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KAMPUNG AS CORE MODEL OF URBAN COMPACTION DEVELOPMENT: YOGYAKARTA INITIATIVE

Muhammad Sani Roychansyah
Researcher and Lecturer, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gadjah Mada University

Obviously, compaction development in urban areas recently becomes wider-spread as one of believed implementation to achieve a sustainable urban form and to reach sustainable communities. The strategy has progressively been tried to be implemented in developed countries in various efforts. In the same time, under debates and unclear situation yet, approaches to deliver compaction or compactness strategy are also tried to be applied in developing countries. In Indonesia, one of potentials and challenges of this compact city strategy is how to apply its concept into densely, mixed-use, organic, and slum conditions of kampungs as main spatial structure of urban settlements. This paper aims to revisit kampung as an important space unit for social, economy, and physical entity in Indonesian cities. A kampung oriented development (KOD) is introduced as a core model for compaction development model in Indonesian cities. Yogyakarta City's related data and conditions are undertaken as a case study to grasp more concrete the initiative.
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1. DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMPACTION

Nowadays, “sustainability” appears to be emerging as one of the competing rationales for planning and design in almost entire worlds. The concept of sustainable development has officially become an important part of the urban development vocabulary. Urban developments have faced both new challenges and new references, how precisely to implement this concept into urban characteristics appropriately. Furthermore, there has been growing support in recent years, mainly in developed countries for an idea of a compact city as one of popular alternatives for urban form facing the sustainability paradigm (Jenks, et al., 1996; De Roo and Miller, 2000, Williams, et al, 2000). Meanwhile, in the developing countries, attempts of compact city implementation still face the basic social-economic problems of the communities (Burgess and Jenks, 2001). These conditions consequently bring different setting conditions of compact city attributes (Roychansyah, 2008).
This urban compaction idea originally has emerged primarily in response to widely acknowledged need to find more sustainable models for towns and cities in the world. These trends seem to focus that this concept has been placed as an interesting guideline in urban policy strategy without deeply background consideration on its objectives and characteristics (Jenks, et al, 1996). As the demand increases, the compact city is employed directly as either some city government’s solutions or urban planner’s beliefs that it is able to solve the city from many problems related to sustainability, without any respects to real purposes of the concept through well understanding.

From the existing studies related compact city, we concluded that compactness is characterized by several attributes that each of them has same roles in conducting level of compactness (Roychansyah et al., 2004, 2005). Among attributes have strong causal effects and coherent relationships. Despite one attribute has strong influence to increase another attribute simultaneously, it cannot still represent the collective meaning of compactness or degree of relationship yet, rather than single interpretation contributed by each attribute to the compactness pattern. As described through diagram in Figure 1, those are six attributes: activity concentration, population densification, public transport intensification, city scale (city size) consideration, social welfare justification, and there exists a process to realize compactness respectively. The idea of compaction or compactness of the city popularly has been progressively tried to be implemented in the certain developed countries in various names, like America and Canada with their smart growth or new urbanism, Europe, especially in England, with its urban regeneration, and Japan with its urban renaissance with many central city redevelopment projects (Roychansyah, 2005).

2. URBAN COMPACTTION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRY

If developed countries courageously declared that compact city is one of popular remedy to deliver a sustainable urban form, many countries in the developing worlds still face the basic problems of urban life, such as housing affordability, jobless, poverty alleviation, environmental degradation, and so on. As early development of compact city concept in the developed world, now this idea still in debates on how this concept is able to be applied in the developing countries cities where they have different characteristics from their counterparts in the developed countries. Nevertheless, Burgess and Jenks (2001) stated that there are some
potentials of developing countries urban condition in which easier condition to deliver such a compactness condition, namely population density.

![Urban Density](image)

**Figure 2. Population density in some cities in the world**

(Adapted from Newman and Kenworthy, 1999)

Adopted from Newman and Kenworthy (1999), Figure 2 shows average of population density in some cities in the world. On the left side, developed countries cities have population density no more than 50 persons/ha. In contrast, on the right side, some Asian cities including Yogyakarta City where this paper undertakes this city as a case study, shows higher population density, two times or more than American or European cities. Furthermore, besides of population density, the developing countries cities have another potential, such as mixed use activities in a community. It is a natural condition where informal sectors and formal sectors both are important structure of work segregation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compactness Attributes</th>
<th>Developed Countries</th>
<th>Developing Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Densification</td>
<td>Medium population density, city center is a target space in making higher density, combining vertical lifestyle</td>
<td>Higher population density, tends to exceed environment capacity, dominated by horizontal lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Concentration</td>
<td>Mixed use by designs, naturally and traditionally segregated activities</td>
<td>Mixed use by either nature or forces, existence of informal sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Intensification</td>
<td>Many strategies are introduced and combined in different level of cities to encourage public transport usage</td>
<td>Effective strategies are limited to bigger cities (where have stronger budget), still partial policy in strengthening public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Size Consideration</td>
<td>Some cities face too big of city size to apply a compact city policy, needs suitable adjustments into divided areas</td>
<td>Domination of medium-small city size where compactness development would be easier to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Target</td>
<td>Socio economic gap still exists, needs more evidences of compactness in successful</td>
<td>Socio economic gap is higher than socio culture gap in the communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 1, this paper has tried to compare conditions of compactness attributes in developed and developing countries. As substantive considerations, we should absolutely understand that although there are different settings of compact city development in the both conditions, there are still spaces to explore some potentials and to apply some ideas in appropriate ways. As represented in Figure 3, the degree of compactness of cities would be different, depending on internal and external factors along the times. Some cities may have high degree of compactness in the past, but if it is measured now, the degree of compactness would be decrease since some factors have changed. It is similar with trend of compactness development idea in the planning world, in which some ideas has been initiated by predecessors, garden city movement for an example, in context of preserving agriculture land and infrastructure connection or ideas of mixed use zoning for another one, in context of mixed use activities.

3. KAMPUNG AND INDONESIA URBAN STRUCTURE

Kampung is a familiar word in Indonesia urban space and has very strong relationship with Indonesian culture itself. Etymologically, Sullivan (1992) differentiated clearly that desa is a residential area within a rural and kampung as residential area within a city. In kampung, people can find social-culture pattern ala Indonesia. Nowadays kampung, which physically illustrated in Figure 4, becomes a multi dimension residential area where it covers not only physical term of settlement, but also social, economic, and cultural entities. Kampung was born through strong relationship along its urban history and grows organically based on internal and external carrying capacity. However, recent kampung mostly positioned into negative
pole in urban development discussion with its higher densely inhabitant, dominated by poor and disadvantaged residents with lack of access to basic infrastructure.

Figure 4. Common condition of kampung morphology: dense, limited open spaces, and spatially organic settlement (Location: Kampung along the Candi River, Yogyakarta City)

Discussions about kampung (refers to a residential or settlement area within a city) in Indonesia are varies, complex, and interesting to show some existence problems in Indonesia cities (see for example; Setiawan, 2003, Steinberg, 1998, Guiness, 1986, Turner, 1985). Nas (1987) explicitly wrote that Indonesian cities cannot be analyzed without discussing kampung as integral part of the cities. Setiawan (2003) additionally stressed that despite the clear significance of kampung for Indonesian society, the Indonesian government continues to ignore the socio-political aspects of development in kampung, especially in housing markets. It means that social considerations that are vital to the formulation of urban and housing policies have thus been neglected. It substantially does not solve the basic problems of housing in Indonesia.

As considerable beliefs, kampung in Indonesia really takes an important role substantially in the process of urban development. As informal or popular settlement sectors in other developing countries, kampung settlements have provided serviceable and affordable shelter for a majority of Indonesian urban households, more than 80% (McGee, 1996). As Setiawan (2003) stated, kampung represents a dynamic process by which groups of people—mostly the poor—provide their own housing, control their environments, and engage in collective efforts or mutual assistances (gotong royong) to improve their lives. Despite its clear significance of kampung for providing space for urban housing, the Indonesian government continues to favour the formal housing sector and to direct its assistance to it. Kampung from perspective of Indonesia government has been neglected as potential resource and confirmed as impermanent solution to cope with recent housing problems.

Development that really focused on kampung development was popularly named KIP (Kampung Improvement Program). Based on Suselo and Taylor (1995) the KIP
was initiated in 1969 coincided with Repelita I (midterm national development program), primarily to alleviate the low physical living conditions of the kampungs, using a minimum of technical and administrative resources. However, KIP was only focused on an infrastructure upgrading program for kampungs based on the needs of installation and improvement for roads, pathways, water supplies, drainage, and sanitation. Assumption that the idea of improvement of limited housing and infrastructure would also stimulate the improvement the socio-economic conditions in kampung community, should be reviewed again. In fact, as Setiawan (2003) indicated, that these physical improvements also tend to be temporary and is not a sustaining program. After several years, many of the improvements made under the programs have decayed and no further improvements are made by either the government or the communities. Moreover, the recent government programs and policies which focus on kampung or settlement in the urban center are still far from ideal condition of kampung if correlated to the compactness attributes (Roychansyah, 2010).

4. TOWARDS A KAMPUNG COMPACTION: CASE OF YOGYAKARTA CITY

Regarding idea of compact city development in urban areas in Indonesia, this paper considers kampung as important part of urban area in which a deep analysis should be carefully taken into account. Yogyakarta City located in Central Java is undertaken as case study to show some significance potentials in delivering city compactness. The city itself was founded in 1756 and the kampung has traditionally clustered together as important part of community settlements in the urban structure. Up to now, population of Yogyakarta City is about 420 thousand, while the population density is about 120 persons/ha. It is distributed differently in 14 wards (kecamatan). There is a ward with 100 persons/ha, contrary there is also a ward with more than 200 persons/ha (see Figure 5). This population density is more than enough as main consideration of population densification of compactness attributes explained above. Consequently, this condition also brings high density in built urban areas. As illustrated in Figure 2.1 before, the kampung space is very dense settlements with lack of open space and forms irregular patterns of buildings and pathways.

![Figure 5. Distribution of population and population density of Yogyakarta City based on wards (Yogyakarta in Figures, 2007)](image-url)
In the term of activity concentration, the kampung has offered a suitable model of mixed use activities. As McGee (1996) argued that the kampung represents a 'dualistic' model of the socio-economic structure of cities in developing countries, traditional and modernity, formal and informal, legal and illegal activities. Since it is argued that unity of activities in the same location by means of mixed-use development will lead to greater opportunities for successful sustainability in the area, balancing residential and non-residential uses in Yogyakarta City based on land use data of its 14 wards represents very interesting findings. As shown in Figure 6, percentage results of non dwelling to dwelling usage are variously big, 0.3-0.6 (8 wards) and 0.8-1.4 (6 wards). This condition may be emerged by various forces like limited of engagement spaces in the kampungs, creativity or challenges in community facing the poverty, as well as lack of law of enforcement in urban space order. However, inevitably this condition primarily initiates an ideal condition of kampung as an entry point of compactness development.

![Graph showing land use in Yogyakarta City](image)

Figure 6. The condition of land uses in Yogyakarta City based on wards (Yogyakarta City in Figures, 2007)

Furthermore, issues of transportation in the compact city are arguably the single biggest environmental argument relating to urban form, especially for the developing country. Burgess and Jenks (2001) argued that urban transport usage in developing countries is not triggered by a planned policy rather than by limited access to own private vehicles. In contrast, now in Indonesia cities, this condition is worsened by a market driven. People can brings back a motorcycle to home easier, even without any down payment in the beginning of their contract. Although there has been an initial good model in bus rapid transit (BRT) service in Yogyakarta City, namely Trans-Jogja, released in the beginning of 2008, a rapid evaluation of the project and relations with other supported transport system have not forecasted well yet. However, we can examine Yogyakarta City transportation condition by comparing composition of vehicle numbers.
Figure 7 illustrates how Yogyakarta City's transport condition is still dominated by private vehicles, mainly by motorcycle (240075). The second place is place for private car (32332), followed by truck (12730), public taxi (776), and public bus (620) respectively. Accumulation of private vehicle numbers, both motorcycle and private car, is around one third of Yogyakarta City's population itself. This number would be greater if we consider transport condition of Yogyakarta Metropolitan Areas (Yogyakarta City and its surrounding sub-urban areas that compile some wards from its neighbour regions, Sleman Region and Bantul Region). From the view point of compactness attributes, the transport condition of Yogyakarta City is so far from an ideal situation in an urban compaction, where a competitive public transportation system may be a key initial action to overcome other crucial problems in transportation. Moreover, more efforts toward finding appropriate intensification of public transport in medium city size in developing countries like Yogyakarta City may rapidly be a main target for a reduction in private car dependencies, and will change the travel behaviour of the residents.

The consideration of city size and access, aimed at providing as many daily needs as possibly within minutes of most habitations. Consequently, it is necessary to consider certain city attributes in order to determine a more manageable city where a certain population, activities, and the physical pattern of the city work together in harmony. Yogyakarta City itself has an area that is very reachable with easy access, even from surrounding areas (some wards of surrounding neighbour regions). The position of Yogyakarta City is in the center of the region of Yogyakarta Special Region Province, precisely in the central southern part of Java Island. Inspite of it is the smallest area in the region, but Yogyakarta City is acknowledged as a center of trendsetter of the region, even in Indonesia. That is why although Yogyakarta City population is just 400 thousands bit more, but actually in daily activities, this area should be considered larger and then generates its population numbers double, almost one million peoples. This sprawling Yogyakarta City or Yogyakarta "Metropolitan" Area (see Figure 8) is very crowded with various famous activities, from culture, education, tourism, creative industry, service, and commercial.
Making compactness in Yogyakarta City, from viewpoint of city size should firstly consider how the city is able to facilitate all activities, including pulling population to live in the city area. Population reasonably lives in the sprawl area triggered by some causes. Besides of lifestyle including social segregation, the main problem may actually be caused by both misinterpretation and mismanagement conditions of kampung as main (inner) structure of the city. As a misinterpretation stated by Setiawan (2003) that kampung as informal settlement is seen by people including official government as a traditional form of housing or urban elements that represents a temporary solution for urban settlement problem. Furthermore, as further strong relation, it also put a mismanagement to let kampung development as second priority of development after suburban areas (formal sector settlement) where assumptions of benefited direct economy exist. In this context, related to city size consideration, the existence of kampung as close settlements that support directly urban activities and its program to bring such compactness development program back to the site become crucial significant to apply.

Moreover, if we examine the social welfare target in Yogyakarta City, composition among welfare groups in the city is still dominated by higher welfare group (welfare III), followed by lower welfare (welfare I) and middle welfare (welfare II) respectively. As illustrated in Figure 9, there is increasing welfare condition for middle and higher welfare groups, including welfare plus group that is the highest group of welfare groups, during 2004 to 2006. At the same time, there is decreasing welfare condition for lower welfare. Despite it can be seen as economic improvement of higher welfare groups, but in the lower groups there is actual worsened condition. The pre welfare group in which the poorest group categorized and in the lower welfare group in which the lowest category of welfare, obtained significant decreases to perform better condition of social welfare in 2006. Since one benefit that the compact city claims to have is to promote the increased quality of life for residents, the implementation of compactness development in Yogyakarta City actually should be closely connected to social equity, with a focus on quality of life, represented not only by equitable access to urban facilities, but also social and economic welfare, including space allocation in the kampungs.
Indeed, the compactness development in Yogyakarta City is still far from a realization. It has just blossomed as an idea or in the beginning step of formalization of a model. It will need a long term process of development and needs to be dynamic and interactive model. This paper furthermore tries to introduce a compactness development model in Yogyakarta City with its kampung as main orientation as more bit discussed above. Inevitably, type of compactness in kampung would be different compared to compactness models in developed countries, as drawn in Figure 10. Adopted from Hayashi (2003), there are three types of compactness, those are concentration type with vertical life concentration, cluster type within larger city size and divided into several administration areas, and homogenous type with similar developments through the areas. Urban compaction model in Yogyakarta City would be same as homogenous type, since almost there are no different characteristics among the kampungs in the city.

5. A CORE MODEL: KAMPUNG ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Kampung Oriented Development (KOD) model is then arranged as an idea of implementation for compactness development in Yogyakarta City in this chapter. Basically it can be seen from two considerations. First, structurally kampung as described above has a significant role in broad range of dimensions in the urban structure. The structure of kampung in inner city spatial structure is also intentionally clear to state that kampung for this model of development might be a permanent
solution, not a temporal solution. Second, historically kampung experiences with many schemes of development from many resources. Although it contains several weaknesses, Kampung Improvement Program (KIP) is widely known as a masterpiece of successful program in Indonesian kampungs. However, KIP is only focused on an infrastructure upgrading program for the kampung based on the needs of installation and improvement for roads, pathways, water supplies, drainage, and sanitation. Assumption that the idea of improvement of limited housing and infrastructure would also stimulate the improvement the socio-economic conditions in kampung community, should be reviewed again. In fact, as Setiawan (2003) indicated, these physical improvements also tend to be temporary. After several years, many of the improvements made under the programs have decayed and no further improvements are made by either the government or the communities. Supporting this argument, the condition of many kampungs is getting worsened today, passing their optimum capacity of their environments, if viewed from their standard of quality of life (uncontrolled population density, lack of open space, environmental degradation, emerging many slum areas, and so forth). An urgency to redevelop kampung as further step in re-improvement of kampung condition becomes a realistic and an arguable idea.

![Diagram](kampung-oriented-development.png)

**Figure 11. Kampung Oriented Development (KOD) embraces some empowerment programs of kampung (Roychansyah, 2008)**

Kampung oriented development (KOD) as shown in Figure 11 is systematically a strategic attempt through a comprehensive policy using kampung as focus area of development that encompasses several intensive developments based on characteristics of kampungs as integral part of urban structure (in Yogyakarta City, Indonesia), like transit oriented development, people oriented development, access oriented development, and activity oriented development, All of these developments are fundamentally framed by SOD, sustainable oriented development principles. Every single theme of development is dedicated to a specific characteristic of the kampung. For instance, access oriented development is purposed to open the kampung from outside positive networks. It would continuously supports kampung to get opportunities making improvements by “kampung” itself adequately.
Furthermore, turn to spatial lay out, as recommended by Urban Task Force (2002) in forming urban structure from dispersed urban structure to the compact one, kampung oriented development (KOD) in Yogyakarta City is very possible to be divided into some units based on some scenarios: kampung administrative unit, kampung physical unit (based on spatial unit analysis), or kampung activity unit (see Figure 12). Basically, the difference of delivering sustainable communities in kampung is that a new development should be integrated step by step within community participation context. It is true that a culture consideration should also be particularly taken into account of sustainability concept in the developing countries, besides of environment, social, and economic considerations as suggested by common definition of sustainability (see for example Wheeler, 1996). For example, vertical living as a consequent effect of compactness development in developed countries should meet another suitable alternative models or approaches if it is implied in developing countries where vertical lifestyle reasons have not socialized properly yet.

As additional propositions, each attributes should be focused on some strategic condition of kampungs. Related to the population densification, kampung should be a living space where residents feel comfort to live and deliver their daily life, viewed from existing and potential conditions of its demography, spatial, and physical aspects. For the activity concentration, kampung and its accessible distance environment should be as an integrating place where its residents able to live, works and do both individual and social. From the view point of public transport intensification, kampung should be as a connecting place where with other parts of broader environment of city, form accessible networks that can reached easily by walking, bicycling, or an integrative public transport system. Kampung should also be as a seizing place where the residents can access easily all corners of its physical environment and use its existence to deliver their activities inside if correlated with physical environment size and access attributes. And from social welfare target point of view, kampung strategically may be as a prospering place where kampung engages and secures its resident for getting a good quality in all dimensions of life.

The study that tried to examine everyday life condition, KOD condition, and other free ideal condition described by residents in 4 types of kampungs along the Code River using a rapid appraisal showed interesting results, where KOD is very suitable
both with their conditions and further ideas (Roychansyah and Diwangkari, 2009). All three conditions in the study are divided into 5 sections that describe a representation of 5 compactness attributes (the last attribute that is a process to realize compactness is not taken into account when conducted appraisal, since it should be considered along change of time). Despite in previous chapter generally has already indicated that Yogyakarta City is still so far from ideal condition of a city compaction based statistical data analysis related to attributes of compactness, but based on the rapid appraisal study resulted many revealed detail findings. For instance, it is important to note that some ideas respectively like population (density) control, vertical living based on actual kampung residents conditions, tradition and awareness to carry out some activities inside kampungs, support to public transport that suitable with their needs, optimum size of kampung that corresponds to kampung facilities and infrastructure provision, as well as some specific programs related to social welfare improvement would be great consideration for KOD adjustments in further developed models. In this case, schemes in some design approaches to correspond programs and activities needed in KOD model become a significant step. Moreover, coincided with further related step to make more concrete on this initiative; it is also necessary to firstly measure compactness attributes and its indicators in the kampungs statistically. Those would clearly describe possibilities of some adjustments through KOD model as a representation of compaction development in the developing countries’ cities. Finally, as illustrated in Figure 13, kampung conditions in one hand offer some potentials and challenges, such as higher density with a compact social community interaction, mixed use between dwelling and non dwelling land. In the other hand, many aspects should be considered and involved if compactness may be implemented, such as choices in public transport intensification, scenario to strengthen socio-economic of the community by development approach, and other relevant strategies.
6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Firstly and undoubtedly, kampungs and its entities that embrace social, economic, culture, as well as physic dimensions showed an important role to represent urban settlement model in Indonesian cities that dealing with many related problems. It is common as considerable beliefs that kampung is an integral part of urban structure in Indonesian cities and will take direct role substantially in the process of urban development. Some observations using a case study in Yogyakarta City's data and its kampungs were reviewed based on compactness attributes discussions. Those compactness attributes respectively are population densification, activity concentration, public transport intensification, certain city size and access consideration, social economic welfare target in the city areas, and finally, a development process to deliver compactness condition. Some related potentials and challenges of urban compaction development were observed and certainly embedded in kampungs entities and their daily lifes.

Kampung Oriented Development (KOD) as a core model has been introduced as important approach for both initiating urban compaction model and overcoming some problems in kampung development. It is systematically a strategic attempt through a comprehensive policy using kampung as focus area of development that encompasses several intensive developments based on characteristics of kampung as
integral part of urban structure. However, some works should be worked to follow this concept up into realization, such as measuring compactness attributes, simulating the results, as well as taking a pilot project in the case study area. These further works will generate more meaningful attempts toward a compactness condition in developing countries.
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