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Kampung Banyu Urip, Surabaya. Indonesians participate in inner-city settlement improvement.
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Banyu Urip is a low-income settlement or ‘kampung’ of 40,439 people in the south-west centre of Surabaya, the second largest city of Indonesia. The original site was an old Chinese graveyard where a few hundred people squatted and made their homes. In 1955, they were joined by ex-'freedom fighters' and their families, who also took up residence on the site. Banyu Urip was initially on the fringe of pre-war Surabaya, but the city has since expanded and grown around it and it is now a typical inner city kampung.

Nearly half the heads of family were born in Surabaya itself. Employment is varied, but with one common characteristic: most family heads have second jobs in the informal sector. The income level is slightly higher than in most kampungs, approximately 55 per cent of the population earn over US$760 a year. The area was subdivided into plots of approximately 7 by 14 metres: one for each family. As in most Surabaya kampungs, the houses are of one storey, most with floor areas between 50 and 75 square metres. Now that all have a water supply, many also have a bath and toilet.

Since colonial times improvements have been carried out in many kampungs by outside agencies, with little or no participation by local people. In Banyu Urip, people were involved right from the start. Since 1972 they had already been carrying out small-scale improvements through their own autonomous neighbourhood organizations. In 1979, due to local pressure, Banyu Urip was incorporated into the Kampung Improvement Programme (KIP), carried out by the local authority of Surabaya, with support from the local university. People participated in the drafting and discussion of the improvement plan, as well as in its implementation.

Abbreviations
KIP Kampung Improvement Programme
RT Rukun Tettanga (block level organization)
RW Rukun Warga (neighbourhood level organization)
Most Indonesian cities developed through the conglomeration and densification of existing villages. After losing their agricultural land to urban services and higher income housing, the villages were transformed into high-density inner city kampungs.

Villages grow into a city
Most Indonesian cities have grown through a process of densification and conglomeration of existing villages, now kampungs. Today, about three-quarters of the 40 million urban population of Indonesia live in kampungs, many dating from the pre-war colonial period.

After the Second World War, incoming migrants who could not find space in the original kampungs, squatted empty or abandoned areas of land in the cities, forming new kampungs. In Indonesian law, the squatters were able to claim some tenure rights permitting the progressive development of their own homes and neighbourhoods. In Surabaya, almost 70 per cent of the population of 3 million live in kampungs. They are found in all parts of the city, from the central business district to the urban periphery. Nearly one-quarter were formed by squatting, mainly in the post-war period. The rest developed from villages.
Urban services are generally absent from most kampungs. Through the ‘Rukun Tetangga’ (RTs) and ‘Rukun Warga’ (RWs) the block and neighbourhood levels of local organization, community facilities such as meeting halls, schools and open spaces are provided. At the same time, a wide range of commercial activities flourish. The houses themselves evolve over time, extra rooms being added to meet additional needs and temporary materials giving way to permanent structures as finances permit. Most kampung houses generate additional income through sub-letting or use as shops or workshops.

Between 1979 and 1982, vehicular roads, footpaths, drainage, water standpipes and public toilets were provided by the KIP at a per capita cost of about US$22 for the 28,000 inhabitants served. Once the works were carried out, the community assumed responsibility for the use and further development of the improvements. Trees, shrubs and flowers were planted; street lighting was installed; a security guard house and meeting halls were built and houses were improved. In 1983 the community’s request for the legalization of their tenure was approved.
Learning from the people
The Banyu Urip experience demonstrates the need for a change of direction. When people participate in the planning, implementation and management of the improvements, the results are far better than when an outside agency carries out a programme using a public works approach, without input from the local community. In Banyu Urip the formal improvements carried out stimulated people's own improvements to their houses and neighbourhood, an ongoing process which multiplies the initial investment made. At the same time, because people were involved in the KIP right from the start, they adopted the improvements as their own, caring for them and reducing the need for future maintenance.

Banyu Urip is an all too rare example of appropriate supportive actions being taken by local authorities and professionals who have respected the kampung as a positive contribution to Indonesia's urban development.

Learning from the people themselves, they have enabled the community and its organizations to tap into its own vast potential for improvement.

The other Surabaya: real estate and public housing
Kampung builders are not the only inhabitants of Surabaya. Commercial and subsidized private developments, co-operative and public housing have all contributed to the city's growth. Housing for the higher income groups occupies most of the available land and receives the best urban services. Kampung dwellers are too poor to afford such housing and are left to fend for themselves.

Government housing policy also gives a low priority to supporting the housing efforts of the poorest. Since 1976 there has been a public building programme to supply low-cost housing. The present Five Year Plan 1984-1989 budgeted US$933 million to build 300,000 houses serving 1,500,000 people. By contrast, only US$13.3 million is budgeted for the improvement of 5,000 hectares of kampung serving 1,500,000 people in 400 different towns and villages. In other words, 70 times more is being spent on housing the better off than on supporting low-income people's own housing initiatives.

Paradoxically, if the budget currently being spent on low-cost public housing were instead allocated to the KIP, it would then be possible to serve some 105,000,000 people. This is more than 3 times the total kampung population of Indonesia. But if the current KIP budget were allocated to low-cost public housing, only 21,425 people would be served.

Typical public housing and a kampung street.
Participation ensures improvement

Big improvements come in small programmes. Since 1972, when Banyu Urip formed its own self-help kampung improvement association, people have carried out small-scale works to strengthen their claims to secure tenure. Through the RTs and the RWs the community built footpaths and public toilets while houses were improved individually. Staff and students of the Department of Architecture of the Institute of Technology of Surabaya, interested in what people were doing, incorporated Banyu Urip in a survey to determine priorities for kampung improvement. They helped the community to press for its inclusion in the Kampung Improvement Programme in 1979. Once the local authority had approved the budget for the KIP in Banyu Urip, a draft plan was drawn up which was discussed with the people. The plan was developed and implemented by a general contractor in consultation with the residents. Greater care was therefore taken to avoid unnecessary demolitions of existing homes, and greater attention was given to detailed design of the many semi-public access paths and the few streets.
Footpaths as key elements
The most important component of the KIP was the improvement of footpaths, accounting for a third of the total cost of the programme. Not only does the footpath improve accessibility, but it also stimulates house improvement by the residents. In the kampung, the footpath has a key social function. It is used as a playground, street market in the morning, for drying clothes and for street and wedding parties. Defining footpaths helped to define boundaries between private, semi-private and public land, ensuring good maintenance of open spaces and avoiding encroachments. As time passes, the contrast between Banyu Urip and other kampungs, where people did not participate in the improvement programme, becomes more dramatic. In Banyu Urip the residents care for their shared improvements as well as for their own homes. But in other improved kampungs where there was no participation, streets and paths are unswept, drains are often used as rubbish tips and open spaces are neglected. Many improvements deteriorate so seriously that they need rebuilding after a few years.

A resource still untapped
The KIP represents a real alternative to the policies of supplying low-cost housing. Kampung improvements help to generate a supportive housing environment for large numbers of very-low-income people.

Scarce government resources are used to match the needs of the low-income majority and full advantage is taken of otherwise wasted resources which kampung communities already have in their hands. Public housing projects serve the wrong groups: those who least need government subsidy. The KIP in Banyu Urip shows how much can be achieved with a relatively small capital investment and far lower long-term costs.

Participation means caring for improvements.