

*This paper is a draft only  
It may not be quoted or cited*

# GATING HONG KONG

by

Adrienne LA GRANGE and Frederik PRETORIUS

## **Abstract**

A central concern in the gated communities literature is the form and function of gatedness. Blakely and Snyder's (1997) seminal work identified three main types of gated communities: lifestyle communities, prestige communities and security zones. This paper presents preliminary empirical data about the form and function of gatedness in Hong Kong. It assesses in turn security at entrance and block level, prestige features and range of club goods in public housing estates, inner city single blocks and private housing estates in turn. On public housing estates security at entrance level is very low although moderately high at individual block level, with locked doors, CCTV and security personnel. There are very minimal club goods and they are accessible to people living in the neighbourhood. The newer estates in particular present a coherent image and promote belonging to estates and but there is no emphasis on creating a prestigious image. In the inner city single blocks levels of security are mixed although generally speaking quite low. No club goods are provided to buildings in our inner city precincts. With the exception of upmarket buildings there is little emphasis on presenting a prestigious façade. The private housing estates are very different. Across the board there is a strong emphasis on security at both the entrance and individual block level – including electronic access control and surveillance and extensive use of roaming security guards, guards at entrances to the estate and in the foyers of individual blocks. The range of club goods is very high, including in more modest estates. There is a huge emphasis on presenting a prestigious image across most estates, lower middle income and affluent included. The intention is clearly to offer a lifestyle rather than only a dwelling.

## **Introduction**

Over the last several decades in particular there has been a rapid spread of gated communities internationally. Indeed it is generally observed that few cities have not shared in this experience to a notable extent, Paris and Tokyo being the most frequently cited exceptions. In their seminal work in the United States Blakely and Snyder (1997) identified three main types of gated

communities: lifestyle communities, prestige communities and security zones. While this typology has been refined it remains a cornerstone in conceptualizing the nature and purpose of such developments.

Hong Kong has experienced the rapid rise of gatedness of its housing stock over the last two decades in particular, although the trend began earlier. Virtually all housing stock recently constructed or in development is gated. Although Hong Kong is such an exceedingly gated city, virtually no empirical research has been conducted on this phenomenon. This paper presents the results of empirical research into the nature, features and purpose of gated communities in Hong Kong as a preliminary step to understanding this phenomenon in the city. It seeks to investigate the applicability of the Blakely and Snyder typology of gated communities, namely security, lifestyle and prestige communities to Hong Kong. Engaging with the international literature this paper investigates a number of issues. To what extent is housing in Hong Kong gated? Is there a difference in the extent and purpose of gating between public housing, inner city single block and private housing estates? How relevant is the Blakely and Snyder typology of gating as security, lifestyle or prestige? The paper is divided into three main parts: a brief literature review on types of gated communities; presentation and analysis of the Hong Kong case; and a conclusion.

## **Literature Review**

It has been observed that the concept of gated communities has been used so broadly that it has become somewhat meaningless. However, while gatedness takes many forms there is general agreement that a gated community can be defined by four major features: restricted public access, usually by the use of gates, booms, walls, security guards and fences; common property that may include shops, schools, medical facilities, golf courses, beaches, polo clubs, clubhouses, recreational open space and swimming pools; a legal covenant between owners; and private management (ref). Atkinson and Blandy (2005) oft-cited definition is of “walled or fenced housing developments, to which public access is restricted, characterized by legal agreements which tie the residents to a common code of conduct and (usually) collective responsibility for management” (Atkinson and Blandy, 2005: 179). There is some debate as to whether single storey buildings with locked doors and/or concierges qualify as gated communities, considering that they lack communal facilities. The authors suggest that this would depend on their social and legal framework.

The rapid spread of gated communities begs a number of questions, an obvious one being why they exist and what purpose they serve. One of the earliest categorizations of gated communities

was Blakely and Snyder's (1997) nine types: lifestyle communities (retirement, golf and leisure and suburban new town), prestige communities (enclaves of the rich and famous, top-fifth developments, executive middle class) and security zones (city perch, suburban perch and barricade perch).

Lifestyle communities seek to provide a way of life and level of comfort for residents with an emphasis on leisure activities and amenities. They identify three distinct types: retirement community, golf and leisure community and suburban new town. Retirement communities are for middle and upper-middle class retirees who want "structure, recreation, and built-in social life in their early retirement years". Golf and leisure community provide exclusive access to sporting facilities. Suburban new town developments are large and attempt to incorporate residential, commercial/industrial and retail activities within or adjacent to the development (Blakely and Snyder 1997). Prestige communities are well secured and provide features such as elaborate gatehouses, monumental entrances and prestige landscape and leisure features. They emphasize distinction and prestige and project a particular image of wealth and success. There are prestige communities for the rich and famous, "highly exclusive, often hidden and heavily defended". Top fifth and executive communities confer some prestige but are less exclusive. Top fifth developments are for senior executives, managers and other successful professionals and are gated versions of middle class subdivisions (Blakely and Snyder 1997). Their third type of security zone communities, comprising city perches, suburban perches and barricade perches. Security features are often retrofitted in declining neighbourhoods as residents respond to outside threats by marking boundaries, restricting access and promoting their community. City perches are secured inner city neighbourhoods and suburban perches are secured suburban neighbourhoods. In barricade perches residents seek to restrict access to their neighbourhoods from public streets, but closure can only be partial (Blakely and Snyder 1997).

This typology has been related to other settings. In Denver-Boulder Colorado Williams (2002) identified Lifestyle Communities and Gated New Towns. The most common form of GC was Prestige Communities. Another special type is Williams' (2002) Rural Retreat Community, an upscale development specifically in the Rocky Mountains region. Richter (2007) identified Lifestyle Rental Communities – apartment complexes with the attributes of Blakely and Snyder's (1997) Lifestyle Communities. Danielsen (2007) observed for the United States that many residents of GCs were renters rather than owners and more likely to be black or Hispanic.

In the UK Webster (2001) distinguished three forms of gated communities: upgraded social housing estates transformed by gates, concierges and innovative local management institutions;

smart city-centre condo-style developments; small gated suburban developments. Chao and Heath (2003) identify mixed use and vertical gated communities for the elderly in Nottinghamshire, where abandoned town centres are revitalized by creating mixed use developments to attract residents back to the city. The “vertical gated community” is aimed at the elderly and single residents and offers both security and inner city revitalization, a model that has also been implemented in the United States. (Chao & Heath 2003).

There is a rapidly expanding literature on GCs in Asia, although there is relatively little emphasis on the development of typologies of GCs. According to Leisch (2002) most GCs in Southeast Asia are a mixture of Blakely and Snyder’s three types, although security is always important. In Indonesia, for example, there is a mix of the three types, although security is the most important feature. Thailand also has a mix of GCs although ranking in order of importance is opposite to Indonesia.

GCs have also been examined in Saudi Arabia (Glasze & Alkhayyal 2002). Arab cities have a long tradition of living in extended family compounds. They classify three types of gated developments in Riyadh: extended-family compounds, cultural enclaves and governmental staff housing. Extended families live in groups of villas surrounded by a common fence or wall. Cultural enclaves have grown in response to the government’s requirement that foreign companies with more than fifty foreign employees provide housing compounds for their staff, which restricts Western cultural influences. These compounds comprise basic accommodation for single unskilled or semi-skilled workers, better quality compounds for individual or unmarried semiprofessionals or technicians, and luxury and well appointed compounds for expatriate professionals who are accompanied by their families. Gated housing estates in Lebanon comprise *condominiums* containing apartments and *gated model towns* and *villa complexes* with predominantly single-family homes or terraced houses, mostly primary homes (Glasze & Alkhayyal 2002).

A number of scholars have reviewed the type of GCs in Latin American cities. Coy & Pohler (2002) differentiate between inner city and suburban GCs. In recent years *edge-city*-like projects have emerged in suburban areas, which provide good infrastructure and leisure facilities and proximity to nature. They identify two types of urban GCs (condominium-type and elite community type) and two types of suburban GCs (edge-city type and elite community type). They also categorize GCs according to types of buildings and connected forms of living. Inner-city GCs tend to be large condominium complexes or retrofitted older exclusive areas. Suburban GCs tend to comprise extensive residential areas with high security and exclusivity and a wide

range of amenities and leisure facilities. They propose that Latin American GCs correspond to a combination of Blakely and Snyder's *lifestyle communities* and *security zone communities*, with a rising trend to *prestige communities*.

Borsdorf et al (2007) submit that Latin America cities are increasingly gated cities. Residential enclaves often include schools, universities, shopping centres and sports facilities like golf courses and marinas and are connected to other highly secured commercial precincts where the wealthy work, shop and amuse themselves. Santiago, for example, is described as comprising an urban archipelago - islands of wealth in a sea of poverty. They also identify the rise of mega-projects - gated new towns designed for more than 50,000 residents. Rodgers (2004) describes Managua (Nicaragua) as having a "disembedded" layer of the city metropolis which comprises a 'fortified network' of homes, office areas, bars, restaurants and shopping malls, linked by safe transport corridors. Managua is too small to sustain self contained GCs, so instead the urban elites live in a "fortified network" of public and private spaces, made possible by the development of a strategic set of well maintained, well-lit and fast moving roads.

## **Hong Kong**

Hong Kong's population of more than seven million lives in an extremely densely populated area of about 100km<sup>2</sup>. About half the population lives on the northern fringe of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon peninsula. The other half lives in a series of compact, high density, new towns in the New Territories. Hong Kong's population is divided quite evenly between private sector housing (53 percent) of which most (37 percent is owner occupied) and public sector housing (47 percent) comprising large rental estates (30 percent) and assisted home ownership estates (17 percent).

With the small exception of traditional villages in the rural areas and a small number of high class townhouse developments on the outskirts of the city, Hong Kong's urban landscape very high density, high rise buildings, much of which is now highly gated. Very few of Hong Kong's original tenement or gracious colonial buildings remain; almost none of the city's housing stock is pre the Second World War, reflecting tremendous pressure on developable land, the government's land and housing policies, rapidly changing tastes and requirements and the short life span of buildings several decades old. Since the 1960s tenements have been demolished to make way for taller buildings, initially up to 20 storeys high and now routinely up to sixty storeys high. Changes to the leasehold system facilitated the building of Hong Kong's massive private sector developments, multi-block, multi storey developments, often the size of suburbs in western countries. From the mid 1970s developers have constructed a variety of sophisticated, large scale,

high rise private developments providing a range of commercial and social facilities such as shopping, recreation, education, social, cultural and transport facilities. These developments needed very large greenfield sites and were often built on what was then the urban fringe or former industrial sites. Older, inner city housing stock generally comprises stand alone buildings of between five and twelve storeys. Where obsolete housing is redeveloped it is replaced by high rise and, where feasible, large scale, comprehensive developments. Most public housing is located in the new towns in the New Territories. With few exceptions public housing estates are massive multi-storey, multi-block developments with integrated social and commercial facilities and transport links. This includes both rental and owner occupied developments.

## **Methodology**

In 2007 a survey was conducted of three main types of housing: public housing estates; inner city housing and private housing estates. The sample included 28 public housing estates, 769 privately owned single blocks in several precincts in two inner city areas, Wanchai and Shamshuipo and 77 private housing estates. Only 28 public housing estates were surveyed because of the high degree of homogeneity of the public housing stock. The precincts of inner city areas were chosen on the basis of their representing the full range of housing options in the two large inner city districts of Wan Chai and Shamshuipo. Access to the private housing estates turned out to be even more difficult than anticipated. In order to conduct a detailed and comprehensive analysis of GC features snowball sampling was used. As far as possible different estates were included in the survey based on location, size, number of tower blocks, price, etc. At the end of the day the survey was dependent on where the friends of the friends lived.

The survey was based on Blakely and Snyder's typology of security, prestige and leisure GCs. A master template was developed to identify the form and extent of gatedness and refined for each of the three housing types. The template was divided into three main parts: the type and extent of security features, prestige elements and presence of club goods to capture the lifestyle element of gated communities. A score for each feature was devised – either yes/no or a Likert scale. These features were weighted to produce a composite for each type of housing with respect to the three aspects of gating, namely security, prestige and club goods.

## **Findings**

### *Public Housing*

A total of 28 public housing estates were surveyed based on their age, size, “development type” and location. They range in age from 1954 to 2005 and are located across Hong Kong. Table 1

shows that security at the entrance to public housing estates is very low key and/or does not exist. In so far as there is controlled access it applies to cars not people, and this would be a practical matter of protecting parking spaces. The roaming security guards are there to keep an eye on things, not exclude strangers. Only four estates have walls or barriers. The public has unimpeded access to the shopping arcades, markets and sitting out areas incorporated into public estates although there is often signage about the “private”/”exclusive” use of the facilities for residents.

At the individual block level security is tighter – and has become more so in recent years, including the retrofitting of security features to older estates. Almost all estates (as is the Housing Authority’s policy) have locked doors, access by key-pad, a reception area, guards in the foyer and CCTV in the lifts. The buildings can be described as secure.

Table 1 - Security Features – Entrance and Building Block – Public Housing

<b>Entrance to Estate</b>	<b>No of Estates</b>	<b>Individual Buildings</b>	<b>No of Estates</b>
Features/ Scores	6-11	Features/ Scores	<b>8-13</b>
No. of estates	28	No of estates	28
walls / barriers	4	card swiping device	6
Cars entry on to estate	28	Intercom	25
boom gate	18	CCTV outside block	14
pedestrian gate	0	guards in foyer	26
Guards at entrance	4	guard station in foyer	26
Roaming guards	12	CCTV in lifts	28
swipe card	0	CCTV in corridor	0
Intercom	0		
CCTV	0		

A characteristic of public housing estates is the lack of club goods in either the older or newer and larger or smaller estates. There are no swimming pools, tennis courts, club houses, or secured and guaranteed parking for residents. What facilities exist are rudimentary, free-of-charge and are shared by nearby residents and the general public. They include parks/sitting out areas with simple landscaping and easy-to-manage street furniture—concrete benches and tables, basketball courts and children’s playgrounds. Some estates have shuttle bus services.

Although the Housing Authority has made a real effort to enhance the physical appearance of its housing estates, estates have low to moderate prestige scores (compared to either private housing estates or private single-blocks) primarily depending on their age (see Table 2). Facade and design is generally low key. However most estates are well maintained and landscaped, and have a coherent visual image, aimed in part to create a sense of belonging and neighbourhood among residents. Guards are generally smartly dressed and most estates have a guard house.

Table 2 - Prestige Score – Public Housing Estates

Features/ Scores	8-13
No of buildings	28
Ostentatious entrance façade	0
Well maintained landscape	22
Uniform property appearance	20
Guard house	18
Guards in uniforms	28
Guards at entrance	4
Roaming guards	12

*Private Single Blocks (Wanchai and Shamshuipo)*

This section presents the findings of the survey of 769 privately owned single blocks in several precincts in two inner city areas, Wanchai and Shamshuipo to identify forms and extent of gatedness. Whereas public and private housing estates can be gated at the entrance level and individual block level, single blocks are only gated at block level. Although not necessarily the case none of the blocks had any club goods in our study area. This section therefore evaluates security at individual block level and prestige features.

Regarding the **security** features of blocks in **Wanchai**, of the 251 buildings that scored between 5 and 10 (having a low level of security), a small number had unlocked doors and no other form of security and would therefore qualify as ungated. Still, most single blocks have some sort of security at the individual block level, mostly locks (rather unreliable) and some touch pads. The big distinction between the low security and higher security buildings was in the deployment of security guards and CCTV. Only 28% of buildings in our study area in Wanchai had security guards. Overall the difference in security is unsurprisingly between blocks in the lower income and more affluent precincts of the district (Table 3).

Regarding the **security** features of blocks in **Shamshuipo**, overall buildings had a relatively low level of security overall. In the blocks with low security less than half the buildings had locked doors. In the minority of buildings with higher security almost all buildings were locked and most buildings had security guards and CCTV. Again the difference in security is unsurprisingly between blocks in the lower income and more affluent precincts (Table 3).

Table 3 Security – Inner City Individual Blocks Wanchai and Shamshuipo

	Wanchai Low Security Blocks	Wanchai Moderate to Highly Secured Blocks	Shamshuipo Low Security Blocks	Shamshuipo Moderate to Highly Secured Blocks
Score	<b>5-10</b>	11-17	5-10	11-17
No. of buildings	251	100	188	52
Locked door	210	93	77	45
Key locks	219	45	110	22
Card-swiping device	2	14	0	0
Touch pad	50	72	1	3
Key locks + touch pad			11	18
Card swiping + touch pads				1
CCTV at entrance	6	38	3	12
CCTV at foyer	13	80	6	43
Intercom for visitors	116	96	37	42
Security guards	17	99	8	51
Desk for guards	16	97	6	51
Uniform for guards	8	94	3	47

Determining factors for **prestige** scores for private single blocks include: facade of entrance, presence of guards, presence of desks/posts/stations for guards, uniforms for guards, and cleanliness of the foyer.

Overall single blocks in **Wanchai** did not score highly on **prestige** features. Entrances to buildings are generally modest and many buildings did not score well on general cleanliness. More than half the buildings, scattered throughout the study area, had only a door or basic metal frame and a very humble appearance. Even in the more up-market buildings with high prestige scores there were few elaborate or ostentatious entrances, landscape features or smart security guards. The common areas of even higher score buildings were not particularly clean. Less than 20% of buildings had an ostentatious façade, but also had uniformed security guards (Table 4). (Uniformed guards and guard stations can be seen as a prestige as well as a security feature.)

Most of the buildings in **Shamshuipo** had low **prestige** scores. Some buildings did not have doors or doorframes, few had grand entrances and many of the older buildings were in a poor state of cleanliness. The buildings with security guards and clean public areas were in the upmarket parts of the study area (Table 4).

Table 4: Prestige Features Single Private Blocks

	Wanchai	Shamshuipo
Features/ Scores	2-8	2-8
No. of buildings	398	236
Door with frames / metal bars	305	179
Door with glass panel	75	11
Door made of frame and glass	4	
Ostentatious facade at entrance	56	8
On-site guards	147	83
Guards in uniform	121	68
Guard posts or desks	135	79
Clean foyer/public areas (cleanliness score of 1 and 2 ex 5)	159	84

### *Private Estates*

This section examines the forms and extent of gatedness of 77 private housing estates. As can be seen, overall private estates are very **security** conscious, at both the entrance and individual block level. Regarding security at **entrance level**, most estates have restricted peripheries. Although they have car access (residents' parking, pick-up/drop off for taxis, delivery vans, etc.) this is almost always controlled by boom gates and security guards. Almost all estates have roaming guards. External CCTV is widespread.

Sites with higher entrance security scores (18-25) are scattered across Hong Kong and high scores are not related to age of development. High scores also apply to estates targeted to different income levels (lower-middle income, mid-market and affluent housing) signifying that high entrance security is not exclusive to the upper echelons of the housing market. Many lower-middle income estates with high entrance security scores are located in the New Territories. Meanwhile, of the four estates with low scores for entrance security (7-9), none have boom gates for vehicles, pedestrian gates, card swiping devices, intercoms or CCTV at the entrance, although all four have roaming security guards (Table 5a).

The majority of private estates have moderate to high security scores at individual **block level** (13-21). Security at individual blocks is maintained by a combination of devices, mainly by the presence of guard stations and guards in the foyer, CCTV in lifts and outside blocks, as well as intercoms that connect individual units to the security in the reception area. More than half the 77 estates have card swiping devices installed at the individual block level. For the eight estates that do not have guards or guard stations in the foyer, some have CCTV in the foyer and lifts and card swiping devices (Table 5b).

Table 5a: Private estates: Security features identified at main entrances

Features / Scores	No. of private estates	walls or barriers	Cars entry into estate	Boom gate	Pedestrian gate	Guards at entrance	Roaming guards	Swipe card	Inter-com	CCTV
7-12	13 17%	3	5	5	3	4	13	0	2	4
13-18	29 38%	19	24	20	16	25	25	7	12	21
19-25	35 45%	34	33	34	35	32	34	24	17	31
% total		73%	81%	77%	70%	79%	94%	40%	40%	73%

Table 5b: Private estates: Security features identified at individual blocks

Features/ Scores	No. of buildings	Card swiping device	Intercom	CCTV outside block	Guards in foyer	Guard station in foyer	CCTV in lifts	CCTV in corridor
5-11	9 12%	3	7	5	0	1	8	1
13-16	28 36%	13	27	18	26	28	27	1
17-21	40 52%	29	39	34	40	40	39	1
		58%	95%	74%	86%	90%	96%	4%

While the survey is not a random sample of private estates, every effort was made to include lower, middle and higher income estates. What is striking about the results is the very high extent of **prestige** features across the board. Smart security guards, at estate entrances, in foyers and roaming the estate are a common feature of most types of estates. This level of security personnel is not necessary for security, and therefore serves a prestige function as well. Half the estates have ostentatious entrances. Most estates have well maintained landscaping.

Some of the interesting features at these high prestige sites are continuous water features (waterfalls, fountains), grand entrances (arches, statues, marbled walls, pillars, signs indicating private property status etc.), lush and well-manicured gardens and smartly dressed guards – features that are visual and impressive to people. In addition, some of the private estates are designed by theme(s) in order to emphasize their uniqueness - green garden/great outdoors, European cities, a luxurious palace, etc. The majority of private estates with high prestige scores also have distinctive names in different languages (Italian, French) or names that depict various locales (city, garden, court, island, peninsula, oasis, etc.). The living environment of the private estates with high prestige scores is well-planned and managed. Many estates have a one-of-a-kind design and appearance to create images of desirable living and unique community identities for residents. All this further promotes the distinctiveness of private estates.

It is also apparent that the range of club goods has an important prestige function in the upmarket estates. New developments include bowling alleys, karaoke rooms, mahjong rooms, beauty parlors, mini movie theatres, mini theme parks or mini go-karts for children, concierge services, shuttle buses etc.). Most club houses provide a area for reading the upmarket magazines on display. What matters is not that residents use these facilities but that they live on an estate that provides such prestigious facilities. Other prestigious activities include music and sports classes/field trips for children, wine/cigar clubs, special hobby groups, etc. This is an attempt to portray the elements of desirable lifestyles and the characteristics of their users (Table 6.

Table 6: Prestige Features – Private Estates

Features / Scores	No. of buildings	Ostentatious entrance façade	Well maintained landscape	Uniform property appearance	Guard house	Guards in uniforms	Guards at entrance	Roaming guards	Guards in foyer	Guard station in foyer
7-11	27 35%	1	17	19	21	27	16	27	20	24
12-16	24 32%	10	22	23	22	24	21	22	17	22
17-20	26 34%	26	25	26	25	26	24	24	23	25
	77	48	83	88	88	100	79	95	78	92

Provision of club goods or **lifestyle** services in private estates is high, even in the more affordable estates. Nowadays even estates aimed at lower-middle income families provide a club house – it’s the grandeur and magnificence that varies so considerably. The most popular club goods are swimming pools, children’s play areas and club houses. Estates that do not have club houses generally have at least a children’s play area. For example, of the ten estates with low club goods scores (0-5), five have a swimming pool and three have a children’s play area. Other facilities like sitting out areas and badminton courts can also be found on estates with lower scores. The two sites that do not have any club goods (score 0) are private developments with multiple blocks (4 to 19 blocks). Private estates with no or simple club goods are quite mixed and include lower income and mid to upmarket housing.

For the 38 estates that have even more elaborate club goods (20-26), the majority were built in the 1990s and 2000s, and are mid- to up-market multi-block and duplex developments. These estates have tennis courts , guaranteed parking, and Jacuzzi/steam rooms (35), shuttle bus services (22), squash courts (29), children’s play areas (37) and other amenities (music room, computer room, game room, restaurant, golf practice room, classes for children, gym, reading room, table tennis desk, pool table, bowling alley, banquet room, Japanese style spa—for family,

model cars playing area, massage chair, catering service, solarium, mini-soccer court, cigar/wine room etc. (36)).

Overall the variety and role of club goods in private estates has been expanding. Exclusivity (for residents and their guests) is emphasized through the provision of specific club goods and services that are usually accessed in the public sphere (movie theatre, bowling alley, mini theme-park/game arcades, spa). By design, residents will no longer need to leave their estates and access shared services/facilities anymore (Table 7).

Table 7: Club goods at private estates

	No. of buildings in total	Club House	Swimming pool	Tennis court	Shuttle bus	Squash court	Secure and guaranteed parking	Jacuzzi, steam room, sauna	BBQ pit	Children's play area	Others
<b>0-9</b>	<b>17 22%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10-17</b>	<b>16 21%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>18-26</b>	<b>43 56%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>
		<b>69</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>79</b>

## Conclusion

In summary public housing estates have low levels of gating although times have changed since the main doors to buildings were unlocked. Gating at the entrance to estates is minimal and primarily concerned with protecting parking spaces. Individual buildings are secure. There is however a trend to increasing the level of security, for example by expanding the use of CCTV. The range of club goods is extremely limited and what there is is rudimentary and equally accessible to nearby residents and outsiders. There is no effort to create an aura of prestige and exclusivity by restricting access and design is concerned with creating a coherent visual image and promoting belonging to the estates.

Overall levels of gatedness are low in the single block inner city study areas. Security at block level is generally low with the exception of the upmarket buildings, which have the expected security accoutrements. As to be expected, none of the buildings have club goods of any kind. Generally little effort is made to create an impression of prestige.

Security at private housing estates is generally very high, and includes both entrance level and individual block level security. Security is achieved by a combination of electronic devices and personnel. Security guards are ubiquitous and alert. This generally applies to upmarket and lower middle incomes estates. Estates across the board provide a very high level of club goods, and again the range is wide across different levels of estates although the quality varies according to

price. There is a big emphasis on creating an aura of prestige across all estates – indeed more affordable estates are marketed in a quite unrealistic way.

What then of Blakely and Snyder's typology? Overall, apart from securing individual blocks, gatedness in Hong Kong is related to a specific built form, namely large, multi-block, private housing estates. While security is high they cannot be described as security zones because Hong Kong does not have security problems that necessitate such elaborate electronic surveillance and so many security guards. Related research suggests that residents are less concerned with security than they are with their privacy. There is a very wide range of club goods and a huge emphasis on creating a prestigious lifestyle for residents. Indeed the marketing campaigns for quite ordinary estates are very dramatic relative to the cost of the dwellings and the prestige of the development and the area. The marketing campaigns for new, up-market developments border on the surreal. You will live in a palace. You will live on the Cote D'Azur. Or Tuscany. You will mix with movie stars and drive a Bentley and sunbathe on the deck of the large yacht. These are not lifestyle communities in the Blakely and Snyder sense but lifestyle gated communities in a Hong Kong sense, combining, virtually across the board, high security, a wide range of club goods and a major emphasis on selling a prestigious lifestyle. It is very seductive to Hong Kong people.

## **References:**

- Blakely, E. J. & Snyder, M. G. 1997. Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States, Brookings Institution Press, Washington DC.
- Borsdorf, A., Hidalgo, R. & Sanchez, R. 2007. A New Model of Urban Development in Latin America: The Gated Communities and Fenced Cities in the Metropolitan Areas of Santiago de Chile and Valparaiso, Cities, Vol 24, No 5, pp. 365-378.
- Chao, T. Y. & Heath, T. 2003. Creating a Safer Community for Elder People in Mixed Use Development – Vertical Gated community in the City Centre, paper delivered at the conference Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities? Glasgow.
- Coy, M. & Pohler, M. 2002. Gated Communities in Latin American Megacities: Case Studies in Brazil and Argentina, Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, Vol 29, pp. 355-370.
- Danielsen, K. A. 2007. How the other Half Lives: Tenure Differences and Trends in Rental Gated Communities, Housing Policy Debate, Vol 18, No 3, pp. 503-534.

- Glasze, G. & Alkhayyal, A. 2002. Gated Housing Estates in the Arab World: Case Studies in Lebanon and Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, Vol 29, pp 321-336.
- Leisch, H. 2002. Gated Communities in Indonesia, Cities, Vol 19, No 5, pp. 341-350.
- Richter, C. & Goetz, A. R. 2007. Gated Communities in the Denver-Boulder Metropolitan Area: Characteristics, Spatial Distribution and Residents' Motivations, Housing Policy Debate, Vol 18, No 3, pp.535-555.
- Rodgers, D. 2004. "Disembedding" the City: Crime, Insecurity and Spatial Organization in Managua, Nicaragua, Environment and Urbanization, Vol 16, No 2, pp. 113-123.
- Webster, C. J. 2001. Gated Cities of Tomorrow, Town Planning Review, Vol 72, pp. 149-170.