental tool in selling the city as a global city, influenced by the ongoing force of globalization. Therefore, the use of the urban sustainability plan as a ‘sustainability fix' to promote the city as a global in the developmental states where the central authorities have strong powers is likely to fail in enhancing ‘just sustainability' in cities in developmental states.
CHAPTER 6
THE SEWOON SANGGA REGENERATION PROJECT

Introduction

This chapter asks about the urban dynamics of the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project, such as how growth politics has emerged around the plan and the dominant discourses around the planning. In addition, this chapter examines the sustainability of the project. Korean society has been experiencing recent rapid transformation, including the comparatively late timing of the processes of industrialization, democratization, globalization, and decentralization. However, in the Korean context, the transition from the highly centralized developmental state to partially decentralized urban development policies took place simultaneously with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the nation-state to the embedded dominance of the nation-state (Park, 2008; Sonn, 2010). Therefore, rapid industrialization, democratization, and post-industrialization on the one hand, and the legacies of state intervention and late policy development, on the other hand, have created a local context for growth politics around urban sustainability policy in Korea that may differ from earlier industrializers.

However, few studies have focused on the rapid changing urban dynamics. As a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state (Bae and Sellers, 2007), Korea offers an essential source of insight into the meaning that these transformations are likely to have for the politics of urban sustainability policy in other developing countries. With specific attention to these transformations and their implications, I examine how theories from the Western settings,
including growth machine theory (Logan and Molotch, 1987) and paradoxical uses of sustainability (While, Jonas & Gibbs, 2004) can shed light on the recent politics of urban policy in Korea. A closer look at the applicability of the growth machine theory may explain how these politics differ from as well as resemble the patterns from the Western experiences. Also, the theory on paradoxical sustainability will be used to examine whether the concept of ‘sustainability fix’ is used to promote the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project economically in this chapter.

There is a growing body of literature focusing on social justice related to urban sustainability. Agyeman and Evans introduced the term ‘just sustainability’ (Agyeman and Evans 2004) emphasizing environmental justice, equity, and civic engagement in the planning field. While the social aspect of sustainability, equity, is being incorporated into the language of many city plans, Agyeman pointed out that equity is often not the focus of sustainability plans (Agymen, 2005). Also, researchers argue that we know little about how the concept of sustainability is implemented in daily life in the context of cities, particularly concerning questions of social justice and equity (Isenhour, McDonogh, & Checker, 2015).

After the experience of the ‘third wave’ of international democratization in the late 1980s, rapid democratization has been occurring in most Asian countries. Few studies examine the effectiveness of urban sustainability plans focusing on ‘just sustainability’ in the Asian city context. This chapter will pay more attention to how the rapid democratization is affecting the urban politics around the urban sustainability policy in Seoul, focusing on the project's impacts on promoting ‘just sustainability’ in Seoul.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section deals with the history and background of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project, including the history of the
Sewoon Sangga and the discussions on the demolition of the Sewoon Sangga. The second section explores the dynamics of the urban politics around the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project (Greenway Project) and the sustainability of the project. Finally, the third section examines the dynamics of the urban politics of the second phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project (Remaking Sewoon Project) and the project’s effectiveness of the project. This section also explores how the Remaking Sewoon Project deals with the social aspect of sustainability to explain a paradigm shift in Seoul urban sustainability planning process.

**Main Finding**

The Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a dramatic change of the plan in 2015, from creating green corridor project to historic preservation project. Therefore, the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project is divided into two plans, the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan (Greenway Project) and the second phase of the plan (Remaking Sewoon Project), and each phase will be examined separately.

For the Greenway Project, this case study found that the forces of globalization were the most critical factors determining the dynamics of the urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of the project. The City of Seoul actively used the concept of sustainability to revitalize the mid-Seoul and appeal a positive image of Seoul as an ‘eco-city’ globally by creating a significant greenway after demolishing an old structure in downtown Seoul. However, the Greenway Project demonstrates the transition from the highly centralized government to partially decentralized governance for urban policies in Seoul, affected by the globalization. Even though the Greenway Project was carried out by a Public-Private-Partnership, as a form of networked governance, and
attempted to allow the public to participate in the planning process, the SMG's power was still critical throughout the policy-making process, and this partial decentralization of government occurs with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the state to the embedded dominance of the state.

However, for the Remaking Sewoon Project in 2015, the combined effects of a mayor-centered coalition and the force of rapid democratization informed the decision-making process and the implementation of the project. The initial Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a drastic change of the plan from creating a greenway by demolishing the old urban structure of downtown Seoul (Greenway Project) to an adaptive-reuse project (Remaking Sewoon Project), preserving an old symbolic structure of demolishing it, to improve walkability and connect communities in downtown Seoul. This change of the plan rendered under the strong leadership of the current Mayor of Seoul, Won-Soon Park, with his clear vision towards urban sustainability, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches. While the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project (first phase of the Sewoon Project) more focused on economic revitalization through the greening process and redevelopment, the Remaking Sewoon Project's focus was concentrated around people, sense of community, and historic preservation. This drastic change implies many meanings of the urban dynamics of Seoul, such as more focus on social aspects over economic growth, a paradigm shift from redevelopment-oriented to a balanced approach between development and preservation. These results point to the fact that the recent democratization is becoming more influential in urban sustainability planning in Korea. Therefore, this research found that the vision of the Mayor of Seoul has been critical in the decision-making process and the implementation of the urban
sustainability plans in Seoul. While the ‘pro-growth’ discourse affected by the globalization force was critical in the early 2000s in the urban politics around sustainability planning in Seoul, the urban dynamics around sustainability planning is in a transition towards a just city with the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea.

**Historical Background of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan**

*Historical Background of Sewoon Sangga*

The Sewoon Sangga was a groundbreaking residential and industrial megastructure consisting of eight to seventeen multistory buildings covering a full kilometer in the heart of Seoul, built in 1967 (See figure 13). The Sewoon Sangga is located in the historical part of central Seoul. In particular, it is located in the east side of the city center, in the south part of the historical Jongmyo Shrine (UNESCO World Heritage site since 1995), and in the north part of the Cheonggyecheon. As the first multi-purpose apartment complexes built in 1968 in Seoul, the Sewoon Sangga served as the only commercial center selling various electric appliances. The buildings were designed by the architect Kim Swoo-Geun during the era of developmental dictatorship in South Korea when planning and building an industrial economy was the top priority of the government's tasks. The buildings were designed and constructed in an area that had been completely demolished during the Second World War when Korea was still under Japanese occupation. In the 1960s, the city of Seoul started to refurbish the demolished city and built some department stores and large commercial/residential complexes. The construction of
Sewoon Sangga was one of the most ambitious plans of the city of Seoul, reflecting the authority’s intention for the industrial development in that era.

Figure 13. Sewoon Sangga in 1967


After the Korean War (1950–1953), the area was occupied by illegally constructed residential buildings. During that time, informal settlements were also being built in many other open spaces in Seoul, such as the riverside of the Cheonggyecheon. Policymakers viewed the site as chaotic and felt the need to erase the slum housing of war refugees that had invaded the site (Kim & De Meulder, 2017). Therefore, the site, a quite particular strip in the urban fabric of the historic center that had been cleared during Japanese colonial
period, was seen as appropriate for making a new mega-structure (Kim & De Meulder, 2017).

The word "Sewoon" means "attracts all the energy of the world," while the word "Sangga" means "shopping mall." The Sewoon Sangga building complex consists of eight rectangular elongated single buildings, stretching from North to South. The buildings are divided by crossroads but were initially linked by pedestrian bridges on the upper levels. The first four floors of the building complex were designed as a commercial area to electronic house markets, while floors 5 to 17 were designed as designed for a residential purpose. Also, the top-lit arcade and dense internal alleys in between were used for repair and industry.

Sewoon Sangga was planned to fulfill the demand for the modernization and to symbolize Korea's economic growth. It was the first urban redevelopment megaproject promoted by the government to demonstrate the nation's success in the pursuit of modernization. The Sewoon Sangga was a part of the development wave with which the military government drove the country forwards. Drastic modernization policies were the way taken by the military government at that time to demonstrate a distinction with the previous government (Kim & De Meulder, 2017). Accordingly, many development projects were launched simultaneously as political legitimacy depended upon the success of both modernization and fast industrialization. Also, the Sewoon Sangga project was significantly influenced by contemporary Western urban design (Kwak, 2003).

In the beginning, the building was well accepted by the users and fulfilled the designated purposes appropriately. From 1979, a significant number of the residents started to leave Sewoon Sangga to newly developed large-scale apartments in the southern part of
Seoul, affected by the government's housing policy focusing on the Gangnam area. In the 1970s, the authority of Seoul needed a spatial strategy to protect Seoul as tension between North and South increased. Seoul’s proximity to the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) made the Korean government anxious about the safety of its primary city (Kim, 2003). Accordingly, a land readjustment program was introduced to the agricultural Gangnam (southern part of Han River) area to decentralize the city’s economic functions away from the downtown Gangbuk area. New towns in Gangnam area were set up based on a grid of arterial roads and was occupied with new housings, high-rise office buildings, the relocated top high schools and public offices, and shopping centers. Further, the central and Seoul governments continued to construct bridges over the Han River and relocated public facilities, such as the supreme courts, the public prosecutor’s office, and the national library, to South Seoul (Lee, 2003). On top of that, the SMG planned to develop a new large electronic and digital market, which eventually replaced the original market in Sewoon Sangga, in the Yongsan district in 1987. All in all, Sewoon Sangga lost most of the residents to the wealthy Gangnam district and its customers to a new large electronic and digital market in Yongsan (Seoul Solution, 2015).

As entering the late twentieth century, the Sewoon district became a notorious impoverished area in Seoul. Even though the SMG announced a plan to demolish the Sewoon Sangga building in 1995, the plan was not realized. According to a study done by the government, the main barrier for the regeneration project was a fire safety issue and the high building density of old low-rise buildings, which comprises 72 percent of the total building stocks in the Sewoon district (SMG, 2013, p. 39).
Discussion on the Demolition of the Sewoon Sangga

Since 1995, the demolition of the Sewoon Sangga buildings and the urban regeneration of the Sewoon area have been continually discussed by the city council and mayors (Table 7). The Sewoon Sangga is located at the center of the historical area of Seoul. In the 1970s, the Sewoon area enjoyed its heyday as a Mecca of the newest electricity machinery as well as exclusive residents. However, its glory did not last long, just in ten years, more luxurious residential areas were developed, and a bigger IT complex was built in the southern area of Seoul. The commercial center was shifted from Gangbuk (North part of Han River) to Gangnam (South part of Han River). Since the Sewoon Sangga became a symbol of obsolescence of industrialization era in Seoul, the building was regarded as one of the primary causes of the economic imbalance between Gangbuk and Gangnam. Considering the historical importance of the location of the Sewoon Sangga, the SMG wanted to recover the historical and cultural environment of Seoul through an urban regeneration project (SMG, 2009).
Table 7. History of plans regarding Sewoon Sangga regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Master plan for Jung District in Seoul</td>
<td>Connecting green axis from Mt. Bukak to Mt. Namsan -Creation of green public park</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2011 Basic Master plan for Seoul</td>
<td>Creating harmony between waterway (horizontal line) and greenway (vertical line)</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Urban Management Master plan for Downtown Seoul</td>
<td>Redevelopment plan around Sewoon Sangga -Connecting green axis from Mt. Bukak to Mt. Namsan and convert the Sewoon Sangga site into public park</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Development Master plan for Downtown Seoul</td>
<td>Redevelopment plan around Sewoon Sangga -Connecting green axis from Mt. Bukak to Mt. Namsan and convert the Sewoon Sangga site into public park</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Seoul basic plan for Adjustments for Urban and Housing environments</td>
<td>Redevelopment plan around Sewoon Sangga. -Connecting green axis from Mt. Bukak to Mt. Namsan</td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2020 Basic Master plan for Seoul</td>
<td>Connecting green axis from Mt. Bukak to Mt. Namsan and convert the Sewoon Sangga site into public park -The project starts from the north side of the Cheonggyecheon</td>
<td><img src="image6.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009b, p. 33
As we can see above, the city of Seoul has continually sought to revitalize the depressed urban areas in downtown Seoul through a redevelopment plan through the greening process. These plans were emerged to revitalize the old downtown so-called Gangbuk (northern part of Seoul), where has been depressed compared to the new emerging Gangnam (southern part) area in Seoul over the last two decades. The city of Seoul tried to reinforce new growth strategies by making the most of urban resources: historical and the natural environment. These can be interpreted as examples of sustainable discourse embedded greening projects aiming both economic growth and promoting a good image of the city to the world.

As Campbell (1996) boldly claims that “in the battle of big public ideas, sustainability has won: the task of the coming years is simply to work out the details, and to narrow the gap between its theory and practice,” regarding the “state of sustainability” (Campbell, 1996, p.312), there was an increasing pressure on protected open space and the greening the urban area. Given the current trend that the concept of sustainability has become embedded in our culture, we need to rigorously examine the different components of the concept. Bloomsberg’s “PlanNYC: A Greener, Greater New York,” which was released in 2007, could be a good example of the use of selective sustainability. The plan promotes sustainable goals, including increasing affordable housing, improving park access, and reducing citywide carbon emissions by 2030 (Checker, 2011). However, numerous scholars criticize that the plan’s goals and the city’s redevelopment strategies are somewhat contradictory, concentrating on certain appealing issues such as environmental amenities (green open space). They argue that these policies leave out environmental justice issues. This contradictory relationship between sustainable policies
and inequitable urban redevelopment become more problematized as cities are becoming competitive global cities (Checker, 2011; Finn & Mccormick, 2011). And this contradiction is found in other cities across the globe, including the case of Seoul.

The First Phase of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan: Greenway Project

Overview

In 2006, the SMG announced the urban regeneration master plan for downtown Seoul plans to build a green network that connects the dispersed green spaces across downtown Seoul (Figure 14). The essential concept was to link prominent green spaces, water corridors, and cultural sites in central Seoul. This project intended to form a ring and axis-type network connecting green spaces with the Cheonggyecheon restoration in Seoul. A green network plan included Namsan Mountain, Bukhansan Mountain, Seoul Forest, Dongdaemun Stadium park, and Yongsan Park (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005).
Figure 14. Green network plan in Seoul

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005, p. 17
The Cheonggyecheon restoration project completed in 2005 and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project (Greenway Project) were parts of this long-term plan provided by the Seoul Metropolitan Government. This long-term plan aimed to recover the historical and cultural environment and balance the city’s development between Gangbuk (northern part of Seoul) and Gangnam (southern part) in Seoul. The green network plan emphasized that Seoul's 600-year-old history as the capital had been disconnected due to the disappearance of the waterway which was well-blended with Mt. Bukaksan and Mt. Namsan. The objectives of the green network plan developed by the SMG were as follow: connecting south and north green axes from Bukaksan to Namsan, connecting the ring-shaped green axis including palaces, making Seoul forest as an environment-friendly park linked with Han river, and restoring the nature in the Yongsan park (See APPENDIX E).

More specifically, the Greenway Project was intended to demolish the old Sewoon Sangga and create a greenway within the Sewoon district to connect the dispersed green spaces, between Mt. Bukaksan and Mt. Namsan, and to revitalize depressed Sewoon districts in downtown Seoul (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005). The vision of the plan was to build a competitive dignity of a 600-year-long history and the vitality of a dynamic culture at the heart of Global Seoul (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009b, p. 87). The Greenway Project, approved in 2006, included the demolition of the Sewoon Sangga building in order to create a one-kilometer-long linear shaped green park of 70m to 90m in width by 2015 (SMG, 2009). As an exceptional substantial urban redevelopment project, the plan affected an area of around 438.585 m² and included a green corridor, residential building, commercial buildings, squares, and cultural facilities (Figure 15).
Figure 15. The location of the Sewoon Sangga and a Greenway Project on the site in 2006

Source: The Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009b, p. 92
SMG held the international design competition for the master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District in 2004. An adopted plan suggested a relaxation on the floor area ratio to maximize the contrasting effects between the green spaces and buildings and emphasized the harmony between the existing horizontal waterway, Cheonggyecheon, and the newly created vertical greenway (Figure 16). According to the plan, on the right and left sides of the park high-rise buildings will be built parallel to the greenway after demolishing of around 10,000 small-scale shops, 85.8 percent of which are over 40 years old (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2006)

Figure 16. The master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District in 2004

Source: The Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009b. p. 91

Economic Development Through the Greenway Project

After the 2000s, one of the main goals of SMG was to be globally competitive through an improved image of the urban environment of Seoul to the world. Many of the urban megaprojects have been initiated after the new Millennium began: the Han River Renaissance, Mt. Namsan Renaissance, and 2010 Design Capital City Seoul. In particular, these projects were planned to revitalize the old downtown so-called Gangbuk (northern
part of Seoul), which has been depressed compared to the new emerging Gangnam (southern part) area in Seoul over the last two decades. Along with deteriorated urban structures and depressed neighborhoods in the old downtown, the imbalance and polarization between two districts, Gangbuk and Gangnam, have been chronic urban issues in Seoul. The SMG, thus, tried to reinforce new growth strategies by making the most of urban resources: historical and cultural heritage, and the natural environment. Notably, the first phase of Sewoon Sangga regeneration project (Greenway Project) is a representative example of sustainable discourse embedded greening project aiming both economic growth and promoting a good image of the city to the world.

Even though the Greenway Project provided by the SMG emphasized creating a green network aspect, in reality, the large-scale demolition of the existing urban setting and communities was planned to redevelop them as a substantial mixed-use complex of residential and commercial purpose along with the green open spaces. After completing the demolition, the following tasks were approved: 1) replacement of the 1-km-long Sewoon Sangga building with an urban void in the form of a linear park connecting north and south mountains in Seoul; 2) increase the overall floor area ratio (FAR) in the redevelopment area - an average FAR of 7, and up to 8.5 in specific development areas; and 3) increase of the maximum building height to 90 m and in some areas to 125 m. According to these redevelopment measures, the Greenway Project would result in significant densification of the area, which was demonstrated through the master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District taken from the international competition in 2004 (Figure 17).
One of the arguments of the greenway project was to create a positive image of an environmentally-friendly global city. As the previous Seoul’s mayor, Se-hoon Oh, addressed in the 2010 New Year’s greeting as follow, “Our efforts to promote Seoul through urban brand marketing, create landmarks (…) and highlight Seoul’s charm through effective urban design is all geared toward the attraction of money, people, and information to Seoul and to the realization of economic growth with employment growth” (SMG, February 11, 2010), the vision of the urban regeneration plan for downtown Seoul was to brand market the city and appeal to the world as a competitive city. Therefore, the Greenway Project did not only intend to create public green spaces for the improved quality of everyday life in Seoul but also plan to improve the image of Seoul and bring more economic investments through redeveloping the surrounding areas along with the newly created greenway.
While the small business people were marginalized from the decision-making process, the SMG was focusing on revitalizing the downtown Seoul and selling a positive image of Seoul globally. This manifests how the government interprets “sustainability” and how they use the concept of sustainability selectively. As Jonas & Gibbs (2004) calls this tendency as ‘sustainability fix,’ the Greenway Project is another evidence for my argument that the authority in Korea is using the ideas of sustainability to appeal to both the citizens internally and other cities globally when the specific ways taken along with the implementation process is hard to be seen as sustainable.

Creating Green Spaces in Compact City

As urban green space has become an indispensable part of urban planning, there is evidences that green space can boost economic value of land, provide social and community benefits, promote environmental quality and biodiversity, and increase health and well-being (Bell et al., 2007). Given the importance of green space in urban areas, many politicians, administrators, planners, and citizens aspire to create green cities (Hough, 1994; Bradley, 1995). While many cities provide green spaces in new development and preserve existing green areas in redevelopment (Beatley, 2000), the urban renaissance conducted in some cities could pay tribute to the need to greening cities as means for environmental and economic revival (Hughes, 1991).

While each city has unique problems and limitations in implementing the greening plans, compact cities, such as Seoul, tended to encounter more legal restrictions to greening, and many cities in developing countries have inherited the old compact form. Greening cities, especially upgrading dense urban areas with greenery, is widely advocated as a critical feature of a livable and sustainable city. By itself, greening could serve as a
necessary but not sufficient condition towards urban sustainability; at best, it could only afford a partial answer. To be fully functional ecologically, the site needs to have a naturally fertile setup with a particular scale. Therefore, careful approaches are required when policymakers and planners plan to implement urban greening policy. The ideas of the livable city (Lennard and Lennard, 1987) and the green city (Platt et al., 1994) have blossomed into the sustainable city conception (Roseland, 1998; Newman, 1999).

According to the Greenway Project planned by the SMG, the greenway is likely to be a spectacular green space; however, it may not be planning an ecological park. One of the respondents expressed his concern on this issue as follow:

The Greenway Project Plan is suggesting the densification of the area by building many high-rise buildings just next to the newly created greenway. Considering the chronic problems lacking in parking spaces in downtown Seoul, the underground of the site is likely to become a huge underground parking lot within this site. It is almost impossible to create an ecological green ax if we want to densify this area with high-rise buildings at this location. It will become green looking spaces covered by grass. Also, both policymakers and citizens do not have ecological mindsets yet. When we are still captured by a development-oriented mind, it is risky to implement this kind of mega greenway project in Seoul. (Interviewee 24, June 27, 2017)

As he pointed out, keen attention needs to be paid in creating a spectacular greenway in a compact city, like Seoul. In particular, the greening plan has to be carefully approached when the plan includes developments as well. Considering the technocratic-oriented approach for many urban sustainability plans in Seoul and the chronic shortage of parking spaces in downtown Seoul, the creation of ecological greenway is not a likely scenario even if the SMG could have continued the implementation of the Greenway Project.

The creation of public spaces with trees itself may provide significant benefits to the citizens for their useful environmental and ornamental functions. However, most of
public natural or historical restoration planning process have been done within a short timeframe and completed fast. Controversies were escalating as much as restoration projects were initiated through a short-term planning process by the SMG or local governments on their authority. The critics point out that authentic restoration should be meticulous otherwise it could be another destructive influence. Nevertheless, the plans are forced to proceed under a typical top-down decision-making process with mega-funds an enormous investment of private and public developers, expecting visually upgraded urban landscapes to the public and increased property value. Not to make another Cheonggyecheon restoration project, regarding its anti-ecological approach, the SMG should note that greening cities can be better practiced when the ecological value is more appreciated among policymakers and citizens. It is common that socio-economic benefits carry environmental costs. However, it is required to accept the reciprocal reasoning, that environmental benefits may incur socio-economic costs.

**Public-Private Partnerships for the Greenway Project**

For the Greenway Project, the Mayor of Seoul at that time, Se-Hoon Oh, announced that the SMG would demolish the Sewoon Sangga buildings and convert the area into a green corridor in Seoul in 2006. Urban regeneration plans raised by politicians have been welcomed by citizens in Seoul because “real estate values are matters of the undivided interests of the citizen in Seoul and urban regeneration policies directly influence on the real estate values within and around the allotted site. That is why a majority of politicians strategically take urban regeneration projects as their flagship projects for their campaign” (Interviewee 11, Sep. 26, 2017). This means that the urban redevelopment plans in Seoul, especially for the residential areas, have been favored by many citizens since
those redevelopment plans have resulted in increasing real estate values with the improved built-environments in the neighborhoods. According to an interviewee, he criticizes how the value of housing and real estate have been regarded as a tool for investment as below:

Over the last four decades, we, Seoul citizens have appreciated the value of housing or the real estate as a tool for investment maximizing our assets, especially through the process of a redevelopment project. For example, the SMG wants to refurbish or redevelop certain areas, yet the authority is lacking in funds to provide basic infrastructure. Then, the authority assigns the area as redevelopment districts, offering relaxation on building height limitation and changing zoning within the areas so private companies can make significant profits by participation. During that process, property owners lived within assigned areas get economic benefits from the increased property value through the rehabilitation of the district. Therefore, urban redevelopment or development is welcomed by citizens and is assumed as an efficient way to increase residents' assets. (Interviewee 5, July 20, 2017)

The interview above explains how the urban redevelopment projects have been appreciated by Seoul citizens as a tool to maximize their assets. The central government of Korea enacted the Land Expropriation Act in 1962 to manage urban land efficiently to promote industrialization. However, the Land Expropriation Act allows the government to secure land widely not only for industrial development but also for residential and commercial development, empowering the government's control on land and housing management (Kim and Ahn, 2002). In this context, the government could proceed the urban regeneration projects, mostly for the residential areas, as public-private projects without spending a significant amount of money for the project. The SMG determines urban planning to refurbish districts that need to recover their public functions or where living conditions are poor. While the associations consisting of property owners within assigned areas promoted the refurbishment project through consent among residents, the SMG hardly played any constructive role in the attempts to resolve the numerous
irregularities and conflicts involved in each regeneration project. Despite this lack of administrative support from the government, the association of property owners within the designated area often take the responsibility in choosing the construction company and proceeding the construction for the purpose of economic gain they will get once the projects are realized. This form of public-private partnership has been commonly used for the neighborhood redevelopment plans in Seoul especially in the 2000s.

In 2006, the SMG conducted the feasibility study for the Greenway Project to decide its business method and to what extent the SMG would need to fund for the project (SMG, 2009). Three different business operation methods were suggested for the plan (Table 8).
Table 8. Business operation method comparison for the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban infrastructure project</th>
<th>Adjustment of urban environment project</th>
<th>Urban environmental maintenance project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property owner</strong></td>
<td>Cash-based compensation to reward shop owners</td>
<td>Incorporation to the urban redevelopment district</td>
<td>Choose among cash-based compensation or incorporation to the urban redevelopment district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenant</strong></td>
<td>Cash-based compensation or relocation to an alternative shopping center</td>
<td>Decide based on negotiation between association members</td>
<td>Choose among Cash-based compensation/relocation to an alternative shopping center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project starting time</strong></td>
<td>Right after the SMG confirms the fund</td>
<td>High possibility in delay due to the conflicts among association members</td>
<td>After the facilitation plan set up and the SMG confirms the fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense resource</strong></td>
<td>Public fund</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Pre-investment from the public and recover from the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>Effective operation regardless of the surrounding condition</td>
<td>Less financial and administrative burden for the authority</td>
<td>Easiness of the project through the pre-investment from the public fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>More financial and administrative load for the authority</td>
<td>Complicated interests among association members</td>
<td>Complicated interests among association members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism about a huge expense using citizen’s tax for a project in which surrounding residents only get gains</td>
<td>Concerns about high-density development through giving incentives for facilitating the investment</td>
<td>Expected complaints from other areas for the assignment of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2009b, p. 36
The first business operation method in Table 8, *the Urban infrastructure project*, puts significant responsibility and burdens on the SMG since the SMG had to provide the funds as the central expense resource and needed to take responsibility for the whole process of the project. However, the project could have efficiently proceeded through a top-down approach if the urban infrastructure project method was taken for the project. In contrast, the second business operation method, Adjustment of urban environment project, put the least burden on the SMG, by making the Greenway Project as an entirely private project. Instead, the association's members, consisting of the shop owners and the housing owners within the project site, would take responsibility to provide the funds for the construction and manage the project process. The expected challenges for the Adjustment of urban environment project method were the difficulty of finding consensus among association members with different interests by themselves and some concerns on the reckless high-density development by giving incentives for facilitating the investment. Lastly, the third business operation method, Urban environmental maintenance project, was a form of public-private partnership with the characteristics of in between the first and second business method above. While the SMG had to provide the pre-investment funds for creating infrastructures for the project, the association members were subjected to pay for the rest of the expenses for the project.

Based on the study about the feasibility of the project and value estimation analysis for the project done by the SMG, the total value after the completion of the greenway project is estimated at 113.5 billion Korean Won (KW), which is equivalent to around 101.8 million US dollars (SMG, 2009). The SMG figured the authority has a reliable financial resource to fund the pre-investments for the Greenway Project considering
significant impacts the completion of the project may have. As the SMG announce the special law for Urban environmental maintenance project in July 2006, the urban environmental management project business operation method (third business method in Table 8) was adopted to develop the Greenway Project. This business method can be seen as a typical public-private partnership (PPP). PPP in urban redevelopment can be defined as a true partnership of public officials and private developers who "have development ambitions that they could not complete alone" (Sagalyn, 2007, p. 8).

In this form of public (government) and private sector cooperation, the aim usually is to accomplish a public task or a project by funding and to operate by a partnership in which the financial risks of the public sector are to be reduced. Noting that the public-private partnerships have been coined frequently along with a shift from urban 'managerialism' toward 'entrepreneurialism' (Harvey, 1989), as one of the local state's efforts to reconfigure around an agenda of economic development and competition, whether there was a 'pro-growth' coalition among the policymakers and economic elites or not with the Greenway Project operation and how it differs from the Western experiences will be examined in later section about growth machine theory.

Conflict Managements Among Stakeholders

The project began with the demolition of the Hyundai Sangga (Northeast part of the Sewoon Sangga). There were numerous conflicts in the planning stage due to contradictions among many different factors to consider, such as different interests of the shop owners, residential unit owners, renters, and civic groups.

First of all, it was the first case of an urban regeneration project compensating shop owners and apartment residents in the Sewoon Sangga, the multi-purpose commercial
apartment complex. Since the Sewoon Sangga was planned to be demolished, those who owned shops and residential units in the Sewoon Sangga had to move out the buildings and if they did so, they would be compensated. The Hyundai Sangga area affects the total area of 3,478 m², with 318 business sectors and 79 housing units. The SMG took the lead to move forward the negotiation for the compensation issue with shop owners and apartment residents within the building and Hyundai H&S (owner of the Hyundai Sangga). The most significant concern was getting a consensus on the real estate appraisal results. Most shop owners wanted to receive the highest compensation as much as possible. There were strong oppositions from the merchants' associate, those renting the offices. The renters could not receive the compensations for their relocation since they did not own the properties within the Sewoon Sangga, but they had to move out places where they have been operating their business for a long time. Even though the SMG try to provide other alternative commercial centers to relocate the merchants who were renting, they did not want to relocate. Similar with the market industry around the Cheonggyecheon, the Sewoon Sannga has been known for their old manufacturing business clusters. Most merchants did not see any room for their business outside of the Sewoon area, when the Korean economy is shifting from the manufacturing to the service- and high technology-oriented industries. Also, different merchants' clubs based on their different interests had sprung up spontaneously by the business sector, leading to failure in forming a unitary merchant committee. In Dec. 2008, despite the opposition from the merchants, the SMG and Hyundai H&S finalized compensations with the shop owners and planned to relocate the merchants to other alternative commercial centers, after one year after they announced the real estate appraisal results (SMG, 2009).
Merchants, mostly manufacturing and sales, in the Sewoon Sangga building and the surrounding areas, did not advocate the Greenway Project (SMG, 2009). Most of them already had a negative perception about the regeneration plan based on the negative experiences from the previous Cheonggyecheon restoration project concerning gentrification and the government's top-down implementation way (Lim, Kim, Potter & Bae, 2013). The residents who were living in the residential units of Sewoon Sangga building could expect significant economic gain by the Greenway Project since they would move into newly constructed residential apartments within the Sewoon area with increased property values. On the other hand, shop renters had no option, but they had to move out of the Sewoon Sangga building. Therefore, there were incongruent needs between the residents and the merchants, causing exclusion of merchants in the project initiatives (SMG, 2009). Also, the social bias of such projects and the induced gentrification is not to be perceived as an isolated phenomenon in space and time, but nested within the ambition of increasing Seoul's global competitiveness among other global cities.

Secondly, the Jung-gu (One of the administrative districts of the project site) officials have consistently requested that the SMG relax the building height law (See figure 18).
As the urban environmental management project business method was taken for the realization of the Greenway Project, local administrators of the Jung-gu wanted to make the regeneration assigned area within Jung-gu marketable so they can attract business and developers into the area to the maximum. They suggested the plan of the development of high-rise landmark, with more than 200 floors, arguing that it will provide a better view in between Mt. Bukaksan and Mt. Namsa along with a public greenway. In 2007, the Jung-gu office also held a citizen contest for this landmark plan to promote the idea of high-rise development within the district (Figure 19).
A director of Jung-gu said:

We should have a monumental landmark, like Rockefeller Center in New York City or Taipei 101 building in Taiwan, that can be a symbol of Seoul to vitalize the urban core and improve the competitiveness of the city. This plan can make the Jung-gu area as a hub of financial and tourism in Asia. This Sewoon Regeneration plan can be an optimized opportunity to promote Seoul as a global city by developing the landmark building. Therefore, the SMG needs to relax on the building height limitation. (Korean Economy, August 2009)

As he argued above, the Jung-gu local municipality saw this regeneration plan as an opportunity to market the area as the investable area through ‘entrepreneurial’ politics. In particular, the residents within Sewoon regeneration project area had to pay for the expenses for the creation of a greenway and redevelopment even through the SMG provides some subsidies for the creation of basic infrastructure. Thus, the residents actively
engaged with the Jung-gu municipality's effort to appeal the landmark suggestion plan to the SMG. However, the SMG did not accept their request of the relaxation on building height limitation. Even though the SMG did not accept the request from the Jung-gu municipality to allow them to build a high-rise landmark (220 floors building) in Sewoon regeneration area, this request demonstrates the fact that local policymakers and investors saw this Sewoon regeneration project as an excellent opportunity bringing economic growth within the region.

Lastly, ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) raised a critical voice on the Sewwon regeneration plan to protect the Jongmyo Shrine, one of the UNESCO World Heritage sites (WHS) in Korea. After the international competition for the master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District was released, the SMG was required to call for advice from ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) in 2016. Based on the master plan of the Sewoon No. 4 District, the height of the building was 122m of 36 stories in 2009. As a result, the Cultural Heritage Committee disapproved it seven times between August 2009 and May 2010 mainly because of the visual impact of such a height, which would destroy the historic environment of Jongmyo (SMG, 2009).

*Urban Regeneration in a Developmental State: Growth Machine Theory Application*

Following the special law for *Urban environmental maintenance project* (third business method in table 8), the project operation way taken by the SMG for the Greenway Project was a form of public (government) and private sector cooperation, aiming to accomplish a megaproject by funding and operating on the basis of a partnership in which the financial risks of the public sector are to be reduced. As Harvey (1989) described as a shift from urban ‘managerialism’ toward ‘entrepreneurialism,’ the local state has been
reconfigured around an agenda of economic development and competition (Jessop, 1998; Brenner 2004; Hackworth, 2007). This results in not only a different agenda for urban politics, but also public bodies develop new forms of public-private partnerships and other 'networked' forms of governance. Seemingly, the emergence of more networked forms of local governance is better adapted to the changing economic environment based on public-private partnerships (Brenner and Theodore, 2002).

This global attention to the emergence of networked forms of local governance has produced numerous studies of ‘growth coalitions' (Molotch, 1976) between local municipalities and private business sectors and have become a somewhat dominant paradigm in work on urban politics during recent decades. Those studies describe a fragmentation of power between governmental and non-governmental actors, which leads to a mutual coalition of politicians and business sectors that urges them to form partnerships with their capacities. Therefore, growth machine theory analyzes urban politics through a framework of local dependence that subordinates the state to the dominance of capital. Accordingly, this tendency privileges private business interests causing a bias towards 'pro-growth' rather than redistributive or ecological values in urban politics.

While much of growth machine theory discusses the question of how these corporation modes differ among different cities and contexts, there is little examination in the context of Asian cities, where developmental state legacy prevailed. We observe dependency of local politics and the growing relevance of public-private partnerships along with a trend towards ‘entrepreneurial' politics as a form of global imperative resulting from place-bound economic competition and limited state capacities in Seoul. However, the
actual form of these partnerships is fundamentally shaped by local conditions, including a specific interaction between different processes of uneven socio-spatial development, inherited regulatory landscapes and developmental projects.

A set of main actors were influential throughout the preparation and implementation process, advocating the implementation of the project. They consisted of the Mayor of Seoul, local policymakers (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu), SH Corp. (project manager), and the associations consisting of property owners in the local areas. From the mayor’s perspective, three main objectives for the implementation of the Greenway Project were: 1) political support gained through the completion of a mega redevelopment plan with its visual effects and economic revitalization of a depressed area; 2) resolving chronic imbalance and polarization problems between two districts, Gangbuk and Gangnam, in Seoul; and 3) promoting Seoul as a competitive global city with an image of eco-city by creating a substantial greenway. At the same time, local policymakers in Jung-gu and Jongro-gu saw this redevelopment project as an opportunity to draw investments into the areas in old downtown, suffering from economic development. Evidence of this economic-driven perspective is the high-rise landmark building proposal the policymaker of Jung-gu has been appealing to the SMG (see figure 21). As a project/ construction manager, the SH Corp., a government-owned corporation which is responsible for the development of public housings in Seoul and urban regeneration project, could gain economic benefit after the completion of the construction. Lastly, the associations consisting of property owners within the assigned areas could expect significant economic gain from the redevelopment project, since they would move into newly constructed residential apartments within the Sewoon area with increased property values. These actors, thus, shared a common goal,
pro-growth, through the implementation of the greenway project, which can be seen as a similar coalition of ‘growth machine' as in the Western context.

However, it is important to note the unique characteristics of financing for the redevelopment project in Seoul. The following respondent's observation describes how the public-private partnership operates for the redevelopment project in Seoul:

Korea is the only country where people pay for the housing price without seeing the actual housings even before the construction starts. Because the government cannot complete the development alone, the government assigns some construction companies to complete the construction. Before the construction begins, the construction company sells the apartment units to the future residents. Since most people expect increased property values once the region is redeveloped, the future residents take a risk, buying an apartment unit even before the construction starts. Simply put, the construction company conducts constructions based on the individual subsidy and public administration can proceed with the redevelopment project without spending their budgets. (Interviewee 15, March 30, 2017)

As he pointed out, the risks are taken by the residents who have been living in the redevelopment assigned area and who will live there in the future. A significant source of profit after the redevelopment project is the sale of the housing and commercial units beyond those allotted to the members of the previous resident association. Accordingly, the construction firms seek to build as many units as possible. They could maximize the redevelopment profit by expanding the total building area and by building compact units in high buildings. Meanwhile, the government loses somewhat the land and capacity requirements to improve investment perspectives for the construction firms.

For the Greenway Project, the association members were forced to pay the expenses of the redevelopment construction, even though the SMG provides some subsidies for the creation of necessary infrastructure. However, the association members were advocating for the redevelopment project and were willing to pay for the costs based
on the assumption that the completion of the redevelopment project would refurbish the area and increase the real estate values in the area. To maximize the benefits, the construction companies, local policymakers from Jung-gu, and Jongro-gu, and the association members requested that the SMG to provide relaxation on the maximum height of the buildings.

However, what makes the Greenway project different from other redevelopment projects with a form of typical public-private partnerships is that the authority's power is still critical, and this cooperation was not formed autonomously. To be applicable to growth machine theory, this coalition group should be an autonomous institution involving shared governing outcomes and financial purposes, not controlled by a central government (Davis, 2003). While the SMG only provide administrative support during the redevelopment process and most actual construction work is done by the construction companies and the residents, the project itself can be only initiated by the central government. Also, the fact that the SMG did not provide relaxation on the maximum building height, which was requested by developers and the residents, demonstrates that merely making the project marketable and gain the growth is not the SMG's goal. Instead, the vision the SMG has about sustainability planning matters. Also, importantly, the leadership of the previous Seoul mayor, Se-Hoon Oh, was not strong enough to push this Greenway Project to complete it. The strong leadership of the local government matters in Seoul, where the developmental state legacy is deeply embedded in the politico-economic structure in the nation.

The transition from the highly centralized developmental state to partially decentralized urban development policies took place simultaneously as we could observe
the creation of a networked form of governance for the greenway project. However, this change occurs with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the state to the embedded dominance of the state (Park, 2008; Sonn, 2010). Even when most of the risks are taken by the construction companies and the residents for the greenway project, the key for the implementation of the project remains with the SMG.

Partial Realization of the Greenway Project

In reality, the SMG planned goals for the Greenway Project have barely been implemented in the Sewoon area except for the demolition of Hyundai Sangga and the replacement of small greenway park on the site. There were many reasons for the failure in the implementation of the plan. First of all, the SMG did not have the funding as a result of the 2009 economic crisis to afford the expensive initial investment costs of such an urban megaproject. All the existing businesses (1073 business sectors only in 4 district) had to close down their commercial activities in the area to demolish and rebuild the whole project area (SMG, 2009). The approximate cost for the compensation for the losses of the merchants' economic activities was estimated to around 25.65 million US dollars, by more than 7 times the SMG had for the project (Na, 2012). Secondly, the strong opposition from the ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) to prevent the high-rise building construction in front of the Jongmyo Shrine, one of the UNESCO World Heritage sites (WHS) in Korea, was another critical reason for the failure of the Greenway Project. Third, the failure of public-private partnerships in creating an appropriate consortium of enterprises supported by the institutional network was another reason. Lastly, the rise of local protest by the merchants against the Greenway Project was strong the local stakeholders' interests severely varied to negotiate.
Due to many reasons discussed so far, the Greenway Project – first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan – had to stop after demolishing only Hundae Sangga. The Hyundai Sangga, the northern part of Sewoon Sangga building, which was closest to and just south of the Jongmyo Shrine, was demolished in 2008 (figure 20) and a park named Sewoon Greenway Park was created on that site (SMG, 2013). The SMG ended up bearing the substantial financial cost, 69,000 million Korean Won (KW), which is equivalent to around 62 million US dollars, overruns than anticipated (The SBS news, 2015) and the Greenway Project was canceled in 2012.

Figure 20. Demolition of Hyundai Sangga

The Second Phase of the Sewoon Sangga Regeneration Plan: Remaking Sewoon Project

*Project Overview*

An ambitious greening project presented in 2006 became a regeneration plan through the preservation of the Sewoon Sangga instead of the demolition, which is called "Remaking Sewoon Project" in 2014. The Remaking Sewoon project affects the total area of 439,356 m², with a population of 21,841 (SMG, 2017), and is poised as an adaptive-reuse project which aims to improve walkability, connect communities, and nurture creative growth in downtown Seoul. The current Seoul mayor since 2011, Won-soon Park, decided to renovate the Sewoon Sangga via a process of consultation with a residents committee instead of demolishing the building. This new alternative plan is regarded as a new turning point of the SMG's urban revitalization plan, from demolishing old landmark for creating greenway to re-using the existing infrastructure for the transformation of the building into a new hub for the fourth of industrial revolution (Seoul Solution, March 16, 2017).

The project's primary goals are as follow: 1) establishing north-south and east-west pedestrian networks, 2) preservation of the history and the environment, and 3) creating people-oriented community regeneration. Estimated total cost for the project completion allotted by the SMG for this project is 100,867 million Korean Won (KW), which is equivalent to around 90.2 million US dollars. Among them, approximately 49.8 million dollars is spent on the first stage construction since the Remaking Sewoon Project is started in 2014 (Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2016). As an on-going project, the Sewoon Sangga completed the first stage construction and opened the buildings to the public on September 18, 2017 (Figure 21). The final phase, expected to complete in 2019,
will update creative facilities preparing for the fourth industrial revolution and integrate the megastructure's full commercial length with an open pathway, connecting the walking network and restoring the sense of community.

Figure 21. Current status of the Remaking Sewoon Project

Contending Forces Around the Project

Community Over Greening

Since the Greenway Project faced a lack of economic feasibility and severe conflicts between the SMG, construction company, business owners, and resident within the Sewoon district, the SMG, specifically the Department of Managing Historical City, presented a new proposal, for an Alternative Sewoon Development Plan, Remaking Sewoon Project, in March 27th, 2014 (SMG, 2017). The Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a critical turning point as the SMG launched a new alternative plan, by changing its direction from creating a greenway project through the demolition of the building to pedestrian-network project based on historical preservation on the building. The vision of the Remaking Sewoon Project was to remake and revitalize Sewoon where people can walk and gather at the heart of Seoul. This new plan aims to regenerate the urban area by using the existing infrastructure, strengthening the self-sustainability of the region, as well as preserving the history and the environment.

While the Sewoon market still serves as a center of numerous small manufacturers, such as lighting, electronics, printing, and hardware goods, a serious safety issue of the old building has been raised continually. A total population of the Sewoon district has been dropped by 38 percent between 1985 and 2010, and the total number of business sectors operating the Sewoon Sangga market has decreased by eighteen percent over the last decade. Also, 72 percent of a total number of buildings in the Sewoon district were old buildings, more than 40 years after the construction (SMG, 2017).

The Sewoon Sangga, a massive run-down building, has been isolated disconnecting the surrounding areas. In other words, a landmark architecture in the 1970s
- a symbol of the modernization in Seoul - became a problem hampering surrounding environments in the center of the city. Given the importance of the Sewoon Sangga's location, the socio-economic synergy effects were expected to be significant once the Sewoon Sangga area becomes a node where north-south connection and east-west connection meet. The authority and policymakers have continually discussed the urban regeneration of the Sewoon area for decades based on these reasons. Since previous mayors and the SMG failed to convert this area into greenway due to complicated interests associated with the plans, Mayor, Won-soon Park, decided to preserve the building and aims to improve walkability, connect communities, and nurture creative growth in downtown Seoul, instead of demolishing it. Therefore, the SMG went through the preparation tasks to realize the Remaking Sewoon Project. Even though both the Greenway Project and the Remaking Sewoon Project sought to recover history through the implementations of the plans, the specific ways taken for recovery process were different.

The Sewoon Sangga, built in the 1960s for the purpose of industrialization, was the symbol of modernization in Korea. While the Greenway Project decided to demolish this old concrete monument of the industrialization era and refurbish the areas by ‘greening’ process, the Remaking Sewoon Project took a different remedy to rehabilitate the depressed Sewoon area through the preservation. This is noteworthy since the previous authority under Se-Hoon Oh attempted to promote Seoul through a positive image by greenwashing process with a focus on economic revitalization, using a sustainability plan as a ‘sustainability fix.’ The current authority under the Won-Soon Park’s approach is significantly different with the previous plan with a ‘eco-city’ image. Instead, the Remaking Sewoon Project took a careful approach in changing the built-environment,
focusing on the social aspects over the physical aspects. This captures a critical change in the dynamics of the urban politics around the urban sustainability plans in Seoul.

**Key Actors**

Won-soon Park was the critical actor in the decision-making process and implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project, changing the direction of the plan from redevelopment by demolishing the Sewoon Sangga to regeneration through preserving the Sewoon Sangga. His first term as a Seoul mayor began from October 2011, and he recently entered his third term of mayorship in June 2018. Before he was elected as a Seoul mayor, Won-Soon Park had worked mainly for NGOs for the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, which predicts his direction in his political career. He criticized Seoul's rapid growth arguing that it brought about a culture of demolishing the old and rebuilding. His vision of Seoul is making the city more pedestrian-friendly and where possible to adapt the existing fabric rather than erase it in favor of grand new structures (Cities Today, 2016). Therefore, the current Remaking Sewoon Project presented by the SMG in 2013 reflects Park's strong will preserving the historical, cultural values of the neighborhoods through the public participation.

For the case of Remaking Sewoon Project, the project itself had still various barriers to the implementation of the project, including various stakeholders to deal with and the complexity of their interests. The total expenses cut down dramatically by changing the direction from demolishing and rebuilding to reusing through the preservation. On top of this reduced budget burden, the current Seoul mayor's strong leadership was critical for the on-going implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project. Won-soon Park, had a clear vision towards the Remaking Sewoon Project and actively accommodated residents'
opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan (Seoul Solution, May 2015). This implication of the Remaking Sewoon Project demonstrates how the authority's role is still vital in urban planning in Seoul and shows that the explicit control of urban development by the authority has shifted to the embedded dominance of the authority along with the public participation.

*Globalization & Historic Recovery*

This Remaking Sewoon Project was affected by the 2030 Seoul master plan announced in 2013. The 2030 Seoul master plan suggests making Seoul a civil society based on mutual communication and participation in the front, focusing on improving citizens’ quality of life. Also, 2030 Seoul master plan explains about the new city development paradigm shift as follow:

City of Seoul had shown an extraordinary economic growth through concentrated investment for strategic industries, conglomerate-oriented investment, and human resource-based development. However, there is a limitation for making a sustainable global city where citizens can have a good quality of life with this growth model. The main sources to improve the competitiveness of a city in the twenty-first century needs to be from innovation, cooperation, people-oriented value. On top of the market economy based on industrial activities and companies, a social economy based on community and cooperation should be added to the development paradigm in Seoul. (2030 Seoul master plan, 2013, p. 63)

This can be interpreted as the city of Seoul’s focus on people and building a sense of community, reflecting the emerging recognition for the need to improve social sustainability in the urban sustainability planning in Seoul. Also, the 2030 Seoul master plan emphasizes "global competitiveness enhancement through the reinforcement of the historical and cultural identity of the Seoul" (2030 Seoul master plan, 2013, p. 78) as one of the main strategies for urban regeneration policies in Seoul. According to the master plan, "Over the last four decades, Seoul has lost its historical image by implementing
continuous large-scale redevelopment projects across the city. Given the competitive dignity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul as the capital of Korea, we need to preserve Seoul's traces instead of reckless redeployment, which will eventually contribute to strengthening Seoul's identity" (2030 Seoul master plan, 2013, p. 78). Therefore, according to the 2030 Seoul master plan, the SMG planned to have a balance between ‘development’ and ‘preservation,’ and that vision was translated into practice through the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project.

Even though the SMG did not seek to improve the image of Seoul with the greening process for the Remaking Sewoon Project, we see that the SMG has been conscious about making Seoul as a global city from the statements emphasizing the global competitiveness in the 2030 Seoul master plan. The Remaking Sewoon Project had a different vision from the Greenway Project in terms of globalization. Instead of using an urban restoration or renewal plan as an instrumental tool in selling ‘Global Seoul’ with an eco-friendly image, the Remaking Sewoon Project actively involves various programs so that young startups can apply the techniques of master craftsmen to fourth industrial technologies like the Industrial Internet of Things\(^2\) (IIoT). Therefore, the SMG strategically seeks to specialize the Sewoon area as a platform to lead the fourth industrial revolution that centers on the manufacturing industry with a long-term goal in attracting more investors to Seoul. While the approaches to promote Seoul as a global city taken for the first and second phases of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plans were varied, the on-going

---

\(^2\) The Internet of things (IoT) is the network of physical devices, vehicles, home appliances, and other items embedded with electronics, software, sensors, actuators, and connectivity which enables their things to connect, collect and exchange data (Jazdi, 2014)
process of globalization is one of the essential discourses around decision-making process for urban sustainability plan in Korea.

Also, it is noteworthy that the SMG took historical restoration as a strategy to revitalize the depressed areas in Seoul. As city policymakers sought to use cultural policy as a strategy of urban regeneration, the use of the historic environment as a part of place-making and city-image initiatives has become increasingly evident (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Pendlebury et al., 2004). We may ask why cultural, historical recovery or conservation has become a tool for urban regeneration. It is because cultural heritage is often considered as an essential resource that differentiates a city from others by giving unique character and identity to it. Also, restored heritage persuasively integrates the community into a collective identity (Pendlebury et al., 2004). As we see from the 2030 Seoul master plan, emphasizing global competitiveness enhancement through the reinforcement of the historical and cultural identity of the Seoul, the SMG sought to reinforce the identity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul as the capital of Korea by numerous place-based historical recovery project in old downtown in Seoul.

*Development vs. Preservation*

There has been controversy over whether Seoul needs to preserve the Sewoon Sangga or not for the last few decades. According to an interviewee, "I do not understand what the historical meaning of the Sewoon Sangga Won-soon Park argues is. The historical meaning of a building can be different by the person. However, the Sewoon Sangga is an old unsafe building with the unsanitary condition, a hotbed of crime, and a massively failed architecture. The best way is destroying the building, like we demolished the Chyeonggye
highway over the Cheonggyecheon, and replace it with green places where citizens can enjoy" (Interviewee 19, May 1, 2017).

While the interviewee above was against the idea of preserving the Sewoon Sangga actively, another interviewee advocates the preservation of the Sewoon Sangga as follow:

I think the Sewoon Sangga captures an important moment of our history. It is a symbol, and at the same time, a record of our time in the modernization era. This is one of the rare megastructures in the world, with a nearly 1-km-long length. This is a historical monument itself. This building was designed by the architect Kim Swoo-Geun, affected by Le Corbusier's idea on modernization. This building shows how we had a vision toward modernization and our interpretation of modernization. I think it is worthy to try to realize his vision with some adjustments instead of demolishing it in haste. We can attract people to walk by creating deck along with the building and develop ecological mind among citizens by greening the rooftop of the building. Then we can figure out when the building reaches the end of its operational lifespan. (Interviewee 25, September 6, 2017)

As such, there has been controversy over preservation of the building. Many of the discussions were about maintaining Sewoon Sangga’s ecosystem of urban industries and reducing the excessive burden of redevelopment on residents and creating a more pedestrian-friendly city. This resulted in the SMG officially announcing its Remaking Sewoon Project in 2014. This dramatic change for the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan, from redevelopment by demolishing the Sewoon Sangga to regeneration through preserving the Sewoon Sangga, implies a significant meaning in terms of socio-political change around urban planning dynamics in Korea. It is evident that the Park’s vision on the preservation of historic urban structure instead of reckless development was critical for this direction change of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan. However, the fact that he is in his third-term of mayor-ship in Seoul means Seoul citizens support his vision. Therefore, the planning and the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project demonstrates a
paradigm shift, from a development-oriented approach to balanced approach between ‘development' and ‘preservation,' in urban planning in Korea.

*Transforming Seoul into a Walkable City*

However, the main focus of the Remaking Sewoon Project is creating a pedestrian-oriented welcoming complex through the building preservation. Given that this Remaking Sewoon Project was affected by 2030 Seoul master plan announced in 2013, linking the pedestrian network across Seoul was one of the primary spatial goals of the 2030 Seoul plan. One of the urban projects Won-soon Park actively took the lead on since he was elected as Seoul mayor was Seoulo 7017 project; a 1,024-meter-long elevated pedestrian walkway opened in downtown Seoul as of May 20, 2017 (Figure 22). Influenced by the planning idea of High Line Park in New York (SMG, 2018), it was built on the overpass that had served as a driveway for the last 45 years and lifts, stairs and escalators have been added where necessary to connect it to the ground. Since its official opening, over 12,097,817 people have visited the Seoulo 7017 since it opened as of May 20, 2017 (SMG, 2018). This project is regarded as both a symbol and an instrument of the shift from car to foot.
With the extension of the Seoullo 7017 project, Wonsoon Park's vision in transforming Seoul into a walkable city affects the Remaking Sewoon Project. The SMG plans to repair pedestrian passages inside of and on the ground of Sewoon Sangga to connect them to the existing pedestrian network. The concept of ‘liminal space' is taken by the SMG to make the regenerated Sewoon as a place of both private and public space. It is the urban space where the community performs the everyday life and unfolds its collective memory, imagination, and desires. By providing some ‘liminal spaces' in the Sewoon Sangga building, this plan aims to invite communities into the buildings. The Remaking Sewoon Project also includes building a pedestrian bridge crossing over the restored Cheonggyecheon (Figure 23).
Figure 23. Pedestrian bridge plan crossing over the Cheonggyecheon


**Public participation**

The Remaking Sewoon Project aimed at actively accommodating citizens' participation in the decision-making process and the maintenance of the project through numerous programs. The SMG set up a council for the residents to be engaged in and support its continued development. Also, the plan includes the creation of Suri Cooperative Association (a cooperative union consisting of the Sewoon Living Lab and artisans in the various fields) and supports meetings for the cooperation of various businesses so that the residents of the Sewoon Shopping center can use the skills they have accumulated so far. As an effort to prevent the gentrification after the regeneration, Park signed the Anti-Gentrification Cooperation Agreement in 2016 with the majority of Sewoon Sangga's
businesses, putting community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents (Metropolis, 2018). The Remaking Sewoon Project is the first urban renewal planning which places more importance on the prevention of gentrification than development.

As we can see so far, the Remaking Sewoon Project represents a shift from a development-oriented to a people-centered. The Seoul mayor decided to design the Remaking Sewoon Project with residents, through a systematic reflection of citizens’ opinions on the plan, to convert this old relic of industrialization era into a new hub for the business preparing fourth industrial revolution with pedestrian passages, though the preservation of historical fabric remained in Seoul instead of redevelopment. What differentiates the Remaking Sewoon Project is its ambition to grow out of the historical character and needs of contemporary Seoul. The Seoul mayor's political position and vision still play the most critical role in urban sustainability planning in Seoul.

**Focus on Social Aspect of Sustainability in Urban Policy**

A sustainable city is one where diversity is encouraged, where there is no sharp spatial separation or isolation of income groups, where all individuals and groups have access to primary and essential services and facilities, and where residents have fair equality of opportunity (Beatley 1993). Beyond its technocratic and energy efficiency indicators, an urban regeneration project needs to consider social aspects, such as, reducing social inequality and improving quality of life, without exclusion of certain groups in the planning process. Unfortunately, the Asian experience in dealing with urban sustainability has been generally based on new urban development or redevelopment megaprojects, lacking integrated policy guidelines to tackle the social aspect of urban sustainability.
The Greenway Project, the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration project, faced years of delay in its implementation, failing in addressing a proper public-private partnership network for its financing while facing local oppositions. The new alternative regeneration plan, the Remaking Sewoon Project, finally put more emphasis on the social aspect of urban sustainability. The remaking Sewoon Sangga Project itself was the result of a long participatory process, consisting of a series of workshops, citizen symposium, and personal meeting with the residents. In contrast to the previous physical redevelopment-based planning, including the demolition of the old building and the construction of multi-purpose towels, the new plan focuses on comparable small-scale redevelopments, strengthening the specific characteristics of the Sewoon district and the surrounding areas.

The Remaking Sewoon Project is possible because of the strong leadership of Seoul mayor, Won-soon Park, pursuing a citizen-oriented approach, the regulation of UNESCO for the Jongmyo Shrine also contributed to this paradigm shift. The regulation of UNESCO for the Jongmyo Shrine includes as follow: the maximum building height should not exceed 62 m in the northern part of the Sewoon area; the original spatial structure, such as roads and streams, need to be preserved; the creation of green spaces needs to be considered within a small-scale development; the complete demolition of a considerable large area needs to be avoided; and the redevelopments need to be based on mixed-residential and commercial use in varying housing sizes (SMG, 2013).

The SMG employed various programs, such as the creation of Suri Cooperative Association (a cooperative union consisting of the Sewoon Living Lab and craftsmen in the various fields) and the operation of citizen & merchants school (a program providing
places and funds to support learning activities about new entrepreneurship), to strengthen
the existing small and medium business network and minimize the social conflicts for the
relocation of existing workplaces and residences (SMG, 2017). Also, for the first time in
the history of urban redevelopment planning, the SMG signed the Anti-Gentrification
Cooperation Agreement in early 2016 with the Sewoon Sangga's business sectors, putting
community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents. After that, the
SMG created a commercial leasing dispute medication committee in April 2016, consisting
of a total number of 10 members including the government officials, merchants, lawyers,
and tax accountants (SMG, 2017).

An expert interviewee emphasized the importance of the social aspect of
sustainability in Seoul as below:

The most important two keys for the urban regeneration process enhancing
sustainability are the long-term approach and people-oriented process. We
need to respect the value of historical downtown structures instead of
destroying the existing historic urban tissue. Instead of rehabilitating areas
by changing the physical built environment, which has been our dominant
approach towards urban renewal or regeneration projects, the focus of the
regeneration process has to be on the improved quality of life and increasing
the social network among citizens. Our history of urban sustainability
planning used to be through a top-down approach, but, this is the time to
have a balanced approach in between top-down and bottom-up. Carefully
planned urban sustainability plans can be initiated by the government after
a though research on the plans, then citizens may get involved with the
planning process to guide it. I think we are now in a transition, from
government-driven and market-driven urban approach to people-oriented
one. The most urgent thing is the change in citizen's perception of urban
sustainability and the communication between the authorities and citizens.
(Interviewee 22, April 25, 2017)

He calls our attention to the notion that bottom-up and small-scale urban
regeneration based on citizens' affection on their communities and better understanding on
sustainable cities could facilitate longer-term changes, revitalizing the district while
maintaining its cultural and historical identity. Such an incremental change of the community's social and environmental quality could be seen as a new and critical learning experience for all the Asian cities.

While the Greenway Project can be regarded as an example of an ambitious green and smart settlement, the Remaking Sewoon Project is possibly seen as the beginning of a paradigm shift in Seoul planning process, meeting the framework of ‘just sustainability,’ which is interpreted as meaning ‘the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems' (Agyeman et al. 2003, p. 5), this research uses. This case study calls on the need for integrated, complex, and stepwise urban planning processes, avoiding the oversimplification of the ‘pro-growth’ through the greening paradigm. Indeed, social, cultural, and local economic sustainability must play a key role within urban regeneration projects, and even more so in growing other Asian megacities.
CHAPTER 7
CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

Overview

This chapter provides the results of cross-case analysis of two sub-case studies for
this research: Cheonggyechon restoration project and the Sewoon Sangga regeneration
project. The Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a dramatic change of the plan in
2015, from creating green corridor project to historic preservation project. Therefore, the
Sewoon Sangga regeneration project is divided into two plans, the first phase of the
Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan (Greenway Project) and the second phase of the plan
(Remaking Sewoon Project), and each phase will be examined separately. The purpose of
the cross-case analysis is the identification of similarities and differences among three
plans to explain the characteristics of urban sustainability plans since the 2000s and how
the plans in the different timeline have evolved in Seoul. First, a series of factors explaining
the essential characteristics of the process and the implementation of urban sustainability
plan is used to compare and analyze each plan. Second, using a set of observable
implications developed for this research, sustainability of each plan will be assessed. Third,
the benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project will be
compared. Finally, discussions on the findings based on the cross-case analysis,
conclusion, and the lessons we can get from the implementations of the three plans will be
provided.
Cross-Case Analysis Results by Factor for General Characteristics of the Projects

Table 9 provides a list of factors that are used for this research to explain general characteristics of the plans. It includes global city, historical recovery, use of mega projects, reference to other policies, timeline, process, public participation, developmental state influence, and positive/ negative impacts of the plans. Also, Table 9 summarizes each project’s characteristics by categories used for this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cheonggyecheon restoration project</th>
<th>Greenway Project</th>
<th>Remaking Sewoon Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global city</strong></td>
<td>Eco-city image (water+green)</td>
<td>Eco-city image (Greenway)</td>
<td>A new hub for the fourth industrial revolution development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic recovery</strong></td>
<td>Historical stream restoration</td>
<td>Connecting a greenway between north and south mountains</td>
<td>Historic preservation of a symbol of modernization in Seoul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of megaproject</strong></td>
<td>Urban restoration project</td>
<td>Urban redevelopment project</td>
<td>Urban regeneration project through historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference to other policies (planning idea)</strong></td>
<td>Harbor drive in Portland</td>
<td>Le Corbusier's idea on towers in the park</td>
<td>High line Park in New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Too fast (June 2003 – Sep. 2005)</td>
<td>Long/delayed Began 2008 and stopped in 2015</td>
<td>Middle 2015-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Partially decentralized</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Participation</strong></td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental state</strong></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>Embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Substantial financial cost for the SMG (62 million dollars)</td>
<td>Aged built-environment. Long period to accommodate residents’ opinions. Limitations of green space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the apparent similarities found among the three plans is that the SMG sought to enhance the competitiveness of Seoul as a global city through the implementations of the urban sustainability plans. A widely held belief amongst many government officials is that the stronger international competitiveness and reputation the city has, the more investors and visitors come and eventually bring more money and better job opportunities to a city. Therefore, today, various efforts for urban regeneration or redevelopment are a global trend, since it is one of the main strategies to refurbish deteriorated areas and create new economic and real estate values from the old urban structure. Seoul, as we could see from the previous two chapters, is a representative of this global trend. In general, government-driven place making movements are relatively active in the old city center, downtown Seoul, while large-scale new town projects are flourishing in the suburbs of Seoul (see Chapter 4).

I argue that this SMG’s strategic intention of marketing the city through a sustainability project was one of the core discourses around the implementation of the plans, especially for the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Greenway project. Myung-Bak Lee explicitly stated that “once the stream is restored, we want this area to stand out as a center of foreign investment. The ultimate goal is to make Seoul a great city, one that can compete as an attractive center of business with Shanghai, Tokyo, and Beijing” (Kane, 2003), to appeal to the public justifying the need of the Cheonggyecheon plan’s implementation. In addition, we could observe the following Seoul mayor, Se-hoon Oh, had a similar vision of the urban regeneration plan for downtown Seoul based on his statement in the 2010 New Year’s greeting that, “Our efforts to promote Seoul through
urban brand marketing, create landmarks (…) and highlight Seoul’s charm through
effective urban design is all geared toward the attraction of money, people, and information
to Seoul and to the realization of economic growth with employment growth” (SMG, February 11, 2010).

City’s policymakers are trying to increase competition among other cities by urban
renewal (Balibrea, 2001; Smith, 2005). The Seoul cases imply their own needs to improve
an image of the city. Like many other late industrializers, Korea was regarded as an
underdeveloped country until the late-1970s. While Seoul has developed exceptionally
quickly since the Korean War armistice in 1953, the Seoul government and citizens were
conscious about the image of the city and wanted to replace a previous depressed image
about Seoul with a well-off environmentally-conscious image. According to one of my
interviewees, he pointed out that Korean government and citizens are obsessed with the
image of Korea or Seoul by stating as follow, “Korea might be the only one country that
keeps broadcasting about how the other foreign medias broadcast about their evaluations
on Korea or Seoul” (Interviewee 12, March 25, 2017). Indeed, in Korea, it is common to
see public news showing how other foreign medias portray Korea, especially those from
the US and Western Europe, which means the government and citizens are conscious about
the image of their own country on a global stage.

Some scholars argue that a developmental state focuses on collective national
interest and receives public support for spatial strategies based on national competitiveness
(Saito, 2003; Harvey, 2005). Since this developmental state legacy is still embedded in
Korean culture, the SMG’s appeal that the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the
Greenway project can contribute to increasing the competitiveness of Seoul among other cities was useful in gaining public support for the plans.

Unlike the other two plans, the Remaking Sewoon Project had a different vision for the project in terms of globalization. Instead of using an urban restoration or renewal plan as an instrumental tool in selling ‘Global Seoul’ with an eco-friendly image, the Remaking Sewoon Project actively involved various programs so that young startups can apply the techniques of master craftsmen to fourth industrial technologies like the Industrial Internet of Things\(^3\) (IIoT). Therefore, the SMG strategically seeks to specialize the Sewoon area as a platform to lead the fourth industrial revolution that centers on the manufacturing industry with a long-term goal in attracting more investors to Seoul.

It is clear that the SMG has been conscious about making Seoul as a global city through numerous urban regeneration plans in Seoul, including the three plans examined in this study, which means the on-going process of globalization is one of the essential discourses around decision-making process for urban sustainability plan in Korea. While the approaches to promote Seoul as a global city taken for the first two cases and the last case were varied, globalization is an inevitable force not only other global cities but also Seoul.

**Historical Recovery**

The sites for all these three plans are located at the historical center of Seoul. In particular, they are all located in the east side of the city center, the northern part of Han River, in the south part of the historical Jongmyo Shrine (UNESCO World Heritage site

---

\(^3\) The Internet of things (IoT) is the network of physical devices, vehicles, home appliances, and other items embedded with electronics, software, sensors, actuators, and connectivity which enables their things to connect, collect and exchange data (Jazdi, 2014)
Deteriorated urban structure and old neighborhoods in the old downtown caused by the government’s strategic urban policy developing the Gangnam area led to the imbalance between Gangbuk and Gangnam areas, divided by the Han River, and this polarization has been a pressing urban issue in Seoul. These three plans were all emerged from the SMG’s efforts to revitalize the old downtown Seoul, in Gangbuk area, and involve historical heritage of Seoul.

It is noteworthy that the SMG took historical recovery as a strategy to revitalize the depressed areas in Seoul. As city policymakers sought to use cultural policy as a strategy of urban regeneration, the use of the historic environment as a part of place-making and city-image initiatives has become increasingly evident (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Pendlebury et al., 2004). We may ask why cultural, historical recovery or conservation has become a tool for urban regeneration. It is because cultural heritage is often considered as an essential resource that differentiates a city from others by giving unique character and identity to it. Also, restored heritage persuasively integrate the community into a collective identity (Pendlebury et al., 2004). As we could observe from the 2030 Seoul master plan emphasizing, “global competitiveness enhancement through the reinforcement of the historical and cultural identity of the Seoul, (2030 Seoul master plan, 2013, p. 78)” the SMG sought to reinforce the identity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul as the capital of Korea by numerous place-based historical recovery project in old downtown in Seoul.

Also, historic restoration projects give an impression of improving urban environmental quality. Thus, the government officials and planners can take advantages of
the expectations of people those prefer cultural environments to live and visit. Historical place recovery sounds seemingly sound by endowing the development plan with the politically neutral and plausible title. However, the idea of consciously conserving historical place has undoubted elitist origins (Jokilehto, 1999; Pendlebury et al., 2004). Therefore, the authority can quickly grasp the power to clean up the low-income depressed neighborhoods.

Three plans had different goals for historical recovery. Firstly, the Cheonggyechoen restoration project's justification for the historical recovery was restoring the Cheonggyecheon, a stream running through the inner space from west to east of Seoul, which was serving residents in Seoul for nearly 600 years since the Joseon dynasty period in Korea until it was covered by Cheonggye highway in the 1960s. Secondly, the Greenway Project’s aim was connecting prominent green spaces, water corridors, and cultural sites in central Seoul by demolishing the Sewoon Sangga, which was a symbol of industrialization and modernization in Korea, and building a greenway on that site. The authority believed it would help to emphasize the original landscape of Seoul, thereby, reinforcing the identity of Seoul as a historic city. Lastly, the Remaking Seoul Project sought to preserve the Sewoon Sangga, instead of demolition, and regenerate the place into an adaptive-reuse project.

Even though these three plans sought to recover history through the implementations of the plans, the specific approaches were different. Both the Cheoggye highway and the Sewoon Sangga were built in the 1960s for the purpose of industrialization in Korea. These two symbolic representations of the industrialization and modernization in Korea declined. While the first two plans planned to demolish these old concrete
monuments of the industrialization era and refurbish the areas by ‘greening’ process, the last plan took a different remedy to rehabilitate the depressed Sewoon area through preservation.

This dramatic change for the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan, from redevelopment by demolishing the Sewoon Sangga to regeneration through preserving the Sewoon Sangga, implies a socio-political change around urban planning dynamics in Korea. Wonsoon Park, argued that “Seoul’s rapid growth brought about a culture of destruction, demolishing the old and rebuilding, simply throwing away what one does not need" (Cities Today, 2016). Moreover, he continues, "Instead of demolishing housing and buildings with tenants and residents, we chose a way to preserve the historical, cultural values of the neighborhoods, preserving the structures of people's lives. This has proven to be a better solution for peoples' lives, the local economy and better for our earth” (Cities Today, 2016).

It is evident that Park’s vision of the preservation of a historic urban structure instead of reckless development was critical for this direction change of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan. However, the fact that he is in his third-term of mayor-ship in Seoul means Seoul citizens support his vision. Also, the Remaking Sewoon Sangga Project itself was the result of a long participatory process, consisting of a series of workshops, citizen symposium, and personal meeting with the residents. Therefore, the planning and the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project demonstrates a paradigm shift, from a development-oriented approach to balanced approach between ‘development' and ‘preservation,’ in urban planning in Korea.
Use of Megaproject

As urban policymakers sought to use mega-projects to revitalize cities, urban regeneration projects have become a part of that (Altshuler and Luberoff, 2004). These three plans can be regarded as megaprojects, based on Altshuler and Luberoff’s definition of megaprojects as “large-scale government investments in physical facilities to revitalize cities and stimulate their economic growth” (Altshuler and Luberoff, 2004, p. 1-2). There are many kinds of urban regeneration programs, such as urban revitalization, restoration, redevelopment, renewal, and historic preservation. Among them, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project can be best categorized as an urban restoration project since it focuses on restoring an urban stream which was buried under a highway. Secondly, the Greenway project is a representative example of an urban redevelopment project since it involves massive demolition and rebuilding built environments to convert the deteriorated area. Lastly, the Remaking Sewoon Project is an example of historic preservation, emphasizing ‘restoration history' by preserving a building, which has been a symbol of the previous era, with a new vision for that old structure, rather than redeveloping it.

Reference to Other Policies

Planning ideas were varied over different eras, and they affect each other – from country to country, and city to city. However, it is essential to pick, adapt, and amend foreign planning ideas so that they work in the local context. Government officials and planners have often wanted to know about what has happened in other places to have an effective urban policy, which must be achievable with the available resources, in their jurisdictions. Planning is about making such choices, and the three plans examined for this research were affected by other policies from the beginning of the planning process.
For the Cheonggyecheon restoration project resembles Harbor drive in Portland in many ways. Harbor Drive opened in 1943 and was the original route of US 99W into downtown Portland from the south. By 1950s, Harbor Drive was the first freeway to be completed in Portland, and the only north-south freeway for over a decade (Walker, 2016), which is similar with the Cheonggye highway with the fact that it was one of the earliest highways built in Korea. However, by 1966, Harbor Drive became obsolete as other freeways were built connecting California to Washington borders. Although plans to build a greenway along the banks of the Willamette in downtown Portland have been raised from early twentieth century, an Oregon’s governor, Tom McCall proposed transforming the highway into open space in 1968, and the freeway was closed for transforming into a waterfront park in 1974 (Lloyd, 2014). Portland remains one of the best cities for river access thanks to this critical decision. In addition, in the history of American freeway's, Portland's Harbor Drive holds a landmark position as it was the first major highway in the history of U.S. to be intentionally removed (Lloyd, 2014), like Chenggyecheon restoration project was the first intentional highway removal project to convert it into a linear waterway public place in Korea.

For the case of the Greenway Project, the origin of the idea may trace back to Ebenezer Howard’s ‘Garden City’ concept. A diagram below (figure 24) shows his utopian alternative vision to the overcrowded and polluted industrial cities of the early twentieth century, and his solution included vast open space, with the aim of giving urban slum-dwellers the best of both city and country living.
More specifically, the Greenway Project reflects the concept of “Towers in the park,” one of the most noteworthy urban ideas of Le Corbusier. Le Corbusier’s vision for the towers in the park was proposed to fix the same problems of urban pollution and overcrowding as Howard sought to resolve. Unlike Howard, Le Corbusier envisioned building up, not out, by suggesting numerous high-rise buildings each surrounded by green space. Part of his Radiant City plan in 1933 to house three million inhabitants as a way to deal with overcrowding and slums, towers in the park were skyscrapers set in large, rectangular tracts of lands with open space between the buildings. This particular type of building configuration later reappeared in the design of massive public housing projects in the U.S., particularly in New York City, in the era of urban renewal.

Source: Howard, 1903, Chapter 13
Co-op City in the Baychester section of the Bronx is a massive example of the complex projects affected by Corbusier’s vision of towers in the park. As the most massive cooperative housing development in the world, Co-op City was completed in 1968 with the 320-acre complex including 35 high-rise buildings, and it is home to 15,372 residents (Shulz, 2014). Whether the SMG was consciously influenced by Le Corbusier or not in its planning stage for the Greenway Project, tower in the park vision, Co-op city in New York, and the Greenway Project in Seoul shared common features in terms of physical setting of the environment, such as high-rise buildings along with vast green spaces (Table 10).

Table 10. Comparison between Co-op City in NY and Greenway Project Plan in Seoul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-op City in Bronx, NY</th>
<th>Greenway Project Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Co-op City" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Greenway Project" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Shulz, 2014</td>
<td>Source: SMG, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, the Remaking Sewoon Project was planned by an adaptive reuse approach through the historic preservation of the existing urban landscape. There has been an emerging recognition on the need for preserving the historical fabric of Seoul by the
government officials and the public, as we could observe from the 2030 Seoul master plan that "Over the last four decades, Seoul has lost its historical image by implementing continuous large-scale redevelopment projects across the city. Given the competitive dignity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul as the capital of Korea, we need to preserve Seoul's traces instead of reckless redeployment, which will eventually contribute to strengthening Seoul's identity" (2030 Seoul master plan, 2013, p. 78).

As New York’s High Line project, transforming a stretch of the abandoned elevated railroad on New York's West Side into a linear park, have gained immense popularity, many other cities are looking at their long-disused sections of track, hoping they can replicate New York’s success. The High Line proves that a site-specific, adaptive reuse approach is a viable holistic alternative that embraces both change and continuity. Since the SMA was looking for an alternative for redevelopment, emphasizing a 600-year-long history of Seoul, this adaptive reuse approach taken by High Line project in New York appeared to be a sound model for urban regeneration plans in Seoul. First, this approach affects the construction of Seoullo 7017 project; a 1,024-meter-long elevated pedestrian walkway converted from the overpass that had served as a driveway for the last 45 years, and the influences on the SMG's planning vision for the Remaking Sewoon Project. While the Remaking Sewoon Project was about preserving an old residential-commercial complex and converting parts of the building into walking courses and public spaces, unlike High Line reusing railroad, both projects share a holistic approach that suggests how to transform historical urban landscape to meet contemporary needs.
Process and Public Participation

Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project

The Cheonggyecheon restoration project was implemented by the strongest central power, through a top-down approach throughout the policy-making process, and the SMG allowed the least room for public participation of the project among three plans. Also, the legacy of strong power of the developmental state was the most explicit for the Cheonggyecheon project. Undoubtedly, the project was done within the shortest time, 28 months only, by the strong central power. All these features converge on the strong leadership of Seoul mayor of that time, Myung-Bak Lee. He had a clear vision about the project, a justification to proceed that plan with concrete support from the public for historic restoration, and a strong power provided as a Seoul mayor in one of the developmental states. Based on this foundation, he has been known for his powerful leadership since he served as a CEO for one of the biggest corporations in Korea, Hyundai Construction Company. As a successful former businessman, he knew the completion of the Cheonggyecheon project would be marketable to citizens and other global cities. Most importantly, Lee wanted to complete this project within his mayoral term – between 2002 and 2006 – to utilize this vast achievement to prepare the presidential election in 2007.

Since he fixed the completion date from the beginning of the project, the SMG allowed little room for criticism and modifications of the project. To shorten the total construction period, the total working site was divided into three work districts, and construction period could be dramatically deducted, reducing the room for the other stakeholders’ participation and causing substantial controversy over the way to recover ecological and historical authenticity of the stream. The water flows for the restored
Cheonggyecheon was based on an artificial pumping system. While the natural water flow was the part of the restoration that was the most put forward by the SMG when promoting the project, the SMG changed the plan from natural stream restoration to using an artificial pumping system to circulate the water in the stream in a purpose to complete the project within before the deadline.

Also, the triangular governance system consisted of the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Research Corps, and the Citizens’ Committee, was organized to accomplish the project. The Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project Headquarter was, in fact, an institution operating bureaucratic power over the project process by the SMG, and the research center helped to justify the project, and advice from the Citizens’ Committee was rarely taken into consideration. This achievement was rendered possible by the active involvement of the SMG. In order to implement this project within such a short time frame, the municipality had to adopt a centralized decision-making process, thus reducing room for the participation of actors belonging to civil society.

*Greenway Project*

I argue that the Greenway Project demonstrates the transition from the highly centralized government to partially decentralized governance for urban policies in Seoul. Even though the Greenway Project was carried by a Public-Private-Partnership, as a form of networked governance, and attempted to allow the public to participated in the implication process, the authority's power was still critical throughout the policy-making process, and this partial decentralization of government occurs with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the state to the embedded dominance of the state.
The Greenway Project aimed to accomplish a megaproject by funding and operating by a partnership in which the financial risks of the public sector are to be reduced. Unlike the Choenggyecheon restoration project where the majority of the construction site, including the stream, was owned by the government, properties on the Sewoon district were mostly privately owned. Therefore, complicated interests among various stakeholders were one of the barriers for the Greenway Project. The residents and shop owners were forced to pay for the expenses for the redevelopment construction, while the SMG provides some subsidies for the creation of necessary infrastructure. Given the nature of complicated interests for the Greenway Project, the SMG had to negotiate with residents and merchants, allowing them to participate in the decision-making process for the plan.

However, the government’s power was still critical in the decision-making process. While property owners those are engaged with the Greenway Project sought to maximize their economic gain through an aggressive redevelopment plan, such as high-rise landmark construction, the SMG did not provide incentives for redevelopment nor relaxation on the maximum height of the buildings. Despite many other reasons for the failure of the Greenway Project, including the insufficient public financial resources and the complexity of various interests of stakeholders, weak leadership by the previous mayor of Seoul, Se-Hoon Oh, was an essential cause that led to the failure of the Greenway Project. He had a sort of ideal vision for this substantial urban greening project and he passed the responsibility for the construction of the plan to the local officials (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu), private construction company, and residents. That is why the Greenway Project had to stop in 2015, after seven years since it began in 2008. This case demonstrates that the strong leadership of the SMG matters regarding the realization of urban policies, where
the developmental state legacy is deeply embedded in the politico-economic structure in the nation.

*Remaking Sewoon Project*

Finally, the Remaking Sewoon Project allows for the public to be actively engaged in the decision-making process of the plan. As a current on-going project, this project manifests the rapid change of democratization and public engagement for urban policy occurring in Seoul. The remaking Sewoon Project itself was the result of a long participatory process, consisting of a series of workshops, citizen symposium, and personal meeting with the residents. The current Seoul mayor, Won-soon Park, had a clear vision about the Remaking Sewoon Project, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches, and actively accommodated residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. The SMG employed various programs to promote residents and merchants to be a part of building the project, such as the creation of Suri Cooperative Association (a cooperative union consisting of the Sewoon Living Lab and craftsmen in the various fields) and the operation of citizen & merchants school (a program providing places and funds to support learning activities about new entrepreneurship). It was to strengthen the existing small and medium business network and minimize the social conflicts for the relocation of existing workplaces and residences. Also, for the first time in the history of urban redevelopment planning, the SMG signed the Anti-Gentrification Cooperation Agreement in 2016 with the Sewoon Sangga's business sectors, putting community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents.

While the Cheonggyecheon restoration project was driven by a top-down approach without any room for public engagement and the Greenway Project was in the transition,
the Remaking Sewoon Project represents the paradigm shift in politics of urban policies from top-down to bottom-up, focusing social sustainability aspect over economic development along with the rapid democratization in Seoul.

*Project Outcomes*

*Cheonggyecheon Project*

Even though the approach taken by the SMG to proceed with the construction process was heavily criticized by many, regarding the authenticity of the stream restoration issue and civic organizations' and merchants' exclusion from the process, there were notable positive outcomes after the completion of the project. The most evident benefit was the creation of a linear park in the middle of downtown Seoul, providing a pleasant open space to Seoul citizens. After the completion of the project in 2005, the Cheonggyecheon became one of the most popular destinations in Seoul, increasing the pedestrian experience for residents and attracting more visitors to the area. Economic vitality was enhanced along with the refurbished built environment and increased tourists. Indeed, the urban environment was improved from before when an old highway covered the stream. In terms of a traffic issue, unexpectedly, reducing travel-lane capacity by highway removal resulted in a decrease in vehicle traffic and increased the use of public transportation (Chung, Hwang & Bae, 2012). In addition, some environmental quality enhancements were found after the project completion, such as reduced urban heat (Han & Huh, 2008; Kim & Song, 2015) and improved air quality (Hoe, 2016).

On the other hand, some negative impacts were found as well. Since the water flows for the restored Cheonggyecheon was based on an artificial pumping system, the pumping operation required a significant amount of expenses using Seoul's tax base. In
addition, the restoration affected existing shop owners and renters in the area. Many of renters were forced to relocate to the outskirts of Seoul without any compensation and shop owners who were doing traditional manufacturing businesses in the area for decades has been forced to be transformed to accommodate the post-industrial economy after the restoration. While some project advocates frame these results as economic development, more critics perceive them as clear negative signs of gentrification (Anderson, 2013; Ryu & Kwon, 2016).

Greenway Project

Since the Greenway Project – the first phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan – had to stop after demolishing only Hundae Sangga and the replacement of the greenway park on the site, the positive outcome of the project was increased open space and the adverse outcome was that the SMG ended up bearing the substantial financial cost, 69,000 million Korean Won (KW), which is equivalent to around 62 million dollars in the U.S., overruns than anticipated.

Remaking Sewoon Project

As the Remaking Sewoon Project – the second phase of the Sewoon Sangga regeneration plan – is only half finished so far, it is quite early to evaluate the consequences of the project yet. However, after its opening for the first half construction on September 18, 2017, economic activities are already increased primarily by the migration of young entrepreneurs to the refurbished Sewoon Sangga and more visitors and pedestrians have come to enjoy the rehabilitated Sewoon Sangga and public walking courses in Sewoon district. Also, a sense of community among the residents and business owners that reside in the Sewoon district is seen as enhanced through the community-led programs which
were a part of the planning of the project. On the other hand, negative consequences include a relatively old structure of the building and the limitations for green spaces by choosing to preserve the Sewoon Sangga building.

Cross-case Analysis Results Based on the Observable Implications for Assessing the Sustainability of the Plans

To develop the observable implications of the enhanced urban sustainability in a city, this study uses the framework ‘just sustainability,’ which is interpreted as meaning ‘the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems’ (Agyeman et al. 2003, p. 5). If the implementation of the urban sustainability plans in Seoul were effective in enhancing ‘just sustainability,’ we would expect to see democratic participation for the process of decision-making (Pierson, 2002) and fair access to city amenities, such as public open spaces and parks (Agyeman & Evans, 2003). Also, we look to have vibrant and pedestrian-friendly urban environment with the mixing of land uses (Katz et al., 1994) without a severe economic polarization by gentrification effects (Anguelovski, 2014; Checker, 2011). In addition, we can anticipate seeing preserved nature within cities, such as waterways and greenways (McHarg, 1967; Sprin, 1984; Steiner, 2012) and efforts to reduce the ecological footprint to support current ecosystems (Alberti et al., 2010).

Therefore, using this approach, a set of observable implications of progress on urban sustainability of the projects in Seoul include the following: (1) democratic participation for the process of decision-making; (2) providing fair access to city amenities;
(3) creating vibrant and active urban spaces; (4) prevention of gentrification effects; (5) reducing the ecological footprint; and (6) preservation of nature in a city.

Table 11 provides a series of observable implications that are used for assessing the sustainability of the plans in this research and summarizes each plan’s implication results by category provided above.

Table 11. Cross-case analysis results using observable implications for assessing the sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheonggyecheon restoration project</th>
<th>Greenway Project</th>
<th>Remaking Sewoon Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic participation for the process of decision-making</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing fair access to city amenities (park and square)</td>
<td>Positive (Access to a linear waterway park)</td>
<td>Positive (Access to parks on greenway)</td>
<td>Positive (Pedestrian-friendly squares and walking courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating vibrant and active urban spaces</td>
<td>Positive (Pedestrian-friendliness)</td>
<td>Positive (Pedestrian-friendliness)</td>
<td>Positive (Pedestrian-friendliness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of gentrification effects</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive (Anti-gentrification contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the ecological footprint</td>
<td>Positive (decrease in the temperature, increased public transit uses)</td>
<td>Positive (Compact built-environments and increased trees)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of nature in a city</td>
<td>Positive (waterway and trees)</td>
<td>Positive (Greenway)</td>
<td>Partially positive (Green roof)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Democratic participation

As it is already discussed in the process and public participation section in the previous section, the Chenggyecheon restoration project was implemented by the strongest central power, through a top-down approach throughout the policy-making process, and the SMG allowed the least room for public participation of the project among three plans. However, the Greenway Project demonstrates the transition from the highly centralized government to partially decentralized governance for urban policies in Seoul. While the Greenway Project was carried out by a Public-Private-Partnership and the government attempted to allow the public to participated in the implication process, the authority's power was still critical throughout the policy-making process. Then finally, the Remaking Sewoon Project allows the public actively engaged with the decision-making process of the plan, accommodating residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. Also, the SMG employed various programs to promote residents and merchants to be a part of building the project. Therefore, these three plans show a gradual evolution in terms of democratic participation in the decision-making process of urban sustainability plans in Seoul, from the public-exclusive and government-driven approach to the inclusive, participatory approach for the urban policies.

Access to city amenities and creating vibrant urban spaces

In the aspect of providing fair access to city amenities, such as parks and squares, all the three plans had positive effects. The Chenggyecheon restoration project created a linear waterway park, allowing the residents and visitors to access to the park in their daily life at the center of downtown Seoul. The Greenway Project could have given the residents access to many parks and public spaces on the newly created greenway if the project could
have completed as it is planned. The Remaking Sewoon Project also gave the citizens numerous access to the public amenities, such as Sewoon square, rooftop square, and the incorporated pedestrian networks into the Sewoon Sangga. On the extension of providing fair access to city amenities, the creations of public spaces, such as parks and squares, led to having positive effects of creating vibrant and active urban spaces for the three plans with the increased pedestrian-friendliness.

*Prevention of gentrification effects*

However, in terms of the consideration of preventing gentrification effects after the project completion, the Remaking Sewoon Project has a positive effect by signing the Anti-Gentrification Cooperation Agreement in 2016 with the Sewoon Sangga's business sectors, putting community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents. Besides the Sewoon Project, the consideration of gentrification effects after the project completion was out of the stream restoration project and the greenway project's interests. Indeed, the restoration project affected existing shop owners and renters in the area, causing the result that many of pre-existing traditional manufacturing businesses were replaced with the new service-sector businesses in the area.

*Preservation of nature in a city*

Regarding preserving nature in a city, the stream restoration project and the greenway project have positive effects by providing a waterway and a greenway in the center of the city respectively. While the Remaking Sewoon Project includes a greening aspect (Figure 25). However, greening the roof of the building does not provide a significant change concerning the preservation of nature in the city as much as the stream restoration plan, and the greenway plan does.
Even though at least two first plans seemingly had positive impacts in terms of preserving nature in the city, from the ecologist’s perspective, these results can be differently interpreted. As some criticized that the new Cheonggyecheon is a piece of artificiality and superficiality rather than genuine preservation of nature in the city (An, 2003; Kang, 2007), how much actual ecological effects by the preservation of the stream run by an artificial water circulation system we can get remain unanswered. This critique is applied to the Greenway Project as well. By itself, greening could serve as a necessary but not sufficient condition towards urban sustainability; at best, it could be a partial answer. To be fully functioned ecologically, the site needs to have a naturally fertile setup. Therefore, careful approaches are required when the policymakers and planners plan to implement urban greening policy. According to the Greenway Project planned by the SMG, the greenway is likely to be seemingly spectacular green spaces, without careful ecological approach towards creating a greenway in the middle of a compact city. Considering thetechnocratic-oriented approach for many urban sustainability plans in Seoul and the chronic shortage of parking spaces in downtown Seoul, the creation of ecological greenway is not a likely scenario even if the SMG could have continued the implementation of the Greenway Project.
Reducing the ecological footprint

For the purpose of reducing the ecological footprint, the Cheonggyecheon project demonstrated some positive impacts after the project implementation. Han and Hug (2008) found that the stream restoration had pulled down the daily mean temperature of the area by .31 Celsius degree between 2000 and 2010. Also, another study found that reducing travel-lane capacity by highway removal resulted in a decrease in vehicle traffic and increased the use of public transportation (Chung, Hwang & Bae, 2012). Even though the Greenway Project was not completed, a decrease in the ecological footprint is expected by the efficient energy uses from the compact built-environments and the increased number of trees in the region if the plan was realized. However, it is hard to expect noticeable changes in the ecological footprint after the completion of the Remaking Sewoon Project since it is based on the preservation of the old fabric of the city.

Cross-case Analysis Results for Growth Coalition

Table 12 summarizes the benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project, explaining whether there was a growth coalition formed for each project or not.
Table 12. Stakeholders’ benefits and costs by the implementation of each project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheonggyecheon restoration project</th>
<th>Greenway Project</th>
<th>Remaking Sewoon Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth coalition</strong></td>
<td>SMG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: Political support through the completion of the project</td>
<td>+: Political support through the completion of the project</td>
<td>+: Political support through the completion of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: enhanced city image as an eco-city</td>
<td>+: enhanced city image as an eco-city</td>
<td>+: public amenity (pedestrian-oriented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: Refurbish depressed Gangbuk area</td>
<td>+: Refurbish depressed Gangbuk area</td>
<td>+: Refurbish depressed Gangbuk area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: high financial burden</td>
<td>-: high financial burden</td>
<td>-: long decision-making process by active public engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: urban congestion</td>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td>-: economic vitality through regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td>+: increased tourists/ customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: economic vitality</td>
<td>+: economic vitality through redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: increased tourists/ customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: public amenity (green space)</td>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: complicated interests among various stakeholders</td>
<td>-: complicated interests among various stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>+: economic vitality</td>
<td>+: economic vitality through regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: increased tourists/ customers</td>
<td>+: increased tourists/ customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td>+: public amenity (pedestrian-oriented)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td>-: conflict with merchants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-: reduced economic gain than redevelopment project</td>
<td>-: long decision-making process by active public engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheonggyecheon restoration project</th>
<th>Greenway Project</th>
<th>Remaking Sewoon Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic organizations</td>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
<td>-: destroy the historic environment of Jongmyo Royal Shrine</td>
<td>+: public amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-: damaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-: ecological authenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-: exclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-: decision-making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>+: increased property value</td>
<td>+: increased property value through redevelopment</td>
<td>+: increased property value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>-: not enough compensation</td>
<td>-: not enough compensation</td>
<td>+: improvement of their business environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-: Alternative provided by the SMG was not successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>+: SMG’s agreement on Anti-gentrification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, the SMG has benefited from the Cheonggyecheon Project as an instrument to increase the competitiveness of Seoul as a global city with an enhanced city image and provide public spaces to citizens in densely populated Seoul, while the project requires a significant amount of fund, estimated to around 341.6 million dollars in the U.S. (Seoul solution, 2014), and severe conflicts with existing merchants were expected. Also, the leader of the SMG, Lee, had the most active political interest for the completion of the project among three plans. While local government (Jongro-gu) and residents those who were living around the stream could expect some economic gains by increased property values and economic vitality after the restoration, local units were substantially involved in the implementation of planning, but local governments did not have independent power to make regional development plans and were not significantly involved in making decisions regarding urban planning. The strong oppositions emerged from some civic organizations, arguing a gradual ecological and historical restoration project instead of urgent construction, and merchants those who were operating their businesses in the areas. A growth coalition among diverse stakeholders was not visibly formed around the Cheonggyecheon restoration project. Instead, the essential growth politics and drives were formed within the SMG, and the project was proceeded with a top-down approach, using the central government's intense power.

However, as the Greenway Project was a redevelopment plan through a public-private partnership, local governments (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu) and property owners could actively participate in the decision-making process and sought to maximize their profits by making this project more marketable. Since the SMG could benefit from the completion of the Greenway Project in many ways, such as improved city image with a greening project,
refurbishing the depressed Gangbuk area, and providing public green spaces to the city, there was a growth coalition among the SMG, local governments, and property owners in the project area. Also, there was a strong need for cooperation among them since the private sectors share the SMG's financial burden for this project. There were numerous barriers for the implementation of the Greenway Project, including opposition from ICOMOS to protect the Jongmyo Shrine, one of the UNESCO World Heritage sites in Korea located near to the project site, protests from the merchants in Sewoon Sangga, and complicated interests among various stakeholders. On top of these challenges facing the project, the SMG was overlooking the negotiation process among diverse stakeholders and was not cooperative with other stakeholders’ requests. Therefore, even though there was a growth coalition by stakeholders who share economic growth from the completion of the project, little engagement of the SMG to the decision-making process of the project led to the failure of the project.

The Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway project were more focused on economic revitalization through the greening process and redevelopment. On the other hand, the Remaking Sewoon Project's focus was concentrated around people, sense of community, and historic preservation and the SMG sought to have a balanced approach between development and preservation. From the SMG's perspective, previous redevelopment-oriented Greenway Project could be more beneficial in terms of economic growth. Therefore, the new vision provided by the new plan, Remaking Sewoon Project, manifests that the authority's focus has shifted from economic growth to social and cultural aspects. The SMG's efforts for a redistributive aspect of growth is well demonstrated through the authority’s agreement on Anti-gentrification. Since growth was not the SMG's
primary focus of the project, a growth coalition among various stakeholders was not formed. Instead, the focus was on just redistribution of growth and strengthening the self-sufficiency of the region through the project. Even though the current Seoul mayor's vision of people-oriented urban environment and his role was critical in the planning process for the Remaking Sewoon Project, the implementation of the plan represents the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea.

Discussions

*Growth Politics and Governance Around Urban Sustainability Policy*

These three cases in the cross-case analysis demonstrate a gradual evolution in the politics of urban sustainability policy in Korea since the early 2000s till 2018. The process and implementation of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project represent the centralized model of city-region governance in Korea. However, this centralized governance system has been challenged in the age of globalization. As we entered the 2000s, both the private sector and local governments began to demand the elimination or significant reduction of regulations governing land use and development in order to enhance the international competitiveness of Korean cities (Lee, 1998; Kim, 1999). In addition, citizens, who had been affected by various government land-related policies, began to demand that their property rights be restored. Also, deregulation was believed to be the solution for all the ills created by past government intervention (Kim, 1999). In this milieu of globalization, devolution, privatization, and democratization, new governance arrangements for the city-region evolved in South Korea, and the Greenway Project demonstrates that the SMG was affected by these forces. However, the SMG’s role in the implementation of the Greenway
Project was still critical with an embedded legacy of the developmental state. While the Remaking Sewoon Project represents the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea, Seoul mayor’s leadership towards the implementation of the plan was critical as well.

We acknowledge some similarities with recent politics and governance of the city-regions in North America, Europe and Asia, such as the involvement of the private sector in urban politics, the emergence of diverse actors involved and fragmentation in consensus building. However, unlike the experiences in the Western context, the combined effect of the institutional legacies of the Korean developmental state and democratization generated a growth coalition around the mayor rather than local business interests. As seen in the case of the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project, the newly elected mayors in Seoul by that time endeavored to develop the city through urban redevelopment projects. Local residents and local officials (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu) became strong advocates for the mayor's policy, yet their influence was limited. As a result, the growth coalition in Seoul was a mayor-centered coalition.

*Globalization and Sustainability Fix*

Also, as we have seen in the ‘global city' section in this Chapter, urban sustainability planning in Seoul is under the influence of the on-going force of globalization. The city policymakers' efforts to refurbish deteriorated areas and create new economic and real estate values from the old urban structure is a global trend, and Seoul is representative of this global trend. This globalization discourse was explicit in the case of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Greenway project. In particular, the City of Seoul actively uses the concept of sustainability to revitalize the mid-Seoul and sell a
positive image of Seoul as an ‘eco-city’ globally. These two cases demonstrate how the city of Seoul uses the urban sustainability plans as ‘sustainability fix,’ which is defined as “selective incorporation of environmental goals, determined by the balance or pressures for and against environmental policy within and across the city” (Jonas & Gibbs, 2004, p. 552) by Jonas & Gibbs.

The Cheonggyecheon restoration Project and the Greenway Project were neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable. Rather the plans were only focusing on their visual effects with the greening part. For example, the Cheonggyecheon restoration was realized through a technocratic-approach by using an artificial water pumping system to flow the water in the stream, which is hard to be seen as ecological restoration. On top of that, the stream restoration project completely ignored the social aspects of sustainability by allowing little room for public participation without any consideration of the gentrification effects after the project implementation. A balanced approach among economic, environmental, and social aspects of sustainability is needed to make a region truly sustainable. Therefore, promoting Seoul through a positive image by greenwashing process with a focus on economic revitalization without careful consideration on environmental and social impacts of urban sustainability plans demonstrates that these cases are representatives of the use of how the SMG use the ‘sustainability fix.’ It is common to see implementing urban policy with a technocratic approach in the developmental states with undemocratic planning process among Asian cities, like Seoul. Hence, these characteristics create the context where the use of urban sustainability plan as a ‘sustainability fix’ is likely to happen along with the globalization forces.
Just City Along with the Democratization in Korea

Korean society had a turning point in 1987 as the civil society went through the democratic transition. Rapid democratization since 1987 and the emergence of civic groups have affected urban sustainability policy pattern in Korea. While the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project can be regarded as examples of ambitious green and smart settlements, using the concept of sustainability with an enhance city image to pursue growth, the Remaking Sewoon Project finally put more emphasis on the social aspect of urban sustainability. The gentrification effect caused by the stream restoration project was regarded as one of the most negative impacts of the Choenggyecheon project. There have been criticisms by civil society on urban policy’s focus on development over residents’ quality of life in Seoul, which has not been reflected in urban policy yet. However, the Remaking Sewoon Project developed safeguards to actively prevent the adverse gentrification effects that can be caused by the implementation of the plan, reflecting the emerging recognition on the need for improving social sustainability. The plan also demonstrates that the paradigm shift from a development-oriented approach to historical preservation-oriented is occurring in Korea. As a whole, such changes observed from the Remaking Sewoon Project is seen as a current critical learning experience to make a sustainable and just city affected by rapid democratization occurring in Korea.

Applicability of Urban Theories Developed in the West to the East

While most of the dramatic urbanization is occurring in Asian countries, most urban theories have developed based on Western experiences. However, there has been little discussion about the applicability of urban theories and planning tools developed in the West to the East. As it is mentioned in the discussion for the Growth politics and
governance around urban sustainability policy, we could observe some similarities with the urban politics and governance of the city-regions that were studied from the Western context, such as the involvement of the private sector in urban politics, the emergence of diverse actors involved and fragmentation in consensus building. We observed dependency of local politics and the growing relevance of public-private partnerships along with a trend towards ‘entrepreneurial' politics as a form of global imperative resulting from place-bound economic competition and limited state capacities in Seoul as well. However, the actual form of these partnerships was fundamentally shaped by local conditions. Based on the case studies in this research, the combination of the institutional legacies of the Korean developmental state and democratization has generated a mayor-centered coalition with limited influences from the other stakeholders. This result is quite different from the growth machine theory that analyzes urban politics through a framework of local dependence that subordinates the state to the dominance of capital. Despite its useful explanatory power for urban revitalization in the Western context, conventional theories of urban growth machine have a limitation in terms of providing a theoretical framework useful for the case projects in this research. These differences are seen as results of the combined effects of many factors the urban dynamics in Seoul offer, such as the rapid industrialization, recent democratization, globalization, decentralization, and the legacy of state intervention and late policy development. Therefore, this case study offers an insight into the meaning that these socio-economic transformations are likely to have for the politics of urban sustainability policy in other Asian cities and calls on more studies based on non-western context examining to what extent urban theories developed from the West explain urban socio-economic phenomena occurring in other local contexts.
Conclusion

While rapidly industrializing economies and democratic transition in newly developing countries provide the most favorable circumstances where urban growth politics are likely to occur as the U.S. cities experienced, this analysis demonstrates the necessity of situating an analysis of the urban politics that result in its local context. Rapid industrialization, democratization, and post-industrialization on the one hand, and the legacies of state intervention and late policy development, on the other hand, have created conditions for growth politics in Seoul that remain distinct from those of earlier industrializers.

As a conclusion, developmental states like Korea with a centralized governance system tend to use a “sustainability fix” that is heavily focused on ‘pro-growth’ development. With globalization, privatization, and democratization, the growth machine politics around urban sustainability planning in Korea is similar to that observed in the Western context. However, in Seoul, the growth machine is heavily influenced by the federal government and Mayoral leadership. This is because of the embedded legacy of the developmental state. In addition, with increased democratization and a growing role of civic groups in urban politics, we see a move towards “just sustainability” in urban sustainability planning in Korea.
Lessons

Three urban plans provide both similar and different implementation lessons. In all the cases we find that a strong political leadership matters in Seoul and this would be likely to be true in other developmental state countries in East Asia, such as Japan, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore. For the Cheonggyecheon restoration project, the transformation was possible when the SMG shifted its focuses from providing roads to demolishing them. In other words, the visionary goal of Seoul mayor, Myung-Bak Lee, in creating a pedestrian-oriented city than for cars were the keys to transformations. Also, for the Remaking Sewoon Project, Seoul mayor’s visionary goal, in preserving historic urban fabrics than demolishing them for redevelopments with an adaptive reuse approach was the key to implementation of the plan. Even though Seoul mayors for these two plans had different political backgrounds, conservative and progressive, their strong leadership was critical in implementing the plans. However, the weak political leadership of Se-Hoon Oh, mayor of the time for the Greenway Project, was one of the primary reasons for the failure of the Greenway Project.

Considering the strong power given to the mayor of Seoul in the developmental state, it is critical who becomes a mayor, what kinds of visionary goals he or she has for a city and operation ways that will be taken by him or her. Despite significant many positive impacts the Cheonggyecheon restoration brought, the SMG failed to restore the stream ecologically in a long-term, and the project lacked public consultation, neglecting the historic features of the area because the mayor of that time pushed the project to complete it within a short time mainly for his political calculation. Based on this result, on the one hand, we can regard that strong leadership of mayor can be beneficial in terms of efficient
implementation of urban policy on the one hand. However, on the other hand, the consequences can be dangerous depending on the mayor's political drives for urban policy implementation.

As a way to prevent this negative consequence of the strong power given to Seoul mayor, an interviewee provides his opinion in dealing with this issue as follow:

As a politician, Seoul mayor’s urban strategy and policy will be varied depending on their political background and their visions. For example, Myung-Bak Lee was a conservative mayor with a businessman career background. Thus, his policy strategy was more advocating economic growth, favoring vested interests. On the other hand, Won-soon Park, as a progressive mayor, had a background in grass-roots movement. His focus concentrated on public engagement and self-government. Regardless of their background, the most important thing is the citizen should discern if urban policies they suggest are meant to improve quality of life of the citizen and urban environment of Seoul, or they are to achieve their political interests. Based on the awareness of their intention for urban policy, a citizen should use their voting power and raise their voices. (Interviewee 13, June 21, 2017)

As the interviewee emphasizes above, citizen's keen attention to the city mayor's urban policy plan is required to make these mayor-centered urban politics functions effectively. Also, a citizen should keep monitoring how urban policies are proceeded and participate in the decision-making process of plans. In addition, citizen's different perspective on urban environment is required to make a city more sustainable. In particular, Seoul citizens have appreciated the value of the real estate in the urban context as a tool for investment maximizing their assets. Since urban policy is directly associated with their property in Seoul, strategies for urban policy raised by politicians were more development-oriented. Instead of seeing urban fabric as a tool for investment, notion on that various layers are laid over urban setting, including social, historical, and cultural ones, as well as economic layer, needs to be understood. An interviewee emphasized that "we need to
realize that a city is a home to us before we see it as an economic asset. We should have more active ownership for our city and care for the city. There are many important values, such as the sense of community and history, we need to keep within the city. (Interviewee 14, July 23, 2017)” As he argued, more various appreciations over a city, besides economic growth, with a long-term view is required to make a city more sustainable. When citizens appreciate a city this way, urban politics will follow, in which politicians, including mayors, need to meet citizens desires in a democratic society eventually.

The Cheonggyechon case gives to other Asian countries a successful example of how to use restoration as an instrument of urban development, especially for developing countries. Indeed, experiences from Choeonggycheon case reveal the benefits of reintroducing waterways to urban environments. Today, more than ten years since the restoration of the stream was completed, a significant number of people are still visiting the stream. The fact that the vast majority of these visitors are residents, rather than tourists, suggests that the stream meets a local need, rather than merely attracting international attention. The reintroduction of the stream also forced traffic to be rerouted, discouraging car use in the downtown and increasing bus ridership by 15 percent within the first five years alone (Chung, Hwang & Bae, 2012). This shift in transportation habits has had positive impacts on air quality and public health. The stream has increased biodiversity in the city and reducing the urban heat island effect (Han & Huh, 2008; Kim & Song, 2015).

The successful implementation of this project and the excitement it has created for Seoul citizen and members of the international community has provided an incentive for similar projects in Korea and elsewhere in the world. Numerous stream restoration projects that mimic the success of the Cheonggycheon project are already replicated in other cities
in Korea. In addition, many other cities, such as Shanghai, Tokyo, and Los Angeles, have expressed their interests in planning a similar restoration in their cities (Society for Ecological Restoration, 2018).

Even though the Cheonggyecheon project was useful in terms of urban development, the long-term consequences of the stream restoration offer other sets of lessons in the implementation of public spaces in dense, urban areas. As it is discussed in the previous section for project outcomes, from an environmental perspective, the stream is only a partial victory because it was not an ecological restoration. Socially, the project lacked public consultation and was instead pushed through by the mayor, intent on reinforcing his legacy before entering national politics. The restoration also neglects the historic features of the area. These all negative long-term consequences were caused by fixed short-term construction period, reducing rooms for considerations of these issues. Therefore, these negative consequences provide insight to other cities that a more careful approach, addressing other environmental and social issues, is needed along with a long-term plan to make the restoration project implementation more sustainable.

The Remaking Sewoon Project case gives to Asian countries an excellent example of how to regenerate a region with old structures through an adaptive reuse approach, taking account of social justice. Despite the long history of Asian countries, demolishing old structures and rebuilding has been a typical developmental pattern found in many Asian countries after industrialization. Therefore, there has been more focus on ‘development' over ‘preservation' across Asian countries. Also, as numerous countries around the world, including Korea, experienced ‘third wave' of international democratization during the 1980s and 1990s (Huntington, 1993), social consequences that urban development causes
were demanded to consider. In this sense, the Remaking Sewoon Project is a good case respecting the historic urban fabric of a city, maintaining existing urban industries and communities, reducing the excessive burden of redevelopment on residents, and creating a more pedestrian-friendly city. In addition, this case calls our attention to the notion that bottom-up and small-scale urban regeneration based on citizens’ affection on their communities and better understanding on sustainable cities could facilitate longer-term changes, revitalizing the district while maintaining its cultural and historical identity. Such an incremental change of the community's social and environmental quality could be seen as a new and critical learning experience for all the other Asian cities.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This research analyzed the dynamics of urban politics of two urban sustainability projects and their impacts in Korea, using a series of observable implications and a cross-case analysis to answer the following question: what were the dynamics of urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of urban sustainability megaprojects in Seoul and how effective were the megaprojects in promoting ‘just sustainability’? Seoul is a useful case study to examine urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of sustainability policies paying attention to how growth coalition and discourses have formed around the decision-making process of sustainability plans and to critically examine how sustainable the plans that are implemented based on this urban politics are. The reason why Seoul is a useful case study is that of its context of characteristics of late yet rapid industrialization, recent decentralization, and democratization on the one hand, and the legacy of strong state intervention and late policy development on the other hand. While the ongoing forces of globalization and democratization have been affecting internationally, these conditions have created a local context for urban planning and implementations of sustainability policies in Korea that differs from the Western countries where most of the urban planning theories have developed. Therefore, it is beneficial to examine how the globalization has affected the growth politics around the urban sustainability planning in this local context of a representative Asian city, Seoul, to build up a variation of that growth politics that has proven in the Western context. Also, as there has been an emerging body of literature on
the just sustainability, the influences of the democratization on the decision-making process and the effects of urban sustainability plans in the context of Seoul, where rapid democratization is occurring, is worthy to gain an attention to both the Western cities and the other Asian cities.

For the case studies, two urban sustainability projects, the Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project and the Remaking Sewoon Project were chosen for this study. The restoration of Cheonggyecheon, began in 2003 and completed in 2005, was sensational in the history of urban development in Korea, turning a historic stream covered by a deteriorating highway into an environmentally-friendly and pedestrian-oriented public waterfront through restoration (O'Byrne et al., 2014). Influenced by the current forces of combining sustainable development and urban regeneration and addressing city branding for global competition, the restoration of Chenggyecheon has sought to combine the recovery of the natural environment and historic preservation with a rehabilitation of the urban economy. On the other hand, the Remaking Sewoon Project in 2015 is an adaptive-reuse project, preserving an old symbolic structure - the first multi-purpose commercial-residential complexes built in 1968 - instead of demolishing it, to improve walkability, connect communities and nurture creative growth in downtown Seoul. The case study projects were chosen considering the representativeness and contrasting features. Both projects shared many common goals, such as revitalizing depressed areas in downtown Seoul through an urban regeneration project, historical recovery, providing pedestrian-oriented public spaces, and enhancing the competitiveness of Seoul as a global city. Also, both projects were implemented by the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG).
However, they are different from each other in many ways. First, two leaders for both projects, previous Mayor of Seoul (Myung-Bak Lee) and the current Mayor of Seoul (Won-Soon Park), had the different political background, conservative and progressive respectively, causing them to have different visions toward urban sustainability plans. Second, the Cheonggyecheon Project was completed through the demolition of an urban fabric of Seoul from the industrialization era in Korea while the Remaking Sewoon Project decided to preserve a symbolic megastructure of the same period to regenerate the areas. Third, the restoration project was an outcome-oriented project, through a top-down approach to complete the construction within a fixed timeline, ignoring criticism and the civil society’s voices for the project. On the other hand, the Remaking Sewoon Project was a process-oriented project, emphasizing public participation to the project development with a focus on community development than changing physical environments. Therefore, these similar and different characteristics between two urban sustainability plans offer essential sources to explain the unique characteristics of the urban politics around sustainability plans in Seoul and how urban sustainability is evolving and changing in Seoul along with the social changes of rapid democratization and globalization.

The case studies for this study are conducted based on a mixed-method approach that includes process-driven qualitative analysis and outcome-driven quantitative analysis (Bryman, 2008). As a primary data collection method, the in-depth interviews were performed with 33 key participants in the study cases. Also, other data were collected from both qualitative and quantitative sources, such as relevant planning documents, statistical reports, and media publications. The study cases are analyzed and compared based on the employed categories explaining the main characteristics of the case projects. In addition, a
series of observable implications to assess plans' impacts on sustainability are developed, and the study cases are evaluated based on the developed implications. The benefits and costs for each stakeholder by the implementation of each project were compared to examine the growth coalition patterns around the planning process. This chapter summarizes the conclusion of the research and highlights the contributions this study makes and indicate some limitations of the study with the need for future study.

The Main Conclusion of the Research Questions

This section responds to the initial research questions using the evidence collected and analyzed in this study.

The Main Conclusion on the Central Research Question

The following summarizes the main findings of this research to answer the central research question: what were the dynamics of urban politics around the decision-making process and the implementation of urban sustainability megaprojects in Seoul and how effective were the megaprojects in promoting ‘just sustainability’?

This study found that the forces of globalization, democratization, and the Mayor-centered coalition have been the most critical factors for the urban politics around urban sustainability planning in Seoul after the 2000s, based on the two urban sustainability plans examined in this research. For the Cheonggyecheon restoration project case in 2003, the city of Seoul actively uses the concept of sustainability to revitalize the mid-Seoul and appeal a positive image of Seoul as an ‘eco-city’ globally. Also, the mayor of Seoul at that time, Myung-Bak Lee had a strong political drive to complete the project within his mayoral term. Therefore, this combined effects by the city authority’s aim to enhance the
competitiveness of the city as a global city with an ‘eco-friendly’ image and the Mayor’s strong power with a legacy of developmental state led to the creation of a drive for the implementation of the project. However, the completed project was neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable as the plan claimed in the beginning because the Cheonggyecheon restoration was realized through a technocratic-approach by using an artificial water pumping system to flow the water in the stream and the project ignored the social aspects of sustainability by allowing little room for public participation without any consideration of the gentrification effects after the project implementation. The concept of sustainability was actively used to promote the project and the city of Seoul globally. Therefore, the combined effects of the mayor-centered coalition and the force of the globalization acted as critical drives to implement the Cheonggyecheon restoration project in Seoul. This case study gives us an essential implication lesson that when the implementation of a sustainability plan is used as a sustainability fix in the developmental states with the centralized governance system, the plan’s implementation results are likely to be detrimental in promoting ‘just sustainability’ with a heavy focus on ‘pro-growth.’

However, for the Remaking Sewoon Project in 2015, the combined effects of a mayor-centered coalition and the force of rapid democratization have formed the dominant force for the decision-making process and the implementation of the project. The initial Sewoon Sangga regeneration project had a drastic change of the plan from creating a greenway by demolishing the old urban structure of downtown Seoul (Greenway Project) to an adaptive-reuse project (Remaking Sewoon Project), preserving an old symbolic structure of demolishing it, to improve walkability and connect communities in downtown Seoul. This change of the plan rendered under the strong leadership of the current Mayor
of Seoul, Won-Soon Park, with his clear vision about urban sustainability, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches. While the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project (first phase of the Sewoon Project) more focused on economic revitalization through the greening process and redevelopment, the Remaking Sewoon Project's focus was concentrated around people, sense of community, and historic preservation. This drastic change implies many meanings of the urban dynamics of Seoul, such as more focus on social aspects over economic growth, a paradigm shift from redevelopment-oriented to a balanced approach between development and preservation. These results represent that the recent democratization is becoming more influential in urban sustainability planning in Korea. Therefore, this research found that the vision of the Mayor of Seoul has been critical in the decision-making process and the implementation of the urban sustainability plans in Seoul. While the ‘pro-growth’ discourse affected by the globalization force was critical in the early 2000s in the urban politics around sustainability planning in Seoul, the urban dynamics around sustainability planning is in a transition towards a just city with the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea.

_Plan’s effectiveness in promoting ‘just sustainability’_

To develop the observable implications of the enhanced urban sustainability in a city, this study used the framework ‘just sustainability,’ which is interpreted as meaning ‘the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems’ (Agyeman et al. 2003, p. 5). Using this approach, the effectiveness of the plan in promoting ‘just sustainability’ was evaluated according to following implications: (1) democratic
participation for the process of decision-making; (2) providing fair access to city amenities; (3) creating vibrant and active urban spaces; (4) prevention of gentrification effects; (5) reducing the ecological footprint; and (6) preservation of nature in a city.

First, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project had positive effects in providing fair access to city amenities with vibrant urban spaces, by creating a linear waterway park, allowing the residents and visitors to access to the park in their daily life at the center of downtown Seoul. The stream restoration project seemingly had some positive impacts in terms of reducing the ecological footprint, with an incidence of the decrease in the daily mean temperature of the area by .31 Celsius degree between 2000 and 2010, and in terms of preserving nature in a city by providing a waterway in the center of the city. However, these results can be differently interpreted from the ecologist’s perspective. As some criticized that the new Cheonggyecheon is a piece of artificiality and superficiality rather than genuine preservation of nature in the city (An, 2003; Kang, 2007), how much actual ecological effects by the preservation of the stream run by an artificial water circulation system we can get remain unanswered. For the public engagement, the restoration project was implemented by the strongest central power, through a top-down approach throughout the policy-making process, and the SMG allowed the least room for public participation of the project among three plans.

Second, the Greenway Project demonstrates the transition from the highly centralized government to partially decentralized governance for urban policies in Seoul. While the Greenway Project was carried by a Public-Private-Partnership and the government attempted to allow the public to participated in the implication process, the authority's power was still critical throughout the policy-making process. The Greenway
Project could have given the residents access to many parks and public spaces on the newly created greenway if the project could have completed as it is planned. However, its ecological effects by creating a greenway are uncertain. By itself, greening could serve as a necessary but not sufficient condition towards urban sustainability; at best, it could only afford a partial answer. To be fully functioned ecologically, the site needs to have a naturally fertile setup with a particular scale. However, according to the Greenway Project planned by the SMG, the greenway is likely to be seemingly spectacular green spaces, without careful ecological approach about creating a greenway in the middle of a compact city even if the SMG could have continued the implementation of the Greenway Project.

Lastly, the Remaking Sewoon Project had the least ecological effects in reducing the ecological footprint and preserving nature in a city since the project did not imply greening parts as the other two plans had. However, the project had the most significant effects in terms of the social aspect of sustainability among the three plans. The project gave the citizens numerous accesses to the public amenities, such as Sewoon square, rooftop square, and the incorporated pedestrian networks into the Sewoon Sangga. Also, the Remaking Sewoon Project allowed the public actively engaged with the decision-making process of the plan, accommodating residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. Also, the SMG employed various programs to promote residents and merchants to be a part of building the project. In addition, in terms of the consideration of preventing gentrification effects after the project completion, the Remaking Sewoon Project only shown the positive effects by signing the Anti-Gentrification Cooperation Agreement in 2016 with the Sewoon Sangga's business sectors, putting community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents. The
changes observed from the Remaking Sewoon Project reflect the emerging recognition on the need for improving social sustainability in the urban sustainability planning in Seoul.

As a whole, the three plans examined in this research show a gradual evolution in terms of promoting just sustainability for the decision-making process and the implementation of urban sustainability plans in Seoul, from the public-exclusive and government-driven approach to the inclusive, participatory approach for the urban policies. While the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project more focused on economic revitalization through the greening process and redevelopment, the Remaking Sewoon Project's focus was concentrated around people, sense of community, and historic preservation and the authority sought to have a balanced approach between development and preservation. Therefore, the planning process and the implement of the Remaking Sewoon Project is regarded as a pivotal project, reflecting the emerging recognition on the need for improving social sustainability in the urban sustainability planning in Seoul and the paradigm shift from a development-oriented approach to historical preservation-oriented is occurring in Korea. Such changes observed from the Remaking Sewoon Project is seen as a current critical learning experience to make a sustainable and just city affected by rapid democratization occurring in Korea.
The Main Conclusions on the Sub-research Questions

The followings summarize what this study does say about the urban politics around urban sustainability planning in Seoul and the effectiveness of their sustainability plans by answering initial sub-questions for this research.

1. What visions and goals of the sustainability planning were reflected in the case sustainability projects in Seoul?

For both projects, the visions about urban sustainability the Mayor of Seoul of that time had was the most critical factor. In the case of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project, the visionary goal of Seoul mayor, Myung-Bak Lee, in creating a pedestrian-oriented city than for cars were the keys to transformations. Therefore, his vision has realized by demolishing the old highway over the Chenggyecheon and by restoring the historical stream in Seoul. On the other hand, for the Remaking Sewoon Project, the current Seoul mayor’s visionary goal, in preserving historic urban fabrics than demolishing them for redevelopments with an adaptive reuse approach was the key to implementation of the plan. The current Seoul mayor, Won-soon Park, had a clear vision about the Remaking Sewoon Project, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches, and actively accommodated residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. While the Cheonggyecheon project and the Greenway Project (first phase of the Sewoon Project) more focused on economic revitalization through the greening process and redevelopment, the Remaking Sewoon Project's focus was concentrated around people, sense of community, and historic preservation and the SMG sought to have a balanced approach between development and preservation. Therefore, the vision provided by the
plan for the Remaking Sewoon Project manifests that the authority's focus has shifted from economic growth to social and cultural aspects.

Even though the Mayors of Seoul for these two plans had different political backgrounds, conservative and progressive, their strong leadership were critical in implementing the plans. Considering the strong power given to the mayor of Seoul in the developmental states, as it is found that urban politics in Seoul is mayor-centered in the previous section, it is critical who becomes a mayor, what kinds of visionary goals he or she has for a city and operation ways that will be taken by him or her. Despite the Mayor’s critical role in translating the vision into actions of sustainability planning in Seoul, who becomes a Mayor of Seoul is determined by the citizens of Seoul. In other words, Seoul citizen’s desires and concerns are reflected in the implementations of urban policy in Seoul. For example, Myung-Bak Lee suggested the Cheonggyecheon restoration as a significant public pledge for the city mayoral election in 2002 and the project emerged as a hot issue for debate among the candidates running for the city mayoral election slated for May 2002. During the run-up period, Myung-Bak Lee expressed the will to restore the Cheonggyecheon Stream strongly whereas his rival Min Seok Kim took a somewhat cautious approach to the project. As a result, Myung-Bak Lee was elected mayor of Seoul on May 31, 2002 and set about executing the project as quickly as possible. Also, it is evident that the Park’s vision on the preservation of historic urban structure instead of reckless development was critical for the direction change of the Sewoon project. However, the fact that he is in his third-term of mayor-ship in Seoul means Seoul citizens support his vision. Also, the Remaking Sewoon Sangga Project itself was the result of a long participatory process, consisting of a series of workshops, citizen symposium, and personal
meeting with the residents. Therefore, the planning and the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project demonstrates a paradigm shift, from a development-oriented approach to balanced approach between ‘development' and ‘preservation,’ and the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea.

2. What are the driving forces affecting the decision-making process for urban sustainability planning in Seoul?

First, one of the dominant forces affecting the urban sustainability planning in Seoul was that the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) has been conscious about making Seoul as a global city through numerous urban sustainability plans in Seoul, including the three plans (Cheoggyecheon project, Greenway project, and Remaking Sewoon project) examined in this study. In other words, the on-going process of globalization is one of the essential discourses around the decision-making process for urban sustainability planning in Korea. The city policymakers' efforts to refurbish deteriorated areas and create new economic and real estate values from the old urban structure is a global trend, and Seoul is a representative of this global trend. This globalization discourse was explicit in the case of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Greenway project. In particular, the city of Seoul actively uses the concept of sustainability to revitalize the mid-Seoul and sell a positive image of Seoul as an ‘eco-city’ globally. These two cases manifest themselves how the city of Seoul uses the urban sustainability plans as ‘sustainability fix,’ which is defined as “selective incorporation of environmental goals, determined by the balance or pressures for and against environmental policy within and across the city” (Jonas & Gibbs, 2004, p. 552) by Jonas & Gibbs. While the approaches to promote Seoul as a global city taken for the first two cases and the last
case were varied, globalization is an inevitable force not only other global cities but also Seoul.

Second, another dominant force around the urban sustainability planning in Seoul is the embedded legacy of the developmental state for the decision-making process of urban policy. The Chenggyecheon restoration project was implemented by the strongest central power, through a top-down approach throughout the policy-making process, and the SMG allowed the least room for public participation of the project among three plans. Also, the legacy of strong power of the developmental state was the most explicit for the Cheonggyecheon project. Even though the Greenway Project was carried by a Public-Private-Partnership, as a form of networked governance, the authority's power was still critical throughout the policy-making process, and this partial decentralization of government occurs with the transition for explicit control of urban development by the state to the embedded dominance of the state. For the case of the Remaking Sewoon Project, while the Mayor of Seoul, Won-soon Park, took a bottom-up approach to develop and implement the plan, his strong leadership was critical for the implementation of the project. He had a clear vision about the Remaking Sewoon Project and actively accommodated residents’ opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan.

Third, one of the vital forces affecting the decision-making process for the plans was the authority's effort to reinforce the identity of a 600-year-long history of Seoul by place-based historical recovery projects in old downtown in Seoul. Both case projects were located at the historical center of Seoul. It is noteworthy that the SMG took historical recovery as a strategy to revitalize the depressed areas in Seoul. As city policymakers
sought to use cultural policy as a strategy of urban regeneration, the use of the historic environment as a part of place-making and city-image initiatives has become increasingly evident (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Pendlebury et al., 2004). The reason why cultural, historical recovery or conservation has become a tool for urban regeneration is because cultural heritage is often considered as an essential resource that differentiates a city from others by giving unique character and identity to it. Also, historic restoration projects give an impression of improving urban environmental quality. Thus, the government officials and planners can take advantages of the expectations of people those prefer cultural environments to live and visit. The use of historical recovery as a place-making tool for urban regeneration has become evident among many cities, and Seoul is a representative of this global trend. Even though these three plans sought to recover history through the implementations of the plans, the specific ways taken for recovery process were different. Both the Cheonggye highway and the Sewoon Sangga were built in the 1960s for the purpose of industrialization in Korea. These two symbolic representations of the industrialization and modernization in Korea have become decline causes of the urban environment of oldtown in Seoul with their old structures. While first two plans decided to demolish these old concrete monuments of the industrialization era and refurbish the areas by ‘greening’ process, the last plan took a different remedy to rehabilitate the depressed Sewoon area through preservation. This dramatic change for the regeneration plan, from redevelopment by demolishing the old structures to regeneration through preserving them, implies a significant meaning in terms of a discourse change in urban planning dynamics in Korea, from ‘redevelopment’-oriented to ‘preservation’-oriented approach.
Lastly, rapid democratization occurring in Korea was one of the dominant forces affecting the decision-making process for urban sustainability planning in Seoul. This force has become significant through the implementation of the latest case project for this research, Remaking Sewoon Project. While the Cheonggyecheon restoration project was driven by a top-down approach without any room for public engagement and the Greenway Project was in the transition, the Remaking Sewoon Project finally allows the public actively engaged with the decision-making process of the plan with a bottom-up approach for the project. The remaking Sewoon Project itself was the result of a long participatory process, consisting of a series of workshops, citizen symposium, and personal meeting with the residents. The current Seoul mayor, Won-soon Park, had a clear vision about the Remaking Sewoon Project, with citizen- and community-oriented approaches, and actively accommodated residents' opinions for the future of their neighborhoods in developing the plan. Also, for the first time in the history of urban redevelopment planning, the SMG signed the Anti-Gentrification Cooperation Agreement in 2016 with the Sewoon Sangga's business sectors, putting community-led measures in place to empower tenants against rising rents. Therefore, the Remaking Sewoon Project represents the paradigm shift in politics of urban policies from top-down to bottom-up, focusing social sustainability aspect over economic development affected by the rapid democratization occurring in Korea.

3. Was the implementation of the urban sustainability plan used as a ‘Sustainability fix’ to promote the City of Seoul as a global city?

Urban sustainability planning in Seoul is under the significant influence of the force of globalization. This globalization discourse was explicit in the case of the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Greenway project. It is because these urban
sustainability plans were neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable as their plans claimed. Preferably, the plans were only focusing on their visual effects with the greening part. For example, the Cheonggyecheon restoration was realized through a technocratic-approach by using an artificial water pumping system to flow the water in the stream, which is hard to be seen as ecological restoration. On top of that, the stream restoration project completely ignored the social aspects of sustainability by allowing little room for public participation without any consideration of the gentrification effects after the project implementation. A balanced approach among economic, environmental, and social aspects of sustainability is needed to make a region truly sustainable. Therefore, promoting Seoul through a positive image by greenwashing process with a focus on economic revitalization without careful consideration on environmental and social impacts of urban sustainability plans demonstrates that these cases are representatives of how the SMG uses sustainability plans as a ‘sustainability fix.’ It is common to see implementing urban policy with a technocratic approach in the developmental states with undemocratic planning process among Asian cities, like Seoul. Hence, these characteristics create the context where the use of urban sustainability plan as a ‘sustainability fix’ is likely to happen along with the globalization forces. Therefore, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Greenway project manifest themselves as examples of the use of urban sustainability plans as a ‘sustainability fix.’ However, the authority did not attempt to use the same approach to the implementation of the Remaking Sewoon Project, focusing on social consequences over economic development.
4. Are there growth coalitions among various stakeholders in the planning processes of urban greening projects in Seoul? How do they differ or similar to the ones in the US cities?

There were specific groups of stakeholders who shared a common interest, economic growth, by all the urban sustainability plans examined in this research: central government, local governments, and local property owners. However, the decision-making process for the case projects was mainly driven by the city of Seoul, and other stakeholders who shared a growth gain advocated the project with limited influences over the planning process. In other words, it was a mayor-centered coalition, rather than the typical growth coalitions emerged in the US cities’ experiences.

Unlike the Cheonggyecheon restoration project and the Remaking Sewoon Project driven by the central government from the beginning to the implementation, The Greenway Project created a politico-economic environment where a growth coalition is likely to happen the most since it was a redevelopment plan through a public-private partnership. The local governments (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu) and property owners could actively participate in the decision-making process and sought to maximize their profits by making this project more marketable. During the planning process, both the private sector and local governments (Jung-gu and Jongro-gu) demanded the elimination or significant reduction of regulations governing land use and development in order to maximize their profits. The Greenway Project demonstrates that the SMG was affected by the forces of globalization, devolution, and privatization, with new governance arrangements for the city-region. However, the SMG’s role for the implementation of the Greenway Project was still critical with an embedded legacy of the developmental state. The mayor of Seoul of that time, Se-
Hoon Oh, did not have a strong drive to complete the Greenway Project, and his weak leadership contributed to the failure of the project despite a growth coalition emerged among economic elites for the project.

There are some similarities with the urban politics of cities in North America, Europe and Asia, such as the involvement of the private sector in urban politics, the emergence of diverse actors involved and fragmentation in consensus building. However, unlike the experiences in the western context, the combined effect of the institutional legacies of the Korean developmental state and globalization has generated growth coalitions around the mayor rather than local business interests. Despite its useful explanatory power for urban revitalization in the Western context, conventional theories of urban growth machine have a limitation in terms of providing a theoretical framework useful for the case projects in this research.

The Contribution of the Dissertation

This study contributes in many ways to the literature in the field of urban sustainability planning. Selected contributions are presented and classified under their respective sub-section, with a particular emphasis on urban sustainability and the politics of urban planning.

Growth Machine Theory

While the most dramatic urban growth is occurring in Asia (Demographia, 2013), urban planning concepts that have developed from US and European experiences have been applied to the Asian cities (Yokohari et al., 2000; Roy & Ong, 2011), and little study is done exploring the generalization of Western theories in the Asian context. In particular,
this study examined whether a pro-growth coalition (Logan and Molotch, 1987), which has been prevailed in urban politics in the Western context, is applicable in the Korean context or not. How the balance of state powers and competencies, pressures and incentives variously enable and constrain urban environmental policies in different national-urban contexts is critical.

This research found some similarities with the urban politics and governance of the city-regions that were studied from the Western context, such as the involvement of the private sector in urban politics, the emergence of diverse actors involved and fragmentation in consensus building. We also observed dependency of local politics and the growing relevance of public-private partnerships along with a trend towards ‘entrepreneurial’ politics as a form of global imperative resulting from place-bound economic competition and limited state capacities in Seoul as well. However, the actual form of these partnerships was fundamentally shaped by local conditions. Based on the case studies in this research, the combination of the institutional legacies of the Korean developmental state and democratization has generated a mayor-centered coalition with limited influences from the other stakeholders. This result is different from the growth machine theory that analyzes urban politics through a framework of local dependence that subordinates the state to the dominance of capital. Despite its useful explanatory power for urban revitalization in the Western context, conventional theories of urban growth machine have a limitation in terms of providing a theoretical framework useful for the case projects in this research. These differences are seen as results of the combined effects of many factors the urban dynamics in Seoul offer, such as the rapid industrialization, recent democratization, globalization, decentralization, and the legacy of state intervention and late policy development.
Therefore, this case study contributes to the development of the urban theory of ‘Growth machine’ (Logan and Molotch, 1987) by situating the growth machine theory in the local context of Seoul, characterized as a rare case of recent rapid socio-economic transformations with the legacy of a developmental state (Bae and Sellers, 2007), to analyze how growth coalitions have formed around urban sustainability planning in Seoul and how the coalitions were differ or similar with the growth models experienced in the US cities. This case study offers an insight into the meaning that these socio-economic transformations are likely to have for the politics of urban sustainability policy in other Asian cities and calls on more studies based on non-western context examining to what extent urban theories developed from the West explain urban socio-economic phenomena occurring in other local contexts.

*Sustainability Fix*

This study contributes to the literature on the use of urban sustainability plans as ‘sustainability fix,’ which is defined as “selective incorporation of environmental goals, determined by the balance or pressures for and against environmental policy within and across the city” (Jonas & Gibbs, 2004, p. 552) by Jonas & Gibbs, by critically examine if the urban sustainability plans challenge or reproduce existing power imbalance by the growth politics in Seoul. While cities across the world are adopting urban sustainability plans and pursuing ‘sustainable development' instead of ‘development,' Kruger and Gibbs (2007) pointed out that the urban politics of sustainability becomes essential in the process of sustainability, in which political realities force a focus on ‘pro-growth.' As sustainability becomes a pervasive framework, it concentrates on specific appealing issues such as environmental amenities, such as green open spaces and climate change, yet these policies
leave out environmental justice issues (Checker, 2011; Finn & McCormick, 2011). This contradictory relationship between sustainable policies and inequitable urban redevelopment become more problematized as cities are becoming competitive global cities. Given the urban dynamics that growth and sustainable development issues are increasingly prevailing, accelerated by the ongoing forces of globalization, the Asian context can manifest a set of conditions that seemingly favor the emergence of the growth politics using the concept of sustainability with urban sustainability plans to enhance the competitiveness of their cities as a global city. However, little is known about the growth politics around urban sustainability plans in Asian cities.

This study attempted to fill this gap by critically examining the urban politics around two recent urban sustainability plans in Seoul, questioning if the implementation of the urban sustainability plan were used as a ‘Sustainability fix’ to promote the City of Seoul as a global city. This study argues that promoting the city of Seoul through a positive image by greenwashing process with a focus on economic revitalization without careful consideration on environmental and social impacts of urban sustainability plans demonstrates that these cases are representatives of how the SMG uses sustainability plans as a ‘sustainability fix.’ By adding this evidence in Seoul case to the literature, this research reinforces Jonas & Gibbs’ claim on the use of sustainability plans, in which political realities force a focus on ‘pro-growth,’ under the significant influence of the force of globalization.
There is a growing body of literature focusing on social justice related to urban sustainability. Agyeman and Evans introduced the term ‘just sustainability’ (Agyeman and Evans 2004) emphasizing environmental justice, equity, and civic engagement in the planning field. While the social aspect of sustainability, equity, is being incorporated into the language of many city plans, Agyeman pointed out that equity is often not the focus of sustainability plans (Agymen, 2005). Also, researchers argue that we know little about how the concept of sustainability is implemented in daily life in the context of cities, particularly concerning questions of social justice and equity (Isenhour, McDonogh, & Checker, 2015).

Since the experience of the ‘third wave’ of international democratization in the late 1980s, rapid democratization has been occurring in most Asian countries. While social sustainability that urban planning addresses were demanded to consider, few studies about the effectiveness of urban sustainability plans focusing on ‘just sustainability’ are done in the Asian city context. The concept of “just sustainability” (Agyeman & Evans, 2003; Zeemering, 2009) was emphasized in building a series of observable implications to evaluate the sustainability of the implementations of the case projects in this research. This research found that the centralized government utilized the Cheonggyecheon restoration project to refurbish the deteriorated areas at a local level and to promote the city of Seoul as a global city by emphasizing specific appealing issues of sustainability plans at a global level, leaving out justice issues. However, these negative social impacts by the implementation of urban sustainability plan have been problematized in Seoul as the Korean society has become democratized rapidly. Finally, the Remaking Sewoon Project started to put more emphasis on the social aspects of sustainability. As a result, the
Remaking Sewoon Project represents the paradigm shift in politics of urban policies from top-down to bottom-up, focusing social sustainability aspect over economic development, reflecting the rapid democratization in Seoul. As it is found in this research that the recent democratization is becoming more influential in urban sustainability planning in Korea, similar consequences are likely to follow in other Asian cities. Therefore, this study calls on the need for more studies addressing ‘just sustainability’ with a focus on the social aspects of sustainability in other Asian cities in the future.

Limitations of the Research and the Need for Future Research

This study did not attempt to use strict measuring indicators to assess the sustainability of the urban plans examined in this research. Having statistical measuring tools is useful to see how we progress toward sustainability over time is helpful to make a comparison with data that is descriptive. Since this study employed a series of observable implications to assess the sustainability of plans, that are more flexible in addressing the effectiveness of the plans, the comparison results do not provide precise figures. However, this study focused on the qualitative analysis since it is regarded as more appropriate to address the intrinsic side of sustainability and the complex urban dynamics.

This study examines the urban sustainability plans in Seoul from a critical perspective, focusing on how justly the urban policy was planned and implemented and if the implementation results are sustainable in promoting just sustainability. However, different perspectives can be taken to examine other sides of urban sustainability planning in Korea offering insights into the literature and the practical field. For example, this study criticizes the Cheonggyecheon restoration project that the government has manipulated a
discourse of ‘eco-friendlessness’ and ‘ecological restoration’ to appeal the project to the interests groups which were not fully supportive of the idea of downtown regeneration to proceed the project, the project results were neither ecologically sustainable nor socially sustainable as the plan claimed. However, many other evaluate the implementation of this project as a successful urban restoration project focusing on the excitement it has created for Seoul citizen and members of the international community. The fact that many cities such as Shanghai, Tokyo, and Los Angeles, have expressed their interests in planning a similar restoration in their cities (Society for Ecological Restoration, 2018), demonstrates how different perspectives evaluate the same project in different ways. Therefore, it is evident that this study is conducted through a particular lens to explore the urban politics around the sustainability planning and to evaluate the effectiveness of the plans, calling on further researches on this research topic with various perspectives.

In this research, the time frame between two case projects, the Cheonggyecheon restoration project in 2002 and the Remaking Sewoon Project in 2015 is relatively short to capture many factors about how urban sustainability has evolved. Even though two cases demonstrated a critical paradigm shift in terms of urban sustainability in Seoul between two plans, a future study may involve more cases in a longer time span to find a bigger picture of the evolution of urban sustainability in Seoul. In addition, this study captured a pivotal moment with essential changes in the urban sustainability planning in Korea, including a paradigm shift from a development-oriented approach to a balanced approach between ‘development' and ‘preservation,' a focus change from economic growth to social and cultural aspects, and the emergence of citizen groups and democratic politics for urban policies in Korea. As this finding implies, the recent democratization is becoming more
influential in urban sustainability planning in Korea. This change can be more critical in many Asian cities, including Seoul, with the historically centralized model of city-region governance. As negative social consequences by the implementation of urban sustainability plan have been problematized along with an increasing awareness and emphasis on the social aspect of sustainability over economic growth with the emergence of civic groups and democratization in Korea, this study urge the need for more studies addressing just sustainability with a focus on social aspects of sustainability in other Asian cities in the future.
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APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDE (PUBLIC SECTORS)

1. Perception of urban sustainability
   1.1. How is urban sustainability defined and perceived in Seoul?
   1.2. What are the prioritized values among many elements of sustainability?

2. Driving forces and discourses around the decision-making process
   2.1. Where the planning idea for this project come from?
   2.2. What were the main forces and discourses that shaped the case project’s planning process?
   2.3. Who were the main actors in the decision-making process for the case project?
   2.4. What are the prioritized values to determine the urban strategies for the project?

3. Project process
   3.1. Who were raising voices besides the authority about the process and the implementation of the case project?
   3.2. How did the planning authorities allow the public to get engaged with their urban decision making?
   3.3. If there were opposing groups toward the project, what were their main concerns or critics?

4. Implications for urban sustainability
   4.1. Do you think the case project was effective in enhancing sustainability in Seoul economically, environmentally, and socially? If so, or not, why you think so?
   4.2. What are your thoughts on the critical principles and measures as to enhancing urban sustainability?
   4.3. Who were the beneficiaries and losers by the case projects?
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDE (RESIDENTS AND CIVIC GROUPS)

1. Perception of urban sustainability
   1.1. How is urban sustainability defined and perceived in Seoul?
   1.2. What are the prioritized values among many elements of sustainability?

2. Driving forces and discourses around the decision-making process
   2.1. What were the main forces and discourses that shaped the case project’s planning process?
   2.2. Who were the main actors in the decision-making process for the case project?
   2.3. What are the prioritized values to determine the urban strategies for the project?

3. Project process
   3.1. How the residents or civic groups have participated in the processes of policy making of the plans?
   3.2. How did the planning authorities allow the public to get engaged with their urban decision making?
   3.3. What were your main concerns or critiques about the case projects?

4. Implications for urban sustainability
   4.1. Do you think the case project was effective in enhancing sustainability in Seoul economically, environmentally, and socially? If so, or not, why you think so?
   4.2. Who are the economic beneficiaries of the plans’ implementations?
   4.3. Who are the people negatively affected by the plans’ implementations?
   4.4. What are your thoughts on the critical principles and measures as to enhancing urban sustainability?
## APPENDIX C
THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CHEONGGYECHEON PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th><strong>Restoration of a natural environment and enhancement of the quality of life</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The heart of the restoration work lies in clean water flow and a clean environment for fishes and plants. Besides, two-lane roads were built on each side of the stream. The 22 bridges built across the stream and the paths made on both sides of the stream will help people take a good rest alongside or nearby. The authorities are also planning to expand green areas in the residential areas to 1 million pyeong (= 810 acres) and to widen and to develop access roads to the Hangang.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th><strong>Restoration of history and culture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another purpose for the restoration work was to make people regain the past pride of those living at the heart of the nation's long history and splendid cultures. In that matter, the City of Seoul is making some efforts to excavate and restore historical objects and sites in the Cheonggyecheon area as well as in some other areas of the city. Once successfully done, Seoulites will have right rest areas in the downtown area, while witnessing the nation's long culture and splendid cultures through such objects and sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th><strong>Revitalization of the economy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Along with the restoration work for the stream, the City of Seoul is planning to turn the city into a business hub in Northeast Asia by offering some conditions attracting foreign businesses, with full use of its geographically advantageous position, with 43 cities with over 1 million people located within three hours' flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fostering suitable conditions for foreign business people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Designation of a part of the Cheonggyecheon area as a foreign investment promotion zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing tax benefits and one-stop service related to business authorization or approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishment of a prestigious foreign school for the children of the potential investors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fostering a community for foreigners and supporting for the investors' spouses to get jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Operation of the SIBAC (Seoul Int'l Business Advisory Council) and the FIAC (Foreign Investment Attraction Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic control made with the promotion of public transportation. Designation of the entire downtown area as an area where the use of private cars will be restricted as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vehicles passing by the area should use detours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formation of a 630-meter-long DMC (Digital Media City), in which a comprehensive information/communication center and an animation complex will get established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Promotion of international events, such as the SICAF (Seoul International Cartoon & Animation Festival) and the Seoul.
- Collection Fashion Show as well as developing the printing industry as a new business providing the basis for fostering the convention business.

- Fostering business-conducive conditions
  - Financial support granted to SMEs with technological prowess
  - Establishment of one-stop service network for SMEs
  - Establishment of the Seoul Business Center
  - Expansion of techno buildings (i.e., apartment-type factories)
  - Expansion of the technological cooperation among businesses, universities and research institutes

### Objective 4

**Achieving a sustainable development**
The city of Seoul has set the following objectives in connection with its plan to build up a citizens’ square and a downtown culture/tourism belt designed to turn the downtown into a place for tourists, along with the restoration of the Cheonggyecheon.

- *Maintaining the* downtown area as a site for historical education
- Management of the traffic flow by the use of pedestrians
- Enhancing the competitiveness of the downtown area as a business district and historical sites
- Restoration of traditional cultures and historical resources that can only be witnessed in the downtown area
- Formation of an eco-friendly area downtown, including squares and the eco-friendly stream
- The restoration work for the Cheonggyecheon had been planned to establish the image of Seoul as an eco-friendly city through the achievement of sustainable development and to encourage people to remind of the importance of a healthy environment.

### Objective 5

**Creation of a future-oriented urban environment**
The restoration work for the Cheonggyecheon is a future-oriented attempt to get ready for the advent of the era of environmental concern. Future-oriented urban environment means where nature and humankind can co-exist in good balance and harmony with each other. The restoration work for the stream can also be said to be the starting point for greening Seoul and people's co-existence with nature downtown.

Note: This table is provided by the website SMG developed for the Cheonggyecheon restoration project in an English version, which can be retrieved from [http://www.sisul.or.kr/grobal/cheonggye/eng/WebContent/index.html](http://www.sisul.or.kr/grobal/cheonggye/eng/WebContent/index.html).

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Facilities Management Corporation
APPENDIX D
SMG’S INITIAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Active Communication Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government tried to publicize the project and draw public interest to the fullest possible extent by holding various events before starting construction work. In particular, it launched a PR campaign specifically targeting the local merchants in order to help them correctly understand the objective and contents of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Directions for Merchant Measures Set Through Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Seoul Metropolitan Government conducted analysis and field surveys to determine the scope of areas that would be affected by the project. Through such research activities, it collected information regarding administrative jurisdiction, population, and households, and identified the status of business distribution and the major shopping districts. Additionally, it gathered sector-specific data on lease methods, store areas, items the stores deal in and employees. The collected data and information were reviewed and analyzed through additional research from October 21 through November 2, 2002. Based on the thorough preparations, the city government devised its basic guidelines for merchants from November 3 through November 14, 2002.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Basic Principles for Taking Measures for Merchants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The merchants pressed for the government's acknowledgment of the need to provide compensation for the damages they would suffer due to the project. However, the city government was informed by its advisory lawyers that it had</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no legal responsibility to make compensation about land, buildings and business activities in the area. This position was based on the fact that the buildings in the area would not be demolished as the restoration work would be confined within the width of the present roads. The lawyers also told the city that it would be necessary to take measures to cope with the problems related to noise and dust during the construction period. Thus, the focus of the measures for the merchants was placed on minimizing the inconveniences caused by the construction work and invigorating business in the area.

4. Accommodation of Various Stakeholders’ Opinions

SMG formed the Resident-Merchant Consultation Committee in order to accommodate the opinions of the residents, merchants and other stakeholders in four districts adjacent to the stream on December 30, 2002. The government saw to it that the committee was comprised of persons from various backgrounds, including residents, city and district councilors, merchants, experts and government officials. Except for this, each district was given full autonomy regarding specific matters such as its composition and meeting schedules. The committee was eventually made up of 64 members. The merchant members were from trade associations in special tourism districts within Dongdaemun Fashion Town and the Jongno area. The associations representing the tenant merchants, the Cheonggyecheon Merchants’ Commercial Rights Protection Committee (CMCRPC) and the Clothing Stores Association, did not join the consultation committee.

Source: The Korea Transport Institute, 2016, p. 79-81
## APPENDIX E
THE OBJECTIVES OF THE GREEN NETWORK PLAN

1. Connection of the green axes within 4 gates - linked with Seoul fortress restoration project, the restoration of the Cheonggyecheon which is the water axis of Seoul will interconnect the green axes in the four gates including the south-north green axis of Changdeokgung Palace, Jongmyo Shrine, Sewoon sangga, Namsan Mountain and the ring-shaped green axis of Dongdaemun Gate, Namdaemun gate, Gyeongheegung Palace.

2. Connection of south and north green axes – the strategic redevelopment of Sewoon sangga area interconnects south and north green axes. In a long term, the south-north landscape axis of Mt. Bukaksan, Jongmyo Shrine, Mt. Namsan will be completed.

3. Connection of the ring-shaped green axis - Linked with the square creation project for Dongdaemon gate square and Namdaeun Gate square and park creation project for Dongdaemun Stadium, the ring-shaped green axis connected to the existing fortress green axis will be created. It will emphasize the original form of Seoul and the city’s unique geographic features, create the value as tourism resources and provide city view seen from the fortress.

4. Seoul forest – linked with the Jungrangcheon stream and the Hangang River, Ddukseom island located at the end of Cheonggyecheon will be converted into an environment-friendly park where wild animals inhabit.

5. Yongsan Park – As nature is restored, it will play a significant role in intercommuting Mt. Namsan and the Hangang River, which means the completion of south-north green axis.

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Government, 2005, p. 95