

Surviving Urban Renewal Program: Case Study of a Traditional Urban Village in Kuala Lumpur

Sharifah Mariam Alhabshi

Abstract

The study undertakes an analysis of the development trajectory and outcomes of a 110 years Malay village located within Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia called Kampung Baru. More specifically the study seeks to account for the development paths of this village brought about by urbanization and planning. The village is characterized by relative tranquility and neat layout of traditional Malay houses, has relatively been retarded in its development with poor roads and sanitation even though the rest of metropolitan of Kuala Lumpur is enjoying a boom in economic growth and prosperity. The methodology that has been employed for this study relied on empirical field work that utilized both participant observation and a questionnaire survey. The research found political, historical and institutional factors has delayed planning and renewal of the (35,000 people and 153.35 km²) area. The consequence of the delay has been detrimental to landowners but advantages to non-owners and migrants who have been taking advantage of the area cheap rent and strategic location. The situation will soon change, however, for the city authority can no longer tolerate increasing criticism of the area disgracing image in the midst booming Kuala Lumpur city. Renewal is therefore certain but the fate of the village traditional image is uncertain.

Keywords: renewal, culture, Malay, village

INTRODUCTION

A village is a community of people or human settlement relatively clustered and smaller than a town. It is a term is often used to denote communities that are small and subsistence based, local, rural and fundamentally traditional particularly, tied to some socio-cultural heritage. In light of the nature of the village under review, has witnessed some form of developmental transitions, this paper rather refer a village to a community that is still closely tied to its cultural and traditional values however, situated and coexisting within a metropolitan area. The portrayal of a village in this paper is coherently in tandem with Qi Changging et al. (2007 28) description of an urban village which they referred to as “rural enclaves inside large cities or in their peri-urban areas characterized by high building densities, poor building quality, irregular streets and open sewage”. Physically these are areas surrounded and overshadowed by skyscrapers, transportation infrastructures, and other modern urban constructions.

In such areas, rental is relatively cheap and hence, attracts the poor and transient who come from the rural areas to make a living in the city. The deplorable living standard often breeds social problems such as crime, drug addiction, alcoholism and prostitution. Such areas are not regulated by the city authorities particularly due to opposition from the local inhabitants who do not want any infringement to their simple traditional ways of life and most importantly, because such areas do not generate income, less attention is paid to them by city councils. In addition, most of these areas are under facilitated yet overcrowded and buildings are haphazardly arranged, roads are narrow making it difficult for vehicles to pass through. Interesting though, despite the unsightly environment, many of these villages have designated areas for cultural activities and some have special shopping and market streets which attracts a wide spectrum of people from within and outside the village areas.

With few exceptions, these descriptions of a village from the Chinese context given by Qi Changging et al. (2007) is aptly similar to features inherent of Kampung Baru a case study of this paper. The difference with Kampung Baru to the Chinese village could be seen in the nature of the environment and population type. Kampung Baru are lively villages (relatively noisy not from bustling of vehicles but children playing and hawkers fighting for the attention of shoppers by shouting out their bargains) characterised by hardworking family oriented households. Like in China, buildings or houses in this village is haphazardly arranged, old and without proper maintenance. However, unlike China, they are bright, paved with fruit trees and garden crops and there is a strong communal relationship amongst inhabitants in this area which simultaneously enhances safety of the areas from likely social vices particularly crime.

It can be adduced that Kampung Baru has some similar characteristics with urban villages in some Western countries with reference to the descriptions provided by the Institute of Civil Engineers, United Kingdom (ICE UK) (2009) and Homs (2007). According to ICE UK:

An urban village is a concept of a settlement which is small enough to create a community in the truest sense of the word - a group of people who support each other, but big enough to maintain a reasonable cross section of facilities. Walking determines the size - a 10 minute walk from one side to the other. To provide a sufficiently large population to maintain a range of community facilities all within a walkable distance means the density of development must be high. An urban village is densely developed in the centre, with town squares and key community focal points, density eases away from the centre, and the boundary of the village is marked by greenspace (<http://www.ice.org.uk/rtpdf/BS-Urban%20Villages.pdf>).

In the same vein, Homs (2007) characterized an urban village as an area that offers various types of residence as well as a variety of infrastructures and functions, and provides the avenue for social interconnectedness and firm interaction between residents. The urban village is basically designed towards social construction which ultimately provides a community with the benefits of modernization and at the same time strives hard to reduce the erosion of local character and distinctiveness. In other words, urban villages are characterized by a comprehensive blend of local and modern communal structures.

Kampung Baru somewhat shares similar characteristics with urban villages present in some countries of the East and West. But the most distinguishing features rests on the loose plan and simple social setting that can be found in the two villages, which allow easy social and economic interaction among neighbors in the community. The next section provides a vivid picture of Kampung Baru as it explores their backgrounds as well as their varying transitions of change.

THE CASE AREA

The study undertakes an analysis of the development trajectory and outcomes of a 110 years Malay village located within Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. It has 35,000 population and an area measuring 153.35 km². Specifically this study seeks to account for the development paths of this village brought about by urbanization and planning. Kampung Baru is characterized by relative tranquility and neat layout of traditional Malay villages, has relatively been retarded in its development with poor roads and sanitation even though the rest of the capital city and Malaysia was enjoying a boom in economic growth and prosperity.

In examining the case, the paper looks at variables including historical, institutional, political and socio-cultural factors. The historical narrative is straightforward offering an evolutionary background to the current state of affairs. The political institutions that will be examined pertain

to different governing structures and processes of decision making. In particular, the role of leadership shall be examined. How planning was organized and carried out will also be looked at.

The methodology that has been employed relied on empirical field work that utilized both participant observation and a questionnaire survey. Historical data have been assembled by library research and interviews. Owing to the explorative nature of this study, the qualitative data analysis technique has been employed to extract and analyze data with the intent to raise distinct features from the village. This is done by exploring relationships and patterns across categories where the study develops matrices to highlight the link between process and outcomes.

The paper is organized into two main parts. Part I examines the institutional and cultural factors at play in forging the effects that were experienced in the village. In part II, researcher presents the questionnaire survey method and results. In the final part, researcher evaluate the meaning of the preceding two parts as researcher search for explanations for the results in urban planning of the Kampung Baru. Researcher begins by giving some general background information of Kampung Baru. After this is done in Part I, researcher look at the social and political dynamics that underpin their renewal programs by connecting it to development drivers namely; political power and leadership. Here researcher also throws light to the varying renewal issues inherent in both villages simply as a way of providing direct comparisons of both areas. In particular, researcher discusses on future trends for the sustainability of the village as cultural artifacts in quest of identity and dignity. Researcher also offers recommendations for brighter prospects.

Renewal History and Issues

The growth of Kampung Baru is inextricably linked to the growth of Kuala Lumpur. In the 1800's, Kuala Lumpur was only a mining area however, its image gradually changed as a result of the huge increase

in the population which is accrued to massive influx of immigrants particularly from China, who were brought in by the British to work on tin mines. The status of Kuala Lumpur was further upgraded in 1880 when it became the capital for the state of Selangor (the present capital of the State of Selangor is Klang). Kuala Lumpur continue to prosper and in 1896, it was designated the capital of the Federated Malay States. At that time traders (namely from India) and other immigrants have comfortably settled in, and the Chinese were found to have concentrated the south of Kuala Lumpur, now called Chinatown, the Indians (mostly chettiar) chose the area around the Klang River, now called Merdeka Square and Jalan Masjid India, while the Malays chose the north-side, now called Jalan Tun Perak.

The congregation of Malays in Kampung Baru is obviously not by default but as a result of a premeditated colonial design. When the community was formed in 1897, it was referred to as Malay Agricultural Settlement (MAS) measuring 101.02 hectares (equivalent to 874 parcels). With the establishment of the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur in 1974, Kampung Baru area was expanded by 61.93 hectares or 153.04 acre (see Table 1). In this paper, the latter addition to Kampung Baru is referred to as non-MAS area. Thus, as at 1974, the total area of Kampung Baru was 162.95 hectares. Presently, the total area has been reduced to 153.35 hectares after an illegal takeover of about 9.61 hectares by the City Hall Kuala Lumpur (CHKL) for construction of a by-pass from Jalan Tuanku Abdul Rahman to Jalan Raja Abdullah.

Table 1 Layout of Kampung Baru

Non-MAS Area	MAS Area
Chow Kit	Kampung Periok
Dang Wangi	Kampung Masjid
Sultan Ismail	Kampung Atas A
Kampung Sungai Baru	Kampung Atas B
Flat PKNS	Kampung Hujung Pasir
	Kampung Paya
	Kampung Indah
Total land area: 61.93 hectare (153.04 acre)	Total land area: 91.41 hectare (225.89 acre)

Source: City Hall Kuala Lumpur, 2008

Up to the 1930s, Kampung Baru was purely a residential village settlement with houses built of wood and supported by stilt, with a small verandah, big living room (usually with no more than three bedrooms) surrounded by garden crops (such as chili, banana, tapioca, etc.) and widespread rearing of poultry (Hands 1941). Houses are spaciouly built on land area of approximately land 60"x33'. This pattern could still be seen in some parts of Kampung Baru. Basic utilities such as flush toilet and individual water supply were not available until after the WWII. This was however not peculiar to Kampung Baru, the situation was similar to many parts of Kuala Lumpur. By 1960s basics utilities like water and electricity were accessed by all houses and other basic social and economic infrastructures such as roads, schools and mosque were upgraded.

Upgrading was continuous but ad-hoc, nevertheless, benefited certain groups such as traders but also has disturbed the natural setting of the area. For example, the straightening of the Klang River which runs alongside Kampung Baru in 1960s contributed to the susceptibility of Kampung Baru as a flood prone area. Its physical image worsens after the construction of walls along the river side which separated Kampung Baru physically from Jalan Ampang. Then came the KLCC (KL City Centre and the Petronas Twin Towers) and the Light Rail Transit in

the late 1990s, with their varying constructions that totally alienated Kampung Baru from the city centre. With no Master plan, the physical structures of Kampung Baru are haphazard and degraded. The unplanned development slowly pushed original villagers out and were replaced by transient and squatters.

By early 2000, the surrounding structures have completely engulfed Kampung Baru. Complete takeover could not be made because the Rules for the Occupation and Management of the Malay Settlement, Federated Malay States No.40, (page 239 of 18 March 1910 and Amended by Gazette Notification No. 950 of 22 February, 1935) are still valid.

Rules and Management in Renewal

As mentioned earlier, Kampung Baru is divided into two parts - MAS and non-MAS lands. This designation has to be made clear because despite being under the jurisdiction of CHKL, its land administration differs. This land issue was unfortunately not considered and amended during the inclusion of MAS area into the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur in 1974. Thus, in terms of land management the non-MAS land is guided by the National Land Code (NLC). But the MAS-land is managed by both the NLC and the Notification No. 21 in the Selangor Government Gazette of 12 January 1900 (under Section 6 of the 1897 Selangor Land Enactment).

The National Land Code (NLC) of 1965 is the highest law in Peninsular Malaysia on matters of land administration (though it is not applicable in Sabah, Sarawak and the Federal Territory of Labuan). Among other provisions mentioned in the NLC, there are two aspects that are directly related to Kampung Baru. For instance, the provision states that *“otherwise expressly provided, nothing in the Act shall affect 11 items, two of these are on Malay reserve land and law law in force on the ground of sultanate”* (Ministry of Federal Territories <http://www.kwp.gov.my/cmsen/2ndLevel.asp?catid=6&parentid=0>)

In a similar manner, the 1897 Selangor Land Enactment states that the Settlement (MAS area) “*shall be controlled by a Board of Management*” and elaborated that the Board was to consist of four persons to be appointed from time-to-time by the Resident (currently is the mayor of Kuala Lumpur). This set-up is still a present practice in the MAS area. The Board was given the power to frame by-laws for the effectual control and management of the MAS area. The Board was also given the power to allocate land to the Malays subject to express and implied conditions. This is, “*no allotment shall exceed half an acre [or about 21, 780 sq ft], more or less, in extent, and provided that no more than one allotment shall be occupied by any person without the express permission of the Resident communicated in writing to the Board.*” As such, the Board, based on the power vested on it has continues to manage the allotment of land to this date. In addition, the Rules also state that in order not to strain the occupant financially, the allotment was given free (except an assessment not exceeding \$2 per annum towards “*building erected, or to collect a tithe of the produce of each allotment*”) subject only to compliance with the conditions imposed by the by-laws framed under the Rules (Hands 1941).

After 15 August 1946 (the end of Japanese Occupation in the then Malaya), the Board’s financial support declined drastically which subsequently led to the operation of MAS area to be on ad-hoc basis. In May 2005, the Board was revived with the establishment of a new Board of Management. The new Board, although was also financially weak but operates efficiently on voluntary and charity basis.

Ownership of land on the MAS area before 1964 was not based on individual title or allotment. Records of ownership (which include personal and lot details) were noted in a register kept by the Board of Management (which is still kept intact till today in the Board office). This set-up was in accordance with MAS ruling which specified that “*every entry shall be held, as against all other claimants, to be proof of authorized occupation and no entry and no alteration in the register shall be deemed to*

be valid unless approval thereof be recorded in the minutes of a meeting of the Board and be certified by the initials, against such entry or alternation as the case may be, of the Secretary and one other member of the Board” (Hands 1941 p.23). In that year (1964), with political interferences by Datuk Harun Idris, the then Chief Minister of Selangor, convinced the Government of Selangor, i.e. the Sultan, to grant individual qualified title (QT) to all occupants (MAS Newsletter 2009).

In short Kampung Baru a mere 153.35 hectares of land is tied to two administrations mandated by two different laws. The paragraph that follows highlighted some of the issues constraining Kampung Baru’s renewal programs. The discussion focuses on the duplication of local administrative power plus political interference which intertwine with the system of government. Secondly the state of land law restraining sale to non-Malays which in a way has pushed away investors and developers from Kampung Baru.

Administrative and Politics

FTKL is the oldest and most notable of the three federal territories in Malaysia (Putrajaya and Labuan are the other two territories) and it is administered by the Ministry of Federal Territories headed by a minister. The local administration of FTKL is carried out by the Kuala Lumpur City Hall or CHKL. The CHKL is responsible for public health and sanitation, waste removal and management, town planning, environmental protection and building control, social and economic development and general maintenance functions of urban infrastructure. Executive power lies with the mayor in the city hall, who is appointed for three years by the Federal Territories Minister. The practice of appointing a mayor has been in place ever since the local government elections were suspended in 1970 (Shaw 2009).

Another layer of administrators that influence FTKL comes from the system of government in Malaysia. Malaysia has been practicing a multi-

party system since the first direct election of the Federal Legislative Council of Malaya in 1955 (on the first-past-the-post basis). The ruling party then was the Alliance Party coalition and subsequently from 1973 onwards is the National Front. The FTKL as a case is represented in the Lower House of Representatives by eleven Members of Parliament (MPs), who are elected for five-year terms. Prior to 2008 general election, all 11 constituencies in FTKL, was under the National Front seat. After the 2008 election, 10 constituencies were taken by the opposition party which also constituted Kampung Baru [the electoral area is called Setiawangsa which was won by the *Parti Islam SeMalaysia* (PAS)]. This further complicated the stakes of area as its spoke's person now sits on the opposition side of Parliament which is controlled by the ruling party or National Front and hence, lacks the complete political wherewithal to push the course of Kampung Baru.

Land Law and Administration

The MAS settlement was created under Section 6 of the 1897 Selangor Land Enactment Act. In line with the Rules (Selangor gazette 1900 Notification no. 21) of the land administration, no individual title was to be issued to the occupants. Rather they were issued with permits that were not transferable. In 1950, by-laws (MAS Rules 1951) followed by amendment in 1994 (Cap 138, Sec 246 (4) was introduced. The new ruling government gave land ownership title to all occupants (Hands 1941). The area involved in the title change exercise include: 835 residential lots, 4 empty lots, 1 lot for a mosque, and 5 lots for a surau. As at the close of 2009, there were 8 residential lots, 5 surau lots and 4 open space lots ownership titles that are still pending for approval. This means ownership of these remaining lots still rests with the Government of Selangor (MAS Newsletter 2009). In 1977 the exercise was continued by the Federal Territories Land and Minerals Director's Office (PTGKL) to this date.

At least one aspect of the MAS land issue was solved through designating exact lots to all occupants. However, the avenue for government to alienate land in the area remained unchanged as land could only be transferred to a Malay or Corporation with Malay interest (Parliament Sitting 23 September 2004). In light of this restriction, most land transactions were between individuals thus, circumventing the role of government. Furthermore, according to Ismail et al (2006) these transactions were mostly in form of bequeaths rather than market sale (see Tables 2 and 3). In fact, the transactions recorded between individual to company and company to individual were among the Malay property owners in Kampung Baru rather than outsiders.

Table 2 Land Transactions in Kampung Baru

Year of Transaction	Individual-to-Individual	Individual-to-Company	Company-to-Individual	Company-to-Company
1996	0	1	0	0
1997	0	2	0	0
1998	1	1	0	0
1999	1	1	0	0
2000	8	1	2	1
2001	2	1	0	1
2002	5	7	0	0
2003	17	6	1	0
2004	16	6	0	5
2005	14	0	2	2
2006	5	0	1	2

Source: CHKL, Property and Valuation Department, 2007

Table 3 Property Transcation in Kampung Baru

Year of Transaction	Total Transaction 1996-2006	Market Transaction	Bequeath/ Inherit
1996	1	1	0
1997	2	1	1
1998	2	0	2
1999	2	0	2
2000	12	5	7
2001	4	3	1
2002	12	5	7
2003	24	9	15
2004	27	13	14
2005	18	3	15
2006	8	4	4

Source: CHKL, Property and Valuation Department, 2006

With reference to the figures recorded in the tables above, it is evident that the by-laws are still effective specifically in the MAS area. Table 4 presents a comparison between the management laws of 1897 and the current management profile.

Table 4 Comparison of Management Law in MAS Area from 1897 to the Present

Rule	1897 Management	Current Management
3	“the settlement shall be under the management and control of a Board which shall consist of a President, Vice-President, Honorary Secretary and eight other members who shall be appointed by the Menteri Besar from time to time...”	The settlement is managed by CHKL together with the Board (Malay Argicultural Settlement) which consist of a President which is the Mayor of CHKL, Vice-President which is the deputy mayor of CHKL, honorary secretary represented by individual from the MAS community and eight members also represented from the MAS community.
4	“The Board shall have powers to frame by-laws not inconsistent with these Rules for the effectual control and management...”	No longer ineffective
5	“The Board may authorize any approved Malay applicant irrespective of his vocation to occupy an allotment on such terms and conditions as it may consider fit and proper...”	No longer ineffective
6	“It shall be the duty of the beneficiary or beneficiaries to inform the Board within six months of the death of any registered occupant of the fact of such death...”	No longer ineffective
7	“The Board shall keep a Register in which shall be entered the names of approved applicants, deletions and substitutions of occupants, together with all the necessary particulars relating to them and to the allotments which they are authorized to occupy...”	Is still practice

9	No registered occupant, shall extend, alter or rebuild his dwelling house without first submitting a plan for the approval of the Board	ineffective
10	Without the express permission of the Board, no occupant shall: (a) Permit any person, other than Malay, in his house or other part of his allotment. (b) Let, or permit his house to be sub-let	Is still practice No longer ineffective

Sources: Hands, 1941; MAS Newsletter; MAS Management Board of Directors 2009, pers. Comm., 7 October.

Renewal Agenda Past to Present

Over the years urbanization brought more outsiders (immigrants and transient groups) whom increased the density and congestion of Kampung Baru. The rapid increase also affected the ability of CHKL to provide the much needed and efficient services for the area. For example, some houses were extended up to the edge of an already narrow roadway, blocking free passage of garbage trucks and other road users. Similarly, the MAS Management Board which is also tasked with providing services was under-funded to offer any worthy assistance. In light of these shortfalls in planning and provision of basic infrastructural facilities, the development control in Kampung Baru was weak and negligent and thus, accelerated the rapid deterioration of the major facets of development in the entire area.

At different times, the deteriorating conditions in the area have led the villages to agitate and clamor for change however; the desire for change does not imply giving the mandate totally to CHKL, which has had records of suspicion and mistrust by the villagers. For example, in 1975 CHKL was allocated RM5 million under the ambit of Bumiputra Credit Scheme to assist homeowners to rebuild their homes (MAS Newsletter 2009). The scheme was terminated prematurely (in 1980) due

to ineffective service delivery coupled with corruption and abuse of funds by the so-called recommended developer by CHKL. A second attempt was mooted in 1985; it also failed for the same reason. In 2000 a new renewal policy was formulated (included in Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2020) and in 2008, a detailed concept for Kampung Baru was drawn (presented in Kuala Lumpur Draft Plan, 2020, Volume 4). In spite of all these, development fallacies in the area are still farfetched and critics over CHKL's capabilities however have not receded. The next paragraph highlights CHKL's proposal for Kampung Baru, followed by comments of this proposal.

Kampung Baru Renewal Plan, 2008

The Kampung Baru Renewal Plan, 2008 proposed four redevelopment alternatives for Kampung Baru namely: Trend, Selective Development, Integrated Renewal and Comprehensive Renewal (see Table 5). The integrated renewal plan was considered as the most cost effective and sustainable plan in comparison to the other three. The plan proposed only 40% of land to be alienated or 63.62 hectares. Of this total 48.32 hectares will be taken from MAS lands and 15.29 hectares from non-MAS lands. The plan will produced 6.4 million m² of business floor space that will include commercial and cultural centre, with tourist attractions and 15,452 mixed residential units. The population of the area is projected to increase to 85,490 at daytime and 61,808 at nighttime by 2020. Overall the project is estimated to consume about RM18.14 million.

There are many criticisms on the proposal. One of the most serious was from an NGO contradicted the plan from the perspective of the National Physical Plan (NPP). According to the body NPP proposed the population of Kuala Lumpur to be reduced to 25 persons per hectare by 2020. This proposal was in line with the idea of promoting better living environment for Kuala Lumpur residents by way of increasing green areas and recreational areas. But why does the CHKL plan proposed quadrupling persons per hectare to 95, as such; the Plan will be

accompanied with its unintended consequences of pulling more people, structures, pollution and congestion into Kuala Lumpur - an idea that contradicted the NPP (The Star, 26 May 2008, p. 1).

Planning Mechanism

With regard to planning of the MAS and non MAS lands the CHKL proposed two approaches. The first alternative involves the preserving land ownership and land retrieval. CHKL proposed among MAS land owners they could develop their lots individually but has to follow zoning outline. An owner also could develop their lands based on joint-venture, where costs of development to be shared. Transfer of Development Right is another alternative. An owner could exchange his zoning privileges from areas with low population needs to areas of high population needs. The objective of this alternative is to allow for the preservation of open spaces and historic landmarks, while giving urban areas a chance to expand and experience continued growth.

Among non-MAS land owners CHKL proposed development be carried out by Real Estate Development Trust (REIT). REIT's role is to manage groups of income-producing properties and to distribute income from these properties as dividends. A REIT company is required to have at least 30% bumiputra equity and shall not have more than 49% of foreign share. The Company shareholders have to be approved by Security Commission who acts as security holder for investment asset as well as guiding investors' interests through controlling administrative asset by a management company. And the Company should has a minimum value of RM100 million before it could be launched and following investment value should not be less than RM25 million. Finally, a REIT company could offer unit for sale to public investors through sale, restricted sale, subscription sale, bonus, and other means by approval of the Security Commission and Joint development of land.

The second alternative involves land alienation. CHKL is somewhat cautious in dictating renewal policies under this alternative, especially in areas involving MAS lands. In ensuring that the planning pattern for Kampung Baru went as scheduled they were hoping that the by-laws mandated on MAS lands is ignored. This however could be difficult to come by. In accordance with Ainul Jariah et al:

In order to go international, one must do away with quaint law. What was feasible 50 years ago may not be practical today...For example, there is this old rule (Section 6, Land Enactment 1897) says those who own properties in Kampung Baru...not supposed to rent out their buildings to outsiders and non-Malays... Just how many Malays can afford to rent here anyway?...This kampong must be opened to the non-Malays for it to develop (The Star Monday 26 May 2008, p. 1).

The opinion of the Chairman is in line with many research findings that advocate socio-economic integration as a prerequisite for development (The Star Monday 26 May, 2008). The MAS lands have lower land value than non-MAS land in the open market. This is because there is no demand for MAS lands due its land restrictions coupled with the failure to liberalize and open up the area for non-Malays to invest as well as, limited capability of the Malays, affiliate corporations and individuals to embark on large scale investment on MAS land. This set back is further compounded by most banks that champion and favor socio-economic integration. It is discernible that the indulgence enjoyed by the Malays stands out as a fundamental impediment to their growth and development.

FINDINGS FROM FIELD SURVEY

The paragraph below discusses the field findings from 320 questionnaires that were returned of 500 that were distributed. Many unassuming answers were captured that could not be known if a survey is not conducted. In

addition, some answers were also confirming writings of some authors of the area state of affairs.

Demographic and Socio-Economic Background

A total of 320 respondents were sampled in Kampung Baru, out of which 234 (73.2%) were residents of the area, while the remaining were visitors to the area. Among the residents of Kampung Baru (234) 47.4% of respondents were original residents of the area, that is they were born and raised in Kampung Baru, while the majority of 49.7% were newcomers, out of which 44.4% chose to live in Kampung Baru because of its strategic location and Malay identity, whereas the remaining 8.3% have no special reservations for settling in the area.

In term of age highest percentage were from age range 20-29 (25%) years old, followed by 30-39 years (20%) and 40-49 years old (above 18%). Age corresponded with the level of education and most of them have attended compulsory primary schools, and 49% have completed secondary education, Table 5. Respondents that are not educated or no formal education have good reasoning. For instance, the older age group (60 and older) revealed that war (WWII the Communist Insurgency of the late 1940s to 1960) and social background were the main reasons behind their failure to complete the primary education and the attainment of formal education. However despite lack of formal education, these respondents were knowledgeable and had a good account of history. It is important to state that their insights and anecdotes helped this research to confirm the coherence and consistency of literature written on the areas.

Table 5 Respondents Educational Breakdown

Education Level	Kg. Baru
	234 Respondents
Primary	6.8
Secondary	49.7
Diploma	13.5
Degree	5.3
Other	24.7
Total	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2009

*In Kg. Baru Secondary includes MCE, LCE, STPM & certificate

Other includes, informal school, no schooling

Corresponding to the level of education, job opening is limited to the stall level business particularly in the spheres of food and clothing. As shown in Table 6, those who are not inclined to the stall level businesses received employment from the city, generally in technical and service industries.

Table 6 Respondents Job Levels

Job Status	Kg. Baru
	% of 234 Respondents
Mid-level managerial	11.27
Junior-level officer	6.01
Teacher	0.75
Sales/Clerical	13.53
Small business/Hawker	22.56
Blue-collar/laborer	6.76
Pensioner	3.76
Housewife/student	8.27
Looking for work	27.07
Total	100.0

Source: Author's Field Survey, 2009

Job-type matches household income for both areas. The highest income reported was from those holding managerial position and those operating businesses. Those that reported low income were blue-collar workers, such as laborers, clerk and restaurant/stall helper (see Table 7).

Table 7 Respondents Income Level

HH Income	Kg. Baru
	234 Respondents
less than 1000	5.3
1000-1999	18.1
2000-2999	23.3
3000-3999	6.8
4000-4999	0.8
5000 and more	4.5
P & C	0.8
student	3.8
Visitors	3.8
No fixed income	33.1
Total	100

Source: Author's Field Survey, 2009

Kampung Baru is densely populated however, household size of the area is relatively small (see Table 8). This research captured more than 40% of one person household. The second highest is the 3 and 4 persons household. The one person household refers to the old/retired group, all of who still occupying properties of their descendants. Another group is the renters (usually single living in flats and apartments) who take advantage of Kampong Baru's strategic location.

Table 8 Residents Households by Size

HH size(person)	Kg. Baru
	234 Respondents
1	45.3
2	10.9
3	11.7
4	18.8
5	4.7
6	3.1
7	1.6
live with parents	3.9
Total	100

Source: Author’s Field Survey, 2009

In term of house quality unlike other areas in Kuala Lumpur houses in Kampung Baru range from a shack-like abode to high-cost apartments. As such, houses that meet the middle and high income family needs are limited. In light of this limitation, Kampung Baru tends to attract more singles and migrants provided they are willing to forgo luxury living environment for cost of transportation and distance.

Kampung Baru’s complicated land status is also not helping to pull high-income residents. This study found out that of the total land and homeowners (111 respondents), 34.5% have single ownership over the property, 58.6% have two and more persons sharing the ownership of a title. The multiplication of name to a single property corresponds to the age of the property and 27.9% reported the property to be more than 30 years old; 9.1% more than 60 years old and 19.5% more than a century old. The complication on land title is one of the reasons (as indicated by 17.3% of respondents) that restrict sale of properties as well as upgrading of properties (23%). In fact, as explained by a property developer, there is a piece of land in Kampung Baru that has 90 owners and nine of them have passed away (Rohana Mustaffa 2009b).

Table 9 Kampung Baru Status of Ownership Title

Ownership Title	111 Respondents (owner)
Individual/Single Ownership	34.5
2 Persons Sharing ownership	28.7
3 Persons Sharing Ownership	11.5
4 Persons Sharing Ownership	5.7
5 Persons Sharing Ownership	12.6
Not sure	6.9
Total	100

Source: Author's Field Survey, 2009

Issue of multiple ownerships was also captured by Ismail et al (2006) who found from the 51 undeveloped lots surveyed, that 81% had multiple-ownership. Furthermore, 88.1% of these lots were inherited, implying unless the owners are earning good income, the ability to upgrade/rebuild the houses could be minimal. In addition, in their study about 70% of lot owners' earnings were less than RM1500 and more than 66% were over 50 years old. This state of affairs spells negative credibility to obtain financial assistance unless partnering with developer as proposed by CHKL.

Community Belongingness and CHKL Plan

Based on this research survey, 93% of residents that were approached admitted that they have no intention of leaving Kampung Baru. The main reason is for the deep rooted love for the community specifically with reference to the distinct Malay-Muslim culture and its colorful history. For instance, some respondents gave a full recount of their lives in Kampung Baru during the Japanese occupation, 1941-1946. Few of them still recalled their roles in WWII. These are precious memories that many wanted to treasure and pass on to their children and grandchildren. The current CHKL plan however did not pick-up these points; rather it simply plans to commoditize the story of Kampung Baru in light of tourist's demand.

In a nutshell, CHKL is overly engrossed in transforming the area into a heavily commercialized area and in the process; it tends to ignore the resident's vision for Kampung Baru, a strategy that has been observed from the onset of the planning process of Kampung Baru. The approach and mindset of CHKL towards the renewal of Kampung Baru seems very difficult to change owing to its preconceived notion of transforming the area into a world class metropolitan city thus, neglecting the cultural identity and heritage that ought to be preserved. In light of the present reformation of major cities of the world characterized by glitz and flamboyant life styles, Helena Norberg-Hodeg (1996 p. 18) asserts that:

Much of the world's diversity has already been destroyed. Economic globalization accelerates this process. Wherever you go in today's global village' you'll find multi-lane highways, concrete cities, and cultural landscape featuring grey business suits, fast food chains, Hollywood films, and cellular phones. In every corner of the planet, Barbie and Madonna are familiar icons, and the Marlboro Man and Rambo define the male ideal. From Cleveland to Cairo to Caracas, Baywatch is entertainment and CNN is news.

In the course of a planning exercise, it is customary to understand why and for what a plan is designed. The paragraphs below capture remarks by both residents of Kampung Baru with regards to conditions in their living environment, specifically their level of satisfaction with the government particularly, the bureaucrats - planners and administrators.

Resident's Perspectives - Kampong Baru

In accordance with Helena Norberg-Hodeg (1996), irrespective of what we see around us, the tendency towards nationalizing cultural identity and ethnicity is common among development planners, especially when they get engulfed with the short-term agenda of politicians and businesses. This is the premise of Kampung Baru's renewal issue. The actors involved

are the CHKL planners, politicians, the MAS Board of Management, and the residents of Kampung Baru. Selective voices of these actors are gathered and presented in this section to show the diversity and intricacy of the issue at hand.

The chairman of Kampung Baru for renewal programs, also the former Member of Parliament of the area argues for comprehensive renewal when he asserts that:

Unlike KLCC, which is surrounded by iconic multi-million ringgit developments, this kampong [Kampung Baru] remains unblemished even after 100 years. In order for it to go international, it must do away with quaint rules. What was feasible 50 years ago may not be practical today ... For example, old rule [refereeing to the 1899 enactment] that says properties in Kampung Baru (Malay Reserve area) cannot be rent out to outsiders namely non-Malays is no longer practical.... [because] not many Malays can afford to rent [i.e. after renewal] here [in Kampung Baru] anyway... This kampong must be opened to the non-Malays for it to develop (The Star Monday 26 May 2008).

After the publication of this statement residents became more suspicious of the chairman.

Similarly, according to the Permanent Secretary of MAS Board; *"We welcome development; In fact we have long been informed [20 years ago] about this [renewal project] but at the same time are waiting for a fruitful meeting"* (S Suradi 2009, pers. Comm., 16 Oct.).

Furthermore, the Secretary said they [MAS Board of Management] were also not invited to participate in Kampung Baru renewal agenda. At the same time their grievances on fair compensation were not seriously attended to. He relates this point to the issue of trust. According to

the Secretary, people are afraid of opening up their doors to developers because they are victims and susceptible to fraudsters. He cited incidents where a corporate figure cajoled landowners into mortgaging 44 plots of land on the pretext of development. Instead, these lands were used as collateral for the man's project elsewhere that later failed. Because of this bitter experience he suggested development to take the step-by-step approach: *"Develop one area first. If it is a success, then make it a model for other areas rather than developing all at one go that could fail and wipe out the settlement's legacy"* (S Suradi 2009, pers. Comm., 16 Oct).

Another group of actors, investors and developers revolve their arguments on matter of compensation. Investors think landowners are being unrealistic when comparing their land to that of the Golden Triangle properties (valued at RM2000 psf). In the words of a property management manager: *"Land values appreciate due to pressures of development. Compared with the hectic pace of development in the Golden Triangle, there was hardly any development in Kampung Baru. Further, non-Malays are prohibited from owning land in Kampung Baru which in the Golden Triangle does not have such restriction"* (R Abdullah 2009, pers. Comm., 27 Oct). He quoted the real estate of Kampung Baru to range from RM200 to RM400 on average which is 5 to 10 times lower than its adjacent-adjoining neighbor.

Indeed the tug-of-war over compensation has eaten up 20 years of Kampung Baru's renewal time. As at May 2010, developers have refused to compensate residents based on city-centre land value. While residents' decisions against renewal plans remained unchanged.

Resident's Idea of Renewal

Public participation in renewal decision is essential in achieving lasting and sustainable renewal programs and projects. It should no longer be the case that citizens act only to elect and then, whatever the outcome, are governed without giving opportunities to interact with their

representatives. Such is the case in Kampung Baru where the stakeholders or the community were not professionally consulted rather were treated as non-essential group. In light of this gap, respondents were not able to describe the objective(s) and the contents of CHKL's draft plan when asked. As such, this research observed that residents' seem to be narrowing their ideas to familiar parts of their immediate neighborhood. A clear consideration was given on income versus distance to work, school and other daily activities. Like the MAS Board Permanent Secretary, the community was also into incremental approach. Calling for upgrading of commercial buildings and houses and where necessary to introduce new structures with proper layout, a recreational area for children and youths, a community center that offer complete amenities and facilities for social and religious ceremonies. Examples of area they like to model after are established new towns like Shah Alam, Putra Jaya, Damansara Utama, Kota Damansara and Puchong. Another unanimous request was the preservation of the authenticity of Malay heritage as well as reviving the activity of Sunday Market or "Pasar Minggu" – a market established during the colonial era to display and market community produce.

Interestingly, all the points proposed by respondents and more, are mentioned in the CHKL proposed alternative (Alternative 3, summary of the development proposal is depicted in Table 19). The information gap was caused by several factors.

First, CHKL was too engrossed in settling land title issues and hence, puts on hold, its planning ideas as against publicizing it. The research found the rise of this problem when CHKL gave more priority to elected officials (whom are generally not respected by the Kampung Baru community) to dictate Kampung Baru's agenda over the stakeholders. In the process, CHKL's attention was deviated to economic growth instead of stakeholders' affairs. As part of the findings of this research, 99% of respondents and all local leaders suggested discussions and negotiations with CHKL. On occasion where there are many names to a title, they

suggested that CHKL buy-over the land and compensate the parties/ individuals involved fairly (based on market price) equally and amicably, and it should deal the issues of Malay rights and privileges with great restraint. Although this point was mentioned in the proposed plan, at the same time, CHKL was also in purporting for non-Malays ownership of properties in Kampung Baru. Third point was over the word “Malay”. The original residents prefer not to be assimilated with immigrants Malay. The community considers immigrants Malays as invaders of their communal space and business opportunities. Thus in term of compensation exercise, the immigrants are considered unfit to receive equal compensation as Malay or pioneer residents (Malaysia Pribumi).

This point was also mentioned in CHKL's proposed plan, except it used the term old and new land/property owners referring to pioneer Malays and immigrants Malays.

A simple decision on building approval, for example, could take years to resolve if it happens it is not in agreement with the interest of certain groups. Indeed as part of the process of redeveloping Kuala Lumpur in general and Kampung Baru in particular, CHKL has to undergo continuous process of legitimation and sanction to satisfy various parties. This proposition concurs with the words of Allison (1978 p.184):

The decisions and actions of governments are essentially intra-national political outcomes: outcomes in the sense that what happens is not chosen as a solution to a problem but rather results from compromise, coalition, competition, and confusion among government officials who sees different faces of an issue.

DISCUSSIONS

Good governance has a lot to do with how the state, and most importantly how the political process is organized. Good governance usually considers monitoring and recording what is going on, taking steps ensuring compliance with agreed policies, and provides corrective action

in cases where the rules have been ignored or misconstrued. In the case of Kampung Baru, the planning authority is seen as an instrument that enriches selected groups or crony. This is not usually a recipe for efficient governance. Malaysia's political process seems especially prone to special interest (most of all, from big finance and developers), which does not particularly bode well for efficient government either. As mentioned in the earlier section of this paper, when political leaders were among those implicated in squandering people's land for self fulfillment, dismisses peoples' trust on other leader's good intentions. Losing Kampung Baru to an opposition party is an indication of peoples' lost of trust and interest in the ruling party's promises. This is another reason that explains why Kampung Baru's renewal idea drags on.

Laws, rules and regulations that govern land matters usually get amended through time because land usage changes with the changing needs of the community. This has not been happening in Kampung Baru because CHKL does not have enough land to implement its proposed plan and new laws and regulations could not be crafted and legislated as fast as the changing landscape of Kuala Lumpur. There are occasions where the government failed to investigate/examine the existence and implication of old law on new development programs, like in Kampung Baru. The Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur restructuring team overlooked to dissolve the 1897 MAS Enactment during which the inclusion of MAS area was part of FTKL (Parliament Sitting September 23, 2004). The effect of this oversight resulted in fuzziness over roles among implementing agencies. However because Kampung Baru is located in a prime locality, CHKL could not ignore and allow it to continue deteriorating. They had to intervene in every way possible.

However the CHKL was not the only group that desires change for Kampung Baru. The residents were also tired of living in a dilapidated environment. But compensation and land rights have become a building block. The community unanimously wanted fair compensation,

comparable to the value of land in the city centre (golden triangle), that is, RM1500 to RM2000 per ft² as against RM300 per ft². This means for every title (21,780 ft² or half an acre, the exact allocation per original title) each owner will get about RM33 million or about USD 8 million (based on RM1500 per ft²). Of course this deal will not come easy as it is said and CHKL is still chugging along with its proposed plan.

The community saw CHKL's concern of retaining Malay image as dubious when justifying the possibility of allowing leasing of properties to non-Malays. One of it was a *parwah* system. This is a sharing system where the real estate developer gets seven parts while three parts goes to the landowner. Another suspicion rests with the idea of setting-up of a special body under Parliamentary legislation to safeguard Malay rights. The Body is to be run by Malays, it will hold and manage the assets that are to be leased to others including non-Malays. The body also has the power to acquire unsold bumiputra quota that could then be leased to non-Malays. Cunning period of lease was conveniently left in the statement of "lease to others", implying that non-Malays could lease forever. This goes without saying, the process will promote gradual disappearance of Malay identity in Kampung Baru. The plan drew suspicion at the outset. This places another deadlock in redeveloping Kampung Baru.

Central to the planning process of a community, is the highly indispensable need to pull considerable information about the area's cultural and socio-economic background. With such information, the history, values and prospects of a community can be harnessed to suit its proposed plan. Planning for Kampung Baru was grandiose particularly with planners making no assessment of the community's present socio-economic profile and future impact. This study found that (based on the sample) 50% of the respondents were living below the national average income. This implies preference of these residents were towards low profile living. Drastic change as proposed in alternative 3 will introduce negative impact on families and neighborhood and long-term economic effect on small-scale businesses.

Retaining sense of community is essential in planning an area. According to Syamsuri Suradi (2009) the Honorary Secretary of MAS Management Board, Kampung Baru is unlike other centers in Kuala Lumpur. *"It has a soul and character of its own."* He meant the environment and the people that make Kampung Baru are special in the sense that they gave meaning to the area and having distinct character i.e. having individuality or oneness. In the words of Lynch (1974 p. 10) a highly imageable city:

would invite the eye and ear to greater participation. The sensuous grasp upon such surroundings would not merely be simplified, but also extended and deepened. Such a city would be one that could be apprehended over time as a pattern of high continuity with many distinctive parts clearly interconnected. The perceptive and familiar observer could absorb new sensuous impact without disruption of his basic image, and each new impact would touch upon many previous elements. He could be well oriented, and could move easily. He would be highly aware of the environment.

In a nutshell, the Kampung Baru community would like to retain the area's original environment, like the City of Venice in Europe and San Francisco and Boston in the United States, as examples. In line with Kevin Lynch planners that build these great cities were able to *"see the hidden forms in the vast sprawl of our cities"* (p. 12).

THE FUTURE

Kuala Lumpur envisions itself to be a world class city by year 2020. This means it will assume the status of world class cities like New York, Paris and London. London for example is a global centre for politics, finance, education, entertainment, media, fashion, arts and culture. It is also a major tourist destination for both domestic and overseas visitors. In becoming a world class city like London, it is important to take account of many factors that contributed to its remarkable development and

persistent successes. Apart from its legendary history, it has effective and efficient infrastructural network. For example, the London underground administered by Transport of London is the most extensive underground railway network in the world. Also, the London Heathrow Airport is the world's busiest airport attending to numerous travelers from all corners of the world and its airspace is the busiest of any urban centre in the world. This implies that for Kuala Lumpur to be a world class city, besides speeding-up development and renewal, it must ensure that development and renewal is aligned with the world class vision, expectations and sustainability. In line with the governments' target for the reformation of Kuala Lumpur into a world class city by the year 2020, many parts of Kuala Lumpur have witnessed massive improvement, but there are areas that are still awaiting to be revitalized and developed and one of these areas is Kampung Baru. The CHKL has proposed 16 renewal precincts for Kampung Baru. As of May 2010, except for remedial upgrading, CHKL's proposed plan has not taken effect.

There are several impediments that continue to haunt and delay the adoption and implementation of the plan. The most difficult to solve is the MAS land alienation and compensation stalemate between CHKL and MAS landowners. While for non-MAS areas, including the broader Kuala Lumpur was challenged on various issues, the thorniest was contradiction with the National Physical Plan on the question of sustainability.

Having Kuala Lumpur as the heart of Malaysia, of which Kampung Baru is an appendage, resolving all the complex issues that has stalled development in the area seems imperative and the most effective way to reach an agreement will be by way of high-level political intervention. In fact, the survey of this study as well as other studies (see for example Shaw, 2009) found the residents of Kampung Baru particularly the land owners, to be extremely frustrated and harassed by the slum-like environment that is predisposed to diseases and varying social threats like crime and unrest.

With reasonable terms, many are willing to collaborate with CHKL for better living environment and improved economic status. Similar view was given by MAS Management Board. The Board could no longer manage the MAS area effectively, especially with the changing demographic character of MAS residents and changing landscape of MAS area. In addition, the Board is financially weak in comparison to CHKL which has legal jurisdiction over the city's management. This research holds the conviction that in the course of time, the landscape of Kampung Baru will change, however, due to discrepancies and contradictions inherent in CHKL's proposed plan, renewal will not distinctively follow CHKL's proposed plan and instead, the plan will be adopted haphazardly in line with the government's financial capability.

CONCLUSIONS

Planning for people is difficult, because unlike things people can think and are subject to uncontrollable change. The intensity of the difficulty may however vary by political system and government. In the contexts of Kampung Baru policy derailment resulting from institutional faction was obvious. There are officials of CHKL and MAS Management Board squabbling over planning role. There are constituency leaders (Members of Parliament), namely from the National Front who voted for renewal while the current constitutional leader (a member of the opposition party) voted for no or incremental development. Another group is the NGOs, their opinions of development ranges from subjective matter like culture and values to tangible factor like compensation. A policy decision could not be reached because these groups were attacking the issue from different ends.

Organization that carries out programs requires the cooperation of segment of the public or the whole public. If the requirement of cooperation is not forthcoming, the organization will fail to accomplish its objectives and the stake holders stand out to bear the brunt of failure. In addition, planning cannot be enforced against unreceptive public.

Rejection has its reason. Before introducing the renewal plans, planners did not really ask these questions: what does a community want? and how can access be gained to solve the problem? (if any), and predict consequences of their actions? For example, suggesting relocating affected households to a new faraway community was not only insensible but a dumb suggestion. All these points were not effectively discussed and clearly rationalized from within the government agencies, instead was put to action with haste.

Land law is another hurdle to Kampung Baru's development. Some parts of Malaysia land law are still tied to the archaic British law. In addition, its land is also governed by the general structure of the early Malay states before 1500s and the political history and land tenure system that was practiced then. In the case of Kampung Baru, it was reserved for poorer classes of town inhabiting Malays in 1900 by the Sultan of Selangor and was called the Malay Agriculture Settlement with power delegated to a committee to run the area – the MAS Management Board. In 1974, when the MAS area was drawn into the FTKL boundary, the authority overlooks to amend the law binding upon the MAS area. CHKL tried to salvage the blunder through the assistance of the land office, court, and the National Land Code. The action has created tension between MAS Management Board and CHKL. Despite the deteriorating nature of Kampung Baru, no resolution has been reached.

CHKL continues planning program for the area, taking the stance that they know what is best for the area. But sustainable development cannot take place through force, but through gradual and spontaneous proactive efforts of all actors who equally and democratically participate and share their ideas, visions, and responsibilities to steer and implement their community or village development.

In sum, due to political, historical and institutional reasons, planning and renewal of Kampung Baru has been incremental and has sidelined

large areas from the development process especially the MAS area which still remains untouched. Practically, this is the rationale behind the uneven development in the area as the slum-like image is evident amidst luxurious structures. The penalty of non-planning have benefited some and has brought devastating effects on others. Let's take the penalty for non-planning first. The CHKL as the local authority has been seen as an inefficient agency. Outsiders and even Kampung Baru's residents blamed the CHKL for everything from uncollected rubbish, narrow roads, crime, and increased illegal immigrants and so on. The government particularly, the federal government is being shamed for allowing the Kuala Lumpur Malays to live in an appalling environment. Some land owners like the second generation owners (who are already in their 70s), are losing the opportunity of living in a well-planned neighborhood. The third generation owners, contrary to their aspirations, had to sharing their neighborhood with intruders, like illegal immigrants, lowly paid laborers and the unemployed which in turn cultivate the setting for addicts and thugs. Land owners' bitterness for being neglected has been used by selected politicians and individuals as bullet to frame the ruling government as ill-equipped. Such attack is beneficial to the opposition and also a high cost to the legitimacy and credibility of the ruling party. Other gainers are immigrants who thrive on appalling areas and transient residents who ride on Kampung Baru's cheap rental estate to live and have easy accessibility to the city's job market.

The fate of Kampung Baru is yet to be seen, however, this study believes that Kampung Baru, in light of CHKL's planning idea will be like other new centers in Malaysia. The uniqueness of the area could not be sustained because appreciation of what it was will be blinded by money-making real estate.

References

- Ainul Jaria Maidin, Sharifah Zubaidah Syed Abdul Kader, Bashiran Begum Haji Mobarak Ali, Nor Asiah Mohamad, Azlinor Sufian, Ratna Azah Rosli & Fauziah Mod Nor 2008, Principles of Malaysian Land Law, Lexis Nexis, Kuala Lumpur.
- Bavani, M & Yip Yoke Teng 2008, (May 26), 'Kampung Baru folk ready for change' The Star, viewed February, 2009, http://www.malaysianbar.org.my/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=16187
- Changging, Q, Kreibich, V, & Baumgart, S 2007, 'Informal elements in Urban Growth Regulation in China – Urban Villages in Ningbo' *ASIEN*, 103, pp. 23-44.
- City Hall Kuala Lumpur 2008, Kampung Bharu. Vol. 4 of Draft Kuala Lumpur 2020 City Plan, City Hall Kuala Lumpur, Kuala Lumpur.
- City Hall Kuala Lumpur 2007, Property Valuation Report, City Hall Property Valuation Department, Kuala Lumpur.
- City Hall Kuala Lumpur 2006, Property Valuation Report, City Hall Property Valuation Department, Kuala Lumpur.
- Hands, J 1941, The History of The Malay Agricultural Settlement Kuala Lumpur: From January 1899 to October 1941. Compilation of Minute Books.
- Homs, C 2007, 'Localism and the city: the example of urban villages' *The International Journal*, Vol. 3, no. 1. pp. 19-27.
- Institute of Civil Engineers Briefing Urban Villages Forum, viewed September 2009, <<http://www.ice.org.uk/rtfpdf/BS-Urban%20Villages.pdf>>
- Ismail Omar, Hajjah Asiah Othman, Djurjani Wardata, Abd Prijono & Nugroho Djojomartono 2006, Strengthening the Structure of Development Land Market in Kampong Baru, Kuala Lumpur –Transaction Cost of Institutional Economics Analysis Perspective Associate, UTM, Johor Bharu.

- Lynch, K 1974, *The Image of the City*, MIT: Massachusetts.
- Malay Agricultural Settlement 2009, Management Board Newsletter, Kampung Baharu, Kuala Lumpur.
- Ministry of Federal Territories 'Land Administration', viewed October 2009, <<http://www.kwp.gov.my/cmsen/2ndLevel.asp?catid=6&parentid=0>>
- Norberg-Hodeg, H 1996, 'Break-up the monoculture', *Nation Magazine*, July 1996, 15-22. of *Inclusive Democracy*, Vol.3, no. 1.
- Parliamentary Session 1, 2004 (September), Oral Question and Answer Session Meeting 3, Bil. 42, 23.
- Rohana Mustafa, 2009a, 'Kampung Baru Development: Is It 'So Far' Away?' *BERNAMA*, January 31, Features section, viewed July, 2008, <http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v5/newsfeatures.php?id=386895>
- Rohana Mustafa, 2009b. 'Kampung Baru: Tale of Prince and Pauper' *BERNAMA*, viewed July 2008, <http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v5/newsfeatures.php?id=386430>
- Rules and By-Laws Malay Agricultural Settlement, 1951, Kampung Baharu Kuala Lumpur, State of Selangor No. 50 and 66.
- Selangor Government Notification 50/18.1.51
- Selangor Government Notification 480/24.6/54
- Selangor Government Notification 66/18.1.51
- Shaw, R 2009, *Sustainable Eco-Development of Kampong Baharu: A Policy Perspective*. Kyoto University and Malay Agricultural Settlement.