

Towards Sustainability: The Creativity of Managing Rental Walk-Up Flats in Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Deva Fosterharoldas SWASTO

Lecturer and researcher

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

devafswasto@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Starting in 1980s and then becoming massive in 1990s and 2000s, many walk-up flats (rumah susun) have been built in many big cities in Indonesia. This type of building was developed as an alternative solution for housing the community, mainly for low income people. There was an interesting fact that people (both residents and surrounding community) may acclimatize to this shifting experience from horizontal to vertical (Swasto 2008, 2009, 2010). However, there are some situations in which the provided walk-up flats are remain empty or in the end, start to become slum which lead to unsustainable condition. According to this reality, this would also be interesting to explore whether people adaptation (or 'bottom-up creativity') is also happening in "management level" (or 'top-down creativity'). This question is based on challenging fact that the manager deals with low-income community (who relatively has a very limited resources), in which he must handle the 'survival activity' in order to be sustained.

In Yogyakarta Special Province, there are several units of rental walk-up flats that have been built until 2011. Some of them are built in Yogyakarta City (along the Code riverbank), while others are built in other regencies. It is interesting to know that there are differences of managing the walk-up flats among the respective managers, both in city/regency area level and even among the respective flats (within the same city/regency), although they have similar 'sustainability' objective. This paper will then be suggested to compare the creative management among walk-up flats in Yogyakarta as the main focus. The result is expected as a completion of study on creativity in people behavior within the walk-up flats, which has been delivered before in previous Artepulis conferences.

Keywords: *rental walk-up flats (rumah susun sederhana sewa), creative management, Yogyakarta, sustainability*

1. BACKGROUND

Definition of Walk-up Flat

Walk-up flat may best be described as a multi storey building, which is built in such an environment and consists of units that functionally structured both horizontally and vertically. These units can be owned and lived separately by respective user / resident and equipped with sharing (social) unit, land and infrastructure (Law No. 16/1985 concerning Walk-up Flat and the regulation of the Minister of Public Works No. 5/PRT/M/2007 concerning the Technical Guidelines Development for Walk-up Flat).

Unlike the other vertical housing delivery in other countries, the characteristic of walk-up flat in Indonesia may be distinguished by its concern of not having vertical movement equipment except stairs (no lift / elevator). This is the main reason why the height of walk-up flat is considered 'only' 4 storey (more or less, which may up to 6 floors), considering 'humanity' concern or easiness factor of walking up and down regularly and affordability issue for the (potential) occupants.

History of Walk-up Flat Delivery in Indonesia

The history of vertical housing in Indonesia, as initiation of walk-up flat, started in the 1950s with the construction and development of Kebayoran Baru suburban satellite city, Jakarta. At that time, its presence was known as a flat, a shelter that has four floors, which include flat for Ministry of Foreign Affairs staff and Police staff. These flats were dedicated to accommodate staff of respective institution and were also called government housing (*rumah dinas*) or tenure housing. The presence of these flats was pioneering the development of flats in Indonesia (Yudohusodo et. al, 1991: 345 in Herlinawati, 2010).

Then, within the increase demand for residential units, as well as increasing limited and expensive land prices in urban areas, an alternative supply of homes on that limited land, but expected to be able to accommodate more people whilst also relatively affordable to the public, was further developed in Indonesia. The form of this residential unit is an apartment or walk-up flat (*rumah susun*) which is formerly known as flats. Within the construction that consists of up to five floors and divided into several units, this 'simple' apartment (walk-up flat) can accommodate many households. In terms of ownership, the apartment can be in form of possession or rental property. Low cost apartment / flat is called *rumah susun sederhana / rusuna* and internationally recognized as walk-up flat. 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*).

In addition, walk-up flat was also dedicated for people affected by urban renewal projects, especially in slums upgrading program. This scheme of flats for accommodating relocated people have been conducted by the Directorate General of *Cipta Karya* (Ministry of Public Works) and Local Government of Jakarta. They developed these rental flats in various locations, namely in Pondok Bambu, Cipinang, and in Cengkareng, which were built in 1985. In 1986, they built rental flats in Pondok Kelapa whilst in 1987 in Tambora, followed by other developments in 1988 in Penjarangan, Pulo Mas, Karang Anyar, and Jatirawasari (Yudohusodo et al, 1991: 345 in Herlinawati, 2010).

Those above developments was then followed by National Housing Estate (*Perum Perumnas*) as the 'other' main institution, appointed by Central Government, in building many other walk-up flats in 1990s. These 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. To distinguish their role, it is 'agreed' that the rental walk-up flat (*rumah susun sederhana sewa / rusunawa*) becomes the concern of Ministry of Public Works, while owned walk-up flat (*rumah susun sederhana milik / rusunami*), public foundation flat (i.e. civil servant and army's flat) and (student) dormitory is handled by Ministry of Public Housing. However, there is a case in which rental walk-up flat construction is also built / supported by this later Ministry.

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. Most people still prefer to live in ordinary landed houses for various psychological and socio-cultural reasons. 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 (Yudohusodo et al, 1991: 352 in Herlinawati, 2010).

Viewed from the physical form of building condition, which is inhabited by many households adjacent to each other and the utilizations of the area and several objects are shared, there may bring potential for conflict and resistance as has previously been described. Related to all obstacles and limitations that exist in living in the walk-up flat, it is needed to have organization that can regulate the behavior of occupants. This organization or manager then can form rules to regulate rights, obligations, prohibitions, and sanctions for the occupants. These norms can originally source from the legal rules established by government institution (builder of the walk-up flat) or an agreement among residents. Rules are used as guidelines in doing occupancy and expected to cover all aspects of the residency, including safety, security, health issue, cleanliness, order, convenience, aesthetics, harmony, and humanity. Thus, unwanted disruption and potential conflicts can be minimized (Herlinawati, 2010). In conclusion, the manager or this management issue plays quite vital role for the maintenance of the walk-up flat development, considering its sustainability and tenant's limited affordability.

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. Again, beside physical consideration, the social aspect in form of managerial capacity is very important to support the sustainability of walk-up flat delivery.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

In 2008-2010, it was explored in Yogyakarta that the community, both the residents and the surrounding, relatively have no difficulty in adapting their habit when shifting their daily life experience from landed house / horizontal situation to vertical housing / walk-up flat or *rusun* (Swasto, 2008, 2009 and 2010). In addition, it was interesting to know that there was 'local creativeness' produced by the residents in this occupancy. However, there is further question whether this situation stands alone or relates with other 'creativity' in management level. It is interesting to investigate the kind of management issue, since walk-up flat issue deals with temporary occupancy period and low-income people as its target.

This paper is trying to explore what kind of creative management is formed in cases of walk-up flats. Generally, this paper is developing the findings of 'creative spaces' by the community, taken from bottom-up view (Swasto, 2008, 2009 and 2010), but the concern is shifted to management aspect or is taken from top-down perspective. The research is developed by exploring the managerial situation of walk-up flat cases in Yogyakarta Special Province, by looking at three *rusuns* along Code Riverbank in Yogyakarta City (Cokrodirjan / Code, Jogoyudan / Gowongan and Juminahan / Tegalpanggung walk-up flat), and compare these with other three *rusuns* in Sleman Regency (Gemawang,

Mranggen and Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan walk-up flat). The reason of choosing these walk-up flats is due to its period of occupancy, which will make easier for comparison and analysis. The qualitative approach is being used, while comparison technique will become the main method.

3. (CONTEXTUAL) SETTING AND CASES

General Description

In Yogyakarta, the development of walk-up flat was initiated in 2004/2005 by constructing Cokrodirjan/Code walk-up flat in Code riverbank. It was followed by other walk-up flats, in which until this moment, there are 26 walk-up flats (according to the data of Department of Public Works at Yogyakarta Provincial Level, 2011), including student dormitory and public foundation flat. The 'pure' rental walk-up flat / *rusunawa* (to distinguish those flats aimed for student, public/civil servant and other groups) targeted for low-income people are in amount of 8 units among total of 26 and located in Yogyakarta City (3 locations), Sleman Regency (3 locations), and Bantul Regency (2 locations). There is no owned walk-up flat (*rusunami*) until today in Yogyakarta. In addition, recently, there are 2 other new walk-up flats being built in Sleman Regency and expected to be finished in 2012.

Table 1. Data of Rental 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	Name of walk-up flat	Location		No. of buildings (twin block)	No. of units (unit)	Explanation
		Regency / City	District			
1	Gemawang	Sleman	Mlati	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2005/2006
2	UGM	Sleman	Depok	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2006
3	Gemawang	Sleman	Mlati	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2007
4	UII	Sleman	Ngemplak	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2007
5	UGM	Sleman	Depok	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2007
6	UII	Sleman	Ngemplak	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2008
7	UGM 3	Sleman	Depok	1	96	Ministry of Public Housing 2008
8	Gemawang	Sleman	Mlati	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2009
9	Pringwulung I	Sleman	Depok	2	192	Ministry of Public Works 2009
10	Pringwulung II	Sleman	Depok	1	72	Ministry of Public Works 2009
11	Stikes	Sleman	Gamping	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2009
	Total			12	1132	
1	UMY	Bantul	Kasihlan	2	192	Ministry of Public Works 2008
2	Panggunharjo	Bantul	Sewon	2	192	Ministry of Public Works 2009
3	AURI	Bantul	Banguntapan	1	74	Ministry of Public Works 2009
4	Tambak	Bantul	Kasihlan	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2009
	Total			6	554	
1	Cokrodirjan	Yogya	Danurejan	1	72	Ministry of Public Works 2004/2005
2	Jogoyudan	Yogya	Jetis	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2007
3	Tegalpanggung	Yogya	Danurejan	1	68	Ministry of Public Works 2008
4	Jogoyudan	Yogya	Jetis	1	96	Ministry of Public Works 2008
5	UAD	Yogya	Umbulharjo	1	96	Ministry of Public Housing 2008/2009

6	UST	Yogya	Umbulharjo	1	96	Ministry of Public Housing 2009
	Total			6	524	
1	UNY	Kulonprogo	Pengasih	2	96	Ministry of Public Housing 2009
	Total			2	96	
	Total overall			26	2306	

Among 5 cities/regencies within Yogyakarta Special Province, Yogyakarta City (2004/2005) and Sleman Regency (2005/2006) has the earliest start of walk-up flat development, compared to other 3 regencies. There is no walk-up flat being built in Gunungkidul Regency until today. The walk-up flats in Yogyakarta City were built along Code River as part of upgrading program, considering this area as the most densely populated area, compared to other two riverbanks: Winongo and Gadjahwong (Swasto, 2009). There was also a reason of finding the most suitable land and 'idle space' for constructing the walk-up flat building, while social acceptance also became important consideration. Almost similar reason of finding 'idle space' was the walk-up flat development in Sleman Regency. The village saving land (or *tanah kas desa*) became the most possible and affordable option for doing construction. However, different to Yogyakarta City walk-up flat cases, the walk-up flat development in Sleman Regency was not 'strongly' focused on 'upgrading' program or dedicated to surrounding area (like those cases in Code riverbank). As a consequence, the (potential) walk-up flat residents in Sleman's cases come from various places as well as their characteristic backgrounds, unlike those in the Yogyakarta City (except in Juminahan / Tegalpanggung walk-up flat).



Figure 1. Rumah Susun Cokrodirjan / Code in Yogyakarta City



Figure 2. Rumah Susun Jogoyudan / Gowongan in Yogyakarta City



Figure 2. 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

General comparison

The delivery of walk-up flats in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency can be described respectively in following tables.

Table 2. Comparison of Walk-up Flat Cases in Yogyakarta City*Source: analysis*

	Rusun Cokrodirjan / Code	Rusun Jogoyudan / Gowongan	Rusun Juminahan / Tegalpanggung
Year	2004/2005	2007	2008
Location	Code Riverbank (Sultan ground)	Code Riverbank (Sultan ground)	Code Riverbank (Sultan ground)
Builder	Ministry of Public Works	Ministry of Public Works	Ministry of Public Works
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')
Size	21 m ²	21 m ²	21 m ²
Rent	Rp. 75.000 – 85.000	Rp. 75.000 – 85.000	Rp. 5.000 (previous dweller) - 150.000 (new dweller)
Orientation	Facing the river	Facing back the river	Side to the river
Dweller	People from existing location ("slum" area)	Low-income labor (people with labor job)	Low-income people (10% people from existing location, others: general)
Manager	Kampong (neighborhood leader) / appointed person	People from previous location / appointed person	Appointed person / hired by Local Department of Public Works
Characteristic	Homogenous community (existing dwellers), "old" / 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
Assessment	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright	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)
Others (exploration)	Social activity occur mostly in ground level	Social activity occur in each level	There is rare social activity

Table 3. Comparison of Walk-up Flat Cases in Sleman Regency*Source: analysis*

	Rusun Gemawang	Rusun Mranggen	Rusun Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan
Year	2005/2006 (postponed to 2007 due to Yogya's Earthquake in May 2006)	2009/2010	2009/2010
Location	Village saving land (<i>tanah kas desa</i>)	Village saving land (<i>tanah kas desa</i>)	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 (2 nd / 3 rd phase)
Objective	Enhancing "slum area", housing low-income people 'in general' (also targeted for healthy housing program / "RSH")	Enhancing "slum area", housing low-income people 'in general' (also targeted for healthy housing program / "RSH")	Enhancing "slum area", housing low-income people 'in general' (also targeted for healthy housing program / "RSH")
Size	21-24 m ²	21-24 m ²	27 m ² (phase I) 21-24 m ² (phase II)
Rent	Rp. 120.000 – 190.000	Rp. 150.000 – 225.000	Rp. 160.000 – 250.000
Dweller	Low-income people (people from various location and characteristic)	Low-income people (people from various location and characteristic)	Low-income people (people from various location and characteristic)

Manager	Integrated Management Unit (UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu) Sleman Regency	Integrated Management Unit (UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu) Sleman Regency	Integrated Management Unit (UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu) Sleman Regency
Characteristic	Heterogeneous community	Heterogeneous community	Heterogeneous community
Assessment	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright	The occupants are happy, the surrounding community feel alright
Others (exploration)	There is rare social activity due to relatively “new” circumstance (person)	There is rare social activity due to relatively “new” circumstance (building and community), existence of association / <i>paguyuban</i>	There is rare social activity due to relatively “new” circumstance (building and community), existence of association / <i>paguyuban</i>

Based on above facts, it can be said that there are different condition of walk-up flat cases. In addition, there is also dissimilar managerial issue related to respective situation. Further discussion is delivered in following section.

4. COMPARISON OF CREATIVE MANAGEMENT

The comparison of walk-up flat cases in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency can be described as follows.

Table 4. Comparison Between Walk-up Flat Cases in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency

Source: analysis

	Walk-up Flats in Yogyakarta City	Walk-up Flats in Sleman Regency
Target	Enhancing slum area to healthy housing (<i>rumah sehat / RSH</i>), dedicated for existing low-income people (<i>MBR</i>)	Delivering proper housing (<i>rumah layak huni</i>), dedicated for low-income people (<i>MBR</i>) in general
Management issue	Handled “independently”, managed by community leader / appointed person	Managed by Integrated Management Unit (UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu) of Sleman Regency
Location	Situated in “relatively” slum area (riverbank) in downtown	Located in an “empty land” / (village saving land / <i>tanah kas desa</i>) or unproductive land
Difficulty	Rental price, physical quality maintenance, finding (idle) location for construction	“Sustainable” maintenance in long-term and in general (facing casuistic phenomenon)
Impact to dwellers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing physical awareness Socially, it is not as tied as before Economic issue: possible to do saving and seeking better chance for housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physically, it is not really much, since the existing is already “healthy” Socially, there is (still) relatively rare activity (although community association / <i>paguyuban</i> exists) Economic issue: possible to do saving and seeking better chance for housing
Impact to surrounding community	Not as much (there is relatively “no” negative impact)	Not as much (there is relatively “no” negative impact)
Lesson(s) learned	Social flexibility, 1 st hand residents	Good “revenue” (for maintenance), danger of “2 nd /3 rd users”
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rental price difficulty (except in case of Juminahan / Tegalpanggung’s new dwellers) Handed over issue (case of Jogoyudan/Gowongan and Juminahan / Tegalpanggung) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retribution system Handed over issue (case of Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan)

Although the sponsor of walk-up flat construction in Yogyakarta come from the same actor / institution (Ministry of Public Works, and Ministry of Public Housing in the case

of Dabag / Pringwulung / Condongcatur / Seturan walk-up flat), there is different story of each delivery. However, the themes and issues of 'creative' management can be discussed in general as follows.

a) Issue of awaiting period of handed over

After the construction is finished, the 'formal' handed over of the building (and its related management) from central government to the local government (as the future owner / manager) usually did not happen immediately. There is a phase / sequence (and bureaucracy) that should be followed, which may take months to years, before the local government may generate their policy to manage the walk-up flat (for instance in putting the management financial source to local tax and revenue / *Pendapatan Asli Daerah / PAD*). This situation leads to dilemma and less optimal maintenance. However, the local manager conduct creativity management by 'loosing' the 'strict' objective a little bit of targeting low-income people, so the main priority shifts from ideal concept to less. It can be said that the new objective is to have full tenants which then lead to the ability to cover the expense of maintenance. Nevertheless, after the handed over process is realized, the delivery can be brought back to its ideal target. This phenomenon occurred in all cases of walk-up flat in Yogyakarta.

b) Issue of raising (internal) community awareness

It is a fact that the manager deals with low-income community who relatively has a very limited resources and also minimum environmental concern. Therefore, it sometimes becomes difficult to deal with the community will of maintaining, for instance, sharing facilities. However, the manager creates circumstance in which rules, code of conduct, and social norms can be recognized and easily followed by the community. Since the beginning, there is preliminary orientation for the potential residents before they can enter to occupy the walk-up flat unit. It is strongly be underlined that living in the flats is different with living in landed house. Communal concern should be put first before somebody's (individual) right. This certain situation is endorsed by the managers of walk-up flat in both cases of Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency. They believe that community awareness plays important role for the sustainability of walk-up flat delivery. As a consequence, socialization is delivered regularly in every possible opportunity. In addition, there is always regular meeting and interaction between the manager and resident's representative, in order to have constructive feedback and to shape better communal concern.

c) Issue of keeping social interaction within temporary period

Although the potential user come from relatively similar condition in cases of walk-up flat in Yogyakarta City (regarding its objective of upgrading program), generally there are various backgrounds and characteristics of the residents in the long run. As a consequence, there will be also heterogeneous community and its related communal interaction. In addition, added by the fact in which living in rental walk-up flat is 'just' a temporary experience and adaptation, it will not be easy to maintain good social interaction within such 'limited' period. The issue of keeping sustainable social harmony is quite challenging. Nevertheless, knowing that it will be impossible to do by his own, the manager usually 'generate' the residents to create such an association (*paguyuban*), in which it can help him to bridge the ideas for common concern. The rules and reward-punishment system then can also be disseminated easily through group leaders. In addition, potential conflict among residents can be early recognized and or solved together, while social activity can also be planned and implemented. This situation can be seen in both cases in Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency, although with different approach. There is a good leadership of informal community leader and strong bounded history as the main advantage in Yogyakarta City's walk-up flat management, whilst there is a formal association that is strongly supported by the local government manager (Integrated Management Unit / UPT / Unit Pengelolaan Terpadu) of Sleman Regency to become bridging actor in managerial aspect.

d) Issue of minimizing negative impact to (external) surrounding

In order to minimize negative impact to the surrounding, mainly in social aspect, the managers are encouraged by the local government to be able to keep good relationship between the residents and the community in general. Therefore, community involvement / participation are endorsed to be conducted as the basic social approach. There is recruitment effort of the local / surrounding community as part of the management creativity, as happened both in Yogyakarta City's walk-up-flat cases (in which the informal leader is appointed as the manager) and in Sleman Regency (in which the local community is recruited as security officer, cleaning person, and so on). There is also regular active interaction with neighborhood unit (*Rukun Tetangga / Rukun Warga*) as well as with faith leader of certain religion (for instance, there is a collaborative activity with surrounding mosque to celebrate Holy Month/Day in Islamic religion). The objective of above effort is to build social tolerance and mutual benefit, in which it is considered also helpful for security and sustainability concern.

e) Issue of maintaining consensus in day to day activity

There is a communal consensus that becomes part of managerial regulation. Every issue is discussed by sitting together in order to achieve better solution and gain continuous improvement. Keeping a pet (i.e. bird) is one of the examples. The regulation for this issue is different from one to another walk-up flats, based on respective consensus. For example, in Gemawang and Mranggen walk-up flat, the managers only allow their residents to keep bird in 1st floor, while other walk-up flat's manager may allow keeping it in certain area or even in front of owner's unit. This code of conduct may change based on resident's opinion, considering its impact to communal concern. Other 'small' issue such as who will be responsible for public space cleanness (i.e. whether it is decided to do rotate shift or maybe the manager will hire somebody to clean it based on resident's expenses) can also become social consensus. Here, it is the manager who can do creative effort by flooring the issue to the resident and generate the idea.



Figure 7. Keeping bird in 1st floor (Gemawang walk-up flat case)



Figure 8. Keeping bird in the corner (Dabag/Pringwulung case)



Figure 9. Keeping bird in front of its owner's house (Cokrodirjan case)

5. CONCLUSION

It is quite possible that the concept of "living under the same roof" and the shifting way of thought from "individual to togetherness" becomes the main accentuation endorsed by the manager of walk-up flat, as similar as resident's adaptation (Swasto, 2008 and 2010). In addition of the creative management, there are also quite similar community values, as explored in resident's experience, that determine the success and sustainability of walk-up delivery, which can be described as the need of sharing / raising communal awareness, consensus and responsibility, the need of doing tolerance or generating the concept of living in harmony within limited resources and heterogeneous condition, the need of conducting regular communal dialogue, and the important role of resident's association and its leadership in coordinating social activity.

Furthermore, the similar findings can also be drawn from the creativity of the community, taken from bottom-up perspective (Swasto, 2008 and 2010). From this point of view, it can be seen that there is creativity of utilizing all possible opportunity in using sharing facilities (in order to be able to adapt / live within limited spaces and resources) as well as creating consensus space and consensus shifting period to do communal activity (the phenomenon of having 'other' informal communal space in addition to the formal one and taking-turns actors / persons in using public spaces based on consensus schedule). Parallel to that, from top-down situation or management creativity perspective, there is also intention of utilizing all possible managerial issue for the objective of maintaining sustainable activity as well as generating effort to create / keep social interaction as much / often as possible within the framework of public awareness.

In conclusion, both the top-down perspective (taken from management creativity) and bottom-up view (taken from community creativeness) have quite similar objective that is to be able to live in sustainable harmony in relation to the shifting of community living experience from horizontal situation to vertical. In addition, it also means that tolerance and togetherness is becoming the main and underlined paradigm, while creativity is absolutely needed for conducting adaptation within certain limited resources in both perspectives, management and adaptation.

6. REFERENCES

- AKIS, Mimi R and Koeswahyono, Imam (2010) *Konsepsi Hak Milik atas Satuan Rumah Susun dalam Hukum Agraria*, Setara Press, Malang Jawa Timur
- ANONYMOUS (2007) *Law / Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Number 16 Year 1985 concerning Vertical Housing (Rumah Susun)*, Transmedia Pustaka, Jakarta
- HERLINAWATI, Nurwi (2010) *Thesis: Code of Conducts at Rusunawa Jogoyudan, Gowongan, Jetis Subdistrict, Yogyakarta*, Post graduate planning program, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
- KOMARUDIN (1997) *Menelusuri Pembangunan Perumahan dan Permukiman*, PT. Rakasindo, Jakarta:
- KUSWAHYONO, Imam (2004) *Vertical Housing Law: Introduction (Hukum Rumah Susun: Suatu Bekal Pengantar Pemahaman)*, Bayumedia, Malang
- ROSADI, Meta G.M. (2010) *Thesis: The Effectiveness of Affordable Vertical Housing in Enhancing Slum Area: Case Studies of Rusunawa Gemawang, Jogoyudan and Cokrodirjan*, Post graduate planning program, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
- SUTEDI, Adrian (2010) *Hukum Rumah Susun dan Apartemen*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta Timur
- 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
- YUDOHUSODO, Siswono et.al. (1991) *Housing for All / Rumah untuk Seluruh Rakyat*, (INKOPPOL)