Markets and Malls in Jakarta

Jakarta, the largest metropolis in Southeast Asia and a province in itself, is divided into five municipalities and headed by a governor. The city is a metaphor for modernity for the 10 million people in the Indonesian archipelago. Its urban area has sprawled past its boundaries, incorporating smaller towns and the city’s outskirts, consisting of Bogor, Tangerang, and Bekasi. Many workers living in these areas commute to the centre hence the number of people in Jakarta varies from over ten million in the evening to over twelve million during the day.

Both massive movement and rapid expansion are characteristic of Jakarta’s mega-urbanization. One aspect that has recently become contentious is the conversion of trade centres to shopping centres, or ‘new style of markets’, throughout the city.
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Greater Surabaya: The Formation of a Planning Region

I seem pedantic to discuss different models of urbanization in order to gauge the specific situation in Greater Surabaya. An overriding element applying to all models is the interrelation between the host-city and neighbouring towns and cities. Those seeking employment in the cities drive intensification (“urbanization”), whereas investors from the city, seeking to reap profits from cheaper land and labour, drive expansion (“ex-urbanization”). In urbanization takes place when under-used areas or wastelands are put to use. New migrants often transform these areas with their squatter constructions and by introducing hawking in public places. Clearly, city governments despise this type of urbanization, which so often creeps upon them. Ex-urbanization results when economic growth reaches beyond the administrative boundaries. Great constraints in spatial management necessitated the inclusion of neighbouring areas for beyond the city limits. Hence the planning region of CERBAKERTOSUSILA (Cerrik, Bangkalan, Mojokerto, Surabaya, Sidjawi, and Lamongan) was formed. Moreover, by means of local government law no. 22/1999 and the law on the balanced redistribution of national resources (no. 25/1999), local government has now acquired greater autonomy in drafting and approving local development plans without intervention by central authorities.
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As Greater Surabaya’s growth has been mainly realized through local investment with little central government intervention its malls when small and have character which can not, per se, be planned. Functional footprint which different land-uses can be observed. With this situation there is only limited urban problems such as traffic congestion, flooding, and pollution. Heterogeneity creates different forms and types of development and, as such, is a dominant factor in forcing the urbanization process far beyond the city boundaries. Meanwhile, non-economic intervention has also been transformed into the rural area, there are strong ecological repercussions. Pressured by unrest and conflict in many areas, more people are pushed to the cities with a laissez faire policy, which makes the situation difficult to resolve. Would a better understanding of eco-urbanization enable city governments to deal with the issue more adequately? Is it possible to maximize the positive and reduce the negative impacts of mega-urbanization without eliminating the favourable options for the underprivileged to improve their future livelihood?

We may conclude that in Surabaya the processes of intensification and expansion have led to different types of mega-urbanization. Local authorities have to create the optimal conditions for these processes to take place in a sustainable way. Mutually beneficial economic cooperation of the urban and rural economy is crucial for further solid urban development in general and in the region of Surabaya in particular.
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