

Towards Livable City: Are People Ready to Live Vertically?

Pre-evaluation of living in walk-up flat in Yogyakarta

Deva Fosterharoldas SWASTO

Lecturer and researcher

Department of Architecture and Planning, Faculty of Engineering, Gadjah Mada University

INDONESIA

devafswasto@yahoo.com

Abstract

The developed countries have sophisticated living standard which became 'gap' to those on developing countries. The rich countries usually have advance mass transportation, less pollution (both air and water), balanced population growth and density, and so on. This situation cannot yet be achieved by the developing countries, due to several issues. It will also take quite a period before the similar 'stable' condition can be catch up. However, the same problems are faced by both groups, i.e. urbanization. One of the major issues in this urbanized situation is housing aspect.

In comparison, it can be said that the developed countries have better housing situation. There, it is almost 'a must' to live in vertical situation (apartment, walk-up flat and so on), due to the scarcity and high price of land in urban area. The different situation occurs in developing countries i.e. Indonesia. People who cannot afford to rent / buy a house (considered as low-income people) usually occupy squatter and slum area. The government tries hard to generate upgrading programs to handle this issue, in which vertical housing becomes one of the bundled ideas (to replace and to accommodate). On the other hand, the middle class is offered apartment (as type of vertical housing) which is usually sold but not really occupied (just become an asset). As a consequence, it is a question whether people in Indonesia, especially low-income people, are 'really' ready to shift their living paradigm, from horizontal to vertical.

This paper will analyze the outcome of both qualitative and quantitative survey in case of 6 walk-up flats in Yogyakarta (comparing Yogyakarta city and Sleman regency cases). The low-income people, as the target of walk-up flat delivery, are expected to give 'honest' and 'clear' pre-evaluation about the positive and negative impact of living in vertical situation. The result will then be assumed to assess the people readiness in anticipating the fast growth of urbanization and their action in moving towards livable 'city' issue.

Keywords: vertical living, pre-evaluation, walk-up flat, Yogyakarta-Indonesia

1. BACKGROUND

General situation

In Indonesia, living in vertical situation is only an option. There is still many housing unit offered in form of landed house. The high price of land in urban situation, due to its limitation, is tricked by expanding the development to sub-urban areas. However, in many big cities, apartment unit is being built by private developer and targeted to middle-higher income people. Parallel with that, at this moment, the government provides alternative to house people, particularly low-income group, in form of walk-up flat. The government considers that the sub-urban landed house will not be sufficient and affordable to house people, related to its high cost for transportation. While apartment provision has its own market-based circumstances, the walk-up flat has its own challenge, in which the target has financial limitation. Therefore, if there is almost no difficulty for potential resident to live in apartment situation (and they have option to do so or not), the challenge faced by prospective dweller (from low-income group) is relatively greater. People are usually live in landed house although in relatively bad situation (slum and squatter). Thus, this landed house culture, particularly in kampong situation must now be adjusted when people move to vertical walk-up flat. As a result, it is a question whether low-income people are ready to live in vertical housing considering their limitation and (past) cultural experience.

Walk-up flat characteristic

Walk-up flat in Indonesia has the maximum height of 4 to 5 storey, based on concern of not having vertical movement equipment except stairs (Swasto, 2012). This is arranged to press the tight budget by having optimal outcome. The definition itself is a multi storey building, which is built in such an environment and consists of units that functionally structured both horizontally and vertically (Law No. 16/1985 and Law No. 20/2011 concerning Walk-up Flat). These units can be owned and lived separately by respective user / resident and equipped with sharing (social) unit, land and infrastructure

Walk-up flat delivery

The initiation of walk-up flat is delivered by vertical housing history in Indonesia in the 1950s by building 4 floors flat in Jakarta (Yudohusodo et al, 1991: 345 in Herlinawati, 2010). The form of this residential unit is an apartment or walk-up flat (*rumah susun*) which is formerly known as flats. Low cost apartment / flat is called *rumah susun sederhana / rusuna* and internationally recognized as walk-up flat (Swasto, 2012). Nowadays, *rusuna* is then can be distinguished by its ownership into owned walk-up flat (*rumah susun sederhana milik / rusunami*) and rental walk-up flat (*rumah susun sederhana sewa / rusunawa*) or rental public housing. The target group of the *rusunami* is the middle class society, while *rusunawa* / rental public housing is targeted for low-income people (*Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah / MBR*).

The development of flat was then recognized being provided by National Housing Estate (*Perum Perumnas*), appointed by Central Government, in 1990s. The developments were located in many big cities in Indonesia. In the era of 2000s, the walk-up flat development was constructed by Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Public Housing, which was then became the main actors / institutions (Swasto, 2012).

In later developments, although the walk-up flat has several positive sides, not all parts of the community do like or want to live in this housing unit (Yudohusodo et al, 1991: 352 in Herlinawati, 2010). Most people still prefer to live in ordinary landed houses for various psychological and socio-cultural reasons. It is said that they still want to live in a landed house that directly connect with the ground or garden to grow crops, nurture pets, and to play with kids. They need to be close with the yard surrounding the house. In addition, they also do not like to be bounded too much by several rules that apply for living in flats. Apart from the positive and negative sides of living in walk-up flat and problem of public acceptance in doing so, since Indonesia population will continue to grow, while urban land is limited mainly in major and medium cities, the development of living vertical has become already a must (Yudohusodo et al, 1991: 352 in Herlinawati, 2010). Therefore, further efforts are needed to practice people to get used to live in flats, although it still takes time in the process.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research is focusing on walk-up flat delivery in Yogyakarta, particularly situated in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency, considering their length of occupancy period which is the earliest among other regencies. The exploration was chosen among *rental* walk-up flat cases (*rusunawa*), since there is no *owned* walk-up flat (*rusunami*), yet, in Yogyakarta. The selection of 6 cases, besides based on length of tenancy, also due to its similarity of general target group, objective and outcome. The walk-up flat cases are three *rusuns* along Code Riverbank in Yogyakarta City (Cokrodirjan / Code, Jogoyudan / Gowongan and Juminahan / Tegalpanggung walk-up flat), and three *rusuns* in Sleman Regency (Gemawang, Mranggen and Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan walk-up flat)

In addition, this research was carried out by using qualitative approach, supported by quantitative questionnaire. In-depth interview to 30s respondents (the residents of walk-up flats and surrounding communities) was conducted, in which their responses were then converted to keywords/issues to find themes/sub-themes of their assessment towards living in walk-up flat situation. A quantitative questionnaire was then being asked to 76 people on 6 locations afterwards, in order to explore the trend of response and compare the qualitative result. Among these 76 questionnaires, 1/3 is responses from surrounding communities. The questions asked to the residents were: (1) evaluation of flat facility (space / room, water, electricity, social area, comfortability, cleanness, safety / security, facility needed to be added and others), (2) adaptation for living in flat (difficulty during living in flat, socialization and others) and (3) other comments (overall feeling after living in flats, desire and reason of moving out and overall evaluation),

while to surrounding communities are impacts to physical-environmental (health, comfortability and security), social (interaction, gap / behavior and dangerousness), economical (income and expense) and overall aspects.

This paper will not distinguish the result in detail based on respective walk-up flats area, but merge it to demonstrate general situation. Parallel to that, the quantitative result will not be shown in percentage or numbers but described in trends of opinion.

3. GENERAL SITUATION

Yogyakarta Special Province has an area with size about 3,185.80 km², inhabited by more than 3 million people (greater Yogyakarta). It consists of 5 city/regencies, namely Yogyakarta City, Sleman Regency, Kulon Progo Regency, Bantul Regency and Gunung Kidul Regency. Yogyakarta City is being one of big cities in Indonesia (particularly in Java Island). The urban-rural situation blended in (urban) kampong situation In Yogyakarta City, as well as in the other regencies although with different intensity. There is not so many tall (or even medium-rise) building in Yogyakarta Special Province, in which the maximum height is 7-8 floors, considering its Adisucipto International Airport location, situated within the Yogyakarta City. The land limitation, particularly in the city (Yogyakarta City) in the center, causes the development to be expanded to surrounding regencies and or considered to vertical situation. However, the existence of medium-rise building is only a few and most of the vertical building being built within 2-3 floors (low-rise building), especially the residential housing.

Since 2004/2005, there was a massive walk-up flat development in Yogyakarta Special Province, with maximum height of 4 to 5 floors. Until today (2012), there are 26 walk-up flat (including student dormitory) being built, distributed in the city and regencies, with exception in Gunung Kidul Regency (there is not yet walk-up flat in Gunungkidul Regency). The total number of unit is 2,306, in which 1 building (twin block) usually consist of 68-96 unit respectively. This walk-up flat is dedicated for low-income people (*Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah / MBR*) and formerly being a part of upgrading/renewal program. All of the walk-up flat is developed by Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Public Housing. Actually, these two ministries have different rationale, task and objective. Ministry of Public Works is delivering rental walk up flat (*rumah susun sederhana sewa / rusunawa*) and aiming low-income people in general (but particularly related to upgrading/renewal situation), while Ministry of Public Housing is building owned walk-up flat (*rumah susun sederhana milik / rusunami*) and apartment, targeting moderate income and or specific purpose (in which this specific purpose may also related to low-income people in general). However, in Yogyakarta case, the walk-up flat delivery situation provided by these two ministries may blend concerning their good will to house people in need.

Table 1. Data of Walk-up Flat in Special Province of Yogyakarta in the Year 2011, based on Regency / City
Source: Department of Public Works, Special Province of Yogyakarta, 2011

No	Location	No. of buildings (twin block)	No. of units (unit)
1	Yogyakarta City	6	524
2	Sleman Regency	12	1132
3	Bantul Regency	6	554
4	Kulonprogo Regency	2	96
		26	2306

Table 2. Comparison of Walk-up Flat Cases in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency

Source: analysis, Swasto 2012 with modification

Name	Yogyakarta City			Sleman Regency		
	Rusun Cokrodirjan / Code	Rusun Jogoyudan / Gowongan	Rusun Juminahan / Tegalpanggung	Rusun Gemawang	Rusun Mranggen	Rusun Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan
Year	2004/2005	2007	2008	2005/2006 (postponed to 2007 due to Yogya's May 2006 Earthquake)	2009/2010	2009/2010 and 2010/2011
Location	Suryatmajan sub-district, Danurejan District	Gowongan sub-district, Jetis District	Tegalpanggung sub-district, Danurejan District	Sinduadi sub-district, Mlati District	Sinduadi sub-district, Mlati District	Condongcatur sub-district, Depok District
Size (Ha)	0.3	0.265 (1st phase) 0.25 (2nd phase)	0.1	0.3 (1 st phase) 0.35 (2 nd phase)	0.3	Approximately 1 or more (large area)
Capacity (unit)	72	192 (96 + 96)	68	192 (96 + 96)	96	273 (2x96 + 72 + 96)
Number of block / tower	1 twin block	2 twin block	1 twin block (1 integrated building)	2 twin block	1 twin block (1 integrated building)	4 twin block (8 buildings)
Number of floor	4	4	5	4	5	4 (1 st and 2 nd phase), 5 (3 rd phase)
Site location	Code Riverbank (Sultan ground)			Village saving land (<i>tanah kas desa</i>)		
Builder	Ministry of Public Works			Ministry of Public Works		Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Public Housing (for 2 nd / 3 rd phase)
Objective	Enhancing slum area in riverbanks, reducing carbon footprint	Enhancing slum area in riverbanks, housing low-income labor	Enhancing slum area in riverbanks, housing low income people ('in general')	Enhancing 'slum area', housing low-income people 'in general' (also targeted for healthy housing program / 'Rumah Sederhana Sehat / RSH')		
Size	21 m2			21-24 m2		27 m2 (phase I) 21-24 m2 (phase II)
Rent	Rp. 75.000 – 85.000		Rp. 5.000 (previous dweller) - 150.000 (new dweller)	Rp. 120.000 – 190.000	Rp. 150.000 – 225.000	Rp. 160.000– 250.000
Dweller	People from existing location ("slum" area)	Low-income labor (people with labor job)	Low-income people (10% people from existing location, others: general)	Low-income people (people from various location and characteristic)		
Manager	Kampong (neighborhood leader) / appointed person	People from previous location / appointed person	Appointed person / hired by Local Department of Public Works	Integrated Management Unit (<i>UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu</i>) Sleman Regency		
Characteristic	Homogenous community (existing dwellers), long bounded community, few people still doing previous habit (throwing garbage to the river and bathing in the river)	Homogenous community (labor)	10 units are existing dwellers / community, while others = "new" people; quite "individualistic", relatively new community	Heterogeneous community		

4. PRE-EVALUATION OF LIVING IN WALK-UP FLAT

The pre-evaluation of living in walk-up flat can be categorized into three main findings, taken from both perspective of the residents and surrounding communities. The issues are physical-environmental aspect, socio-economical concern and others.

a. Flat facility assessment and physical-environmental impact

Most of the residents being interviewed said that they are happy to live in the walk-up flat. They stated that living in walk-up flat has many advantages compare to their previous situation. It was stated further, especially by relocated people living in walk-up flat as part of upgrading program, that their now unit is generally better. Physically, the residents said that their unit are livable, since they felt secure (in terms of tenure), safe (due to less criminality), comfortable (in terms of good air / temperature), and convenient (related to adequate size of the unit). In addition, the complete facility within walk-up flat is also mentioned as positive factor. Usually, the walk-up flat is equipped with social / public space, parking area, yard and or sport facility, whilst the unit itself generally consists of bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, outdoor terrace / corridor and drying area in the back. There is always design improvement for later walk-up flat development.

The main issue as said by the residents is the water quality and imperfect completion of the building. For the walk-up flat building located near the Code river (in the case of the three walk-up flats in Yogyakarta City), the water quality is muddy and undrinkable since the *ferrum* component is very high. Therefore, the residents have to take water from surrounding wells or buy mineral bottles. In terms of building condition, the finishing is not perfect since there are leakages in some parts / units.

In non-physical aspect, the respondents said that the rent is inexpensive and the location is quite strategic (can be accessed easily). Therefore, they also gave positive remarks in this side. However, the maximum 2 times 3 years tenancy period is considered too short, added with the reality that there is no further option to own the unit or no access to owned walk-up flat (*rusunami*). The possibility to extend the period becomes one of the residents' aspirations.



Figure 1. *Rumah Susun* Cokrodirjan / Code in Yogyakarta City



Figure 2. *Rumah Susun* Jogoyudan / Gowongan in Yogyakarta City



Figure 3. *Rumah Susun* Juminahan / Tegalpanggung in Yogyakarta City



Figure 4. *Rumah Susun* Gemawang in Sleman Regency



Figure 5. *Rumah Susun* Mranggen in Sleman Regency



Figure 6. *Rumah Susun* Dabag / Pringwulung/Condongcatur/Seturan in Sleman Regency

Parallel to this resident's review, generally the surrounding communities gave neutral to positive assessment in physical-environmental aspect. In physical-environmental concern, they said that the walk-up flat development has positive aspect to surrounding situation in terms of infrastructure enhancement after

completion. However, the people said that the construction was noisy since the location is very close to their house. In non-physical aspect, the surrounding community provided different assessment. Some of them said that the impact is none / so-so (they felt alright with that), while the others gave opinion that the situation is now getting more crowded.

Similar to above qualitative interview result, the quantitative questionnaires also showed that most of the residents gave positive assessment of fair to good for the condition of walk-up flat facilities in general. There is only water provision issue and risk of having flood (for walk-up flat located near Code river) being a concern of the residents. In addition, the surrounding communities mostly gave neutral opinion related to the physical-environmental impact. They said that there is relatively no difference after the completion of walk-up flat building compare to before situation. The issue of health, comfortability and security is being said as usual or just normal.

b. Adaptation for living in flat and social-economic impact

Generally, the residents of walk-up flat gave opinion that they face no difficulty in shifting their experience from horizontal to vertical living. They said that dwelling in walk-up flat is different compare to their previous situation in landed house, since there are new conditions and social norms. However, most of them stated that they were able to adapt and or adjust their unit despite some limitations. The action of this adjustment within limited space are expanding the unit, dividing the unit both horizontally and vertically, creating consensus space for doing communal activity, utilizing open space / 'left over' space and doing shifting period for using communal space, which are considered as 'creative' effort (Swasto, 2008 and 2010).

In addition, the residents said that there is also no difficulty to interrelate among themselves as well as to surrounding community. Therefore, it was mentioned that social interaction and harmony can still be conducted. However, the intensity is not always as expected due to its social dynamics. According to that, the surrounding community gave opinion that the social interaction is different to previous situation. It is said that the bond is stronger in the past since they know each other quite well due to long relationship. At this moment, the resident of walk-up flat are relatively new person, even comes from different area / regency.



Figure 7. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Cokrodirjan / Code



Figure 8. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Jogoyudan / Gowongan



Figure 9. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Juminahan / Tegalpanggung



Figure 10. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Gemawang



Figure 11. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Mranggen



Figure 12. Social interaction in *Rumah Susun* Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan

By exploring the quantitative questionnaires, it is showed that most of the residents gave similar result as above qualitative findings. They said that there is relatively no difficulty in doing adaptation to live in walk-up flat. The act of socialization is formed by creating communal association and conducting periodical meeting. However, not all of the residents actively involved in this event. The temporary situation of renting the walk-up flat unit and not knowing each other quite close becomes their major reason. In addition, generally the surrounding communities gave neutral opinion according to the socio-economical impact. They said that the situation is just usual, compare to previous experience. However, some people who have stall (selling food and daily goods) said that there is economic opportunity after the building of walk-up flat since there is more potential customer.

c. Other comments

Besides above assessments, there is also some issue related to living in vertical situation as raised by the residents of walk-up flat and sometimes supported by the opinion from surrounding communities. Those issues are as follows.

1) Aspiration to live in landed house in the future

Although most residents said that they ‘enjoy’ living in walk-up flat, it is being said that dwelling in vertical housing is just a temporary situation. They aware that they cannot live there too long or even forever, considering renting condition and the need to raise children when they grow up. They know that one day they have to move out, therefore they have to be prepared for that, by at least doing saving, building a small house in somewhere else little by little, and or looking for contract house / unit. The absence of owned vertical unit (rusunami) in further housing career ‘cycle’ and or no bigger room size available (in vertical flat) becomes the reason of this situation.

Based on quantitative survey, there were at least 1 person in every walk-up flat who prepare him/herself to move out, considering above reason of temporary renting, raising children, and or have already building house somewhere else.

2) Compatibility and flexibility of walk-up flat building

It is said that the residents have no difficulty in adapting or adjusting their circumstances when moving in vertical unit. However, the characteristic of the residents is various in terms of related existing job. Some of the residents said that they must also shift their existing job since living in walk-up flat means that there is limitation in doing previous work habit. For a resident who previously work as a service provider such as a tailor, he/she cannot open their home based enterprise as formerly happens. Resident who work as trader with mobile chart or as food stall seller also have difficulty in continuing their business since the unit space has limitation to store their chart, goods and or other necessary equipment. On the other hand, this limitation becomes economic opportunity for surrounding community since now they can offer certain service which cannot then be self-fulfilled by the residents, mainly in economic concern.

The above situation was not mentioned by the resident in quantitative survey, and only being said in in-depth interview. In addition, the economic opportunity was said in quantitative survey to the community surrounding walk-up flats which are located in relatively ‘new area’ in Sleman Regency.

Table 3. Comparison of Qualitative Assessment in Walk-up Flat Cases

Source: analysis, Swasto 2012 with modification

	Rusun Cokrodirjan / Code	Rusun Jogoyudan / Gowongan	Rusun Juminahan / Tegalpanggung	Rusun Gemawang	Rusun Mranggen	Rusun Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan
General assessment	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright		The occupants (existing community) are relatively happy; the surrounding community feel so-so (some feel not alright)	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright		
Exploration	Social activity occur mostly in ground level	Social activity occur in each level	There is rare social activity	There is rare social activity due to relatively ‘new’ circumstance (person)	There is rare social activity due to relatively “new” circumstance (building and community); the existence of association / <i>paguyuban</i>	

Table 4. Comparison of Quantitative Assessment in Walk-up Flat Cases

Source: analysis

	Rusun Cokrodirjan / Code	Rusun Jogoyudan / Gowongan	Rusun Juminahan / Tegalpanggung	Rusun Gemawang and Rusun Mranggen*	Rusun Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan
Residents					
Physical-environmental assessment	Good / positive, except water provision (mostly said 'bad')	Good / positive, except water provision (mostly said 'fair')	Good / positive, except water provision (some said 'fair to bad') and noise	Good / positive, except water provision (some said 'fair to bad') and room and electricity (some said 'bad')	Fair to good / positive, except water provision (mostly said 'bad'). Few said concern about cleanness and security
Socio-economic assessment	Most have / face no difficulty to adapt / adjust	Most have / face no difficulty to adapt / adjust	Most have / face no difficulty to adapt / adjust	Most have / face no difficulty to adapt / adjust	Only several fill the answer and mostly said they have no difficulty to adapt / adjust
Others	Almost all feel happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat	Most feel happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat	Almost all feel happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat	Most feel happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat	Almost all feel happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat
Surrounding communities					
Physical-environmental impact	Most said neutral to all aspects; some feel more crowded / stuffy	Most said neutral to all aspects; some said problem about waste water and mosquito	Almost all said neutral to all aspects	Almost all said neutral to all aspects	Almost all said neutral to all aspects
Socio-economic impact	Most said neutral to all aspects; some feel the social interaction is less frequented	Almost all said neutral to all aspect	Almost all said neutral to all aspects; most said 'good' to economic potency	Almost all said neutral to all aspects	Almost all said neutral to all aspects; some feel the social interaction is less frequented
Others	Almost all give neutral assessment towards the existence of walk-up flat	Almost all give neutral assessment towards the existence of walk-up flat	Almost all give neutral assessment towards the existence of walk-up flat	Almost all give neutral assessment towards the existence of walk-up flat	Almost all give neutral assessment towards the existence of walk-up flat; some said now is better

** note: the result is being joined since these walk-up flats are located in close / same area*

5. CONCLUSION

From above discussion, the conclusion can be summarized as follows.

- *Most of the residents are happy to live in walk-up flat*
It can be said from the finding that, although living in vertical situation is relatively new to most of them, the dwellers are happy / keep up to live in walk-up flat. The indicators are they want to return live there (rent again) after the rental period is over, they feel convenient / comfortable (related to opinion of having bigger / livable place, feeling good air / temperature, and experiencing bigger / enough room size rather than in previous building / house), and they feel safe and secure (in terms of tenure). In addition, the reason why they gave positive assessment towards living in walk-up flat is the inexpensive rent and its strategic location.
- *Most of the target group are eager to live in walk-up flat*
From the survey, the low-income people, as the potential target of walk-up flat program, are keen to live in walk-up flat. The indicators are the long awaiting list of living in walk-up flat and change of bad perception that living in such vertical housing is not comfortable.
- *In general, people are ready to live vertically*
Based on interview and questionnaires, the residents said that they may adapt to vertical living without any difficulty. This effort is carried out by reshaping social value in relatively new 'space' / environment. They have new neighbor, social process and norm, so they have to live in harmony / communal tolerance, by creating new community association within walk-up flat, new social space, and new social interaction within friendly atmosphere.

In addition, although most residents gave positive assessment in general, as well as neutral opinion given by the surrounding community, there are some further notes related to this vertical living situation.

- Living in rental walk-up flat means living in temporary situation (consideration of 'just' a 'transitory' housing). This situation leads to assumption that living in walk-up flat will only be suitable for a person with certain job characteristic, considering its limitation. However, there is a big opportunity cost for the residents to do saving, since the rent is considered inexpensive, compare to common situation. On the other hand, there is also enhancement of sanitation awareness if the walk-up flat delivery is being connected to slum upgrading / renewal program since the dwellers are provided with relatively better infrastructure condition.
- There is a dynamics of social activity (in terms of quality and frequency) as well as economic aspect. Although most residents said that they have no difficulty to move in vertical housing from previous landed house, there is certain pre-requirement related to this shifting experience. Since the circumstance (the neighbor and the value) is relatively new, there is also a change of social interaction. Therefore, it is necessary to create new social norm in order to achieve harmony. Communal tolerance and mutual interaction now becomes the main value above individual concern (Swasto, 2008 and 2010). In addition, the further issue of raising children should also be anticipated. Parallel to this concern, there may also be a change in economic aspect. Since space boundary within walk-up flat will limit people business activity, there should also be further consideration towards this issue.
- Despite its relatively completed facility, living in walk-up flat may not be as comfortable as expected if the physical delivery is not properly built. The residents (and supported by surrounding communities) provided notes on this problem of (physical) completion, which are: free-risky site (due to the close location of the walk-up flat near the river), the importance of good water provision, consideration of regular maintenance (for low-cost material) and its added cost, and the need of providing proper floor design / leveling priority (for elderly, diffable, and so on). Above it all, the perfect completion of the building (such as avoiding water leakage and or puncture) is considered as the main necessity.

For further research, this paper encourages study in an owned walk-up flat (*rusunami*) conducted in other place since there is only rental walk-up flat delivery in Yogyakarta. Comparison to different situation in higher flats (such as in medium-rise building in other places) can also be explored to improve the result. In addition, detailed impact in each aspect can also be examined.

6. REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2007) *Law / Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Number 16 Year 1985 concerning Vertical Housing (Rumah Susun)*, Transmedia Pustaka, Jakarta
- Herlinawati, Nurwi (2010) *Code of Conducts at Rusunawa Jogoyudan, Gowongan, Jetis Subdistrict, Yogyakarta*, Thesis post graduate planning program, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
- Rosadi, Meta G.M. (2010) *The Effectiveness of Affordable Vertical Housing in Enhancing Slum Area: Case Studies of Rusunawa Gemawang, Jogoyudan and Cokrodirjan*, Thesis post graduate planning program, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
- Swasto, Deva Fosterharoldas (2008) *Creative Spaces on Affordable Vertical Housing (Rusun): A Sharing Experience*, Proceeding of International Seminar "Artepolis 2", Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB), Bandung, August 8-9, 2008
- Swasto, Deva Fosterharoldas (2009) *The Upgrading Concept by The Approach of Social Housing: Case of Yogyakarta*, Proceeding of International CIB-W110 Meeting and Conference "Sustainable Slum Upgrading in Urban Area", Sebelas Maret State University, Surakarta, April 16, 2009
- Swasto, Deva Fosterharoldas (2010) *Adaptability and Creation of Creative Spaces on Affordable Vertical Housing (Rusun) and Its Surrounding: Case of Yogyakarta*, Proceeding of International Seminar "Artepolis 3", Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB), Bandung, July 22-24, 2010
- Swasto, Deva Fosterharoldas (2012) *Towards Sustainability: The Creativity of Managing Rental Walk-Up Flats in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*, Proceeding of International Seminar "Artepolis 4", Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB), Bandung, July 5-7, 2012
- Yudohusodo, Siswono et.al. (1991) *Housing for All / Rumah untuk Seluruh Rakyat*, (INKOPPOL)