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Abstract. Kebayoran Baru is a sub-district in South Jakarta, hosting one of the largest private business districts in Indonesia. Originally planned and built as a satellite city of Jakarta in the 1950s, it is now one of the most expensive areas in the country. In the last ten years, there has been a rapid transformation within the area due to the land use change from what is predominantly residential to commercial; cafes and restaurants in almost every street. The rapid growth of these commercial and exclusive “public space” or quasi-public space in the form of cafes and restaurants is one of the signs of gentrification. Consumer class life-style changes the condition of the gentrified neighborhood and contributes to the increase of the land value, making it unaffordable for the residents and causing them to seek housing areas with lower cost. This is similar to what has been happening in Kebayoran Baru. However, the area has always been a relatively middle-class neighborhood from the beginning. This indicates that what is currently happening in Kebayoran Baru is actually a second-wave gentrification. Through archival studies and interview with local residents, this research aims to understand the spatial transformation and its relation to social production of public space that considers democracy.

1. Introduction

Gentrification is still considered as an unfamiliar term in Indonesia. According to Clark [1] in Lees, Shin and Lopez-Morales [2], Gentrification is a process involving a change in the population of land-users such that the new users are of a higher socio-economic status than the previous users, together with an associated change in the built environment through a reinvestment in fixed capital. The phenomena have been happening all over the world including Indonesia. Gentrification occurs due to the value of land as a sellable commodity within the capitalist economic system. This makes land speculation inevitable, which ideally would be controlled by the government by making regulations and other constraints to prevent it from getting out of control.

However, at the same time the government has to ensure that the economy does not collapse or experience stagnancy because they also need the profit (in the form of taxes) in order to function. Therefore, the development of cities tends to favor more up-to-date and profitable trends, that can take the form of transforming decaying areas to increase their values. However, this process often causes displacement of the residents, mostly worker-class, which later becomes gentrification. Its process is also related to the existence of social classes, especially the middle-class as consumers, which have grown rapidly in the past 20 years in Indonesia—from only 1.6 million in 2004 to 50 million in 2011 [3]. The middle-class exists as the consumers of the newly ‘transformed’ area, replacing the worker-class.
The middle-class has the tendency to exclude themselves from other social-classes, especially from those who are considered from lower class. This characteristic and behavior have impacts on urban space as middle-class tends to avoid ordinary public space and chooses exclusive ones instead. This quasi-public space usually exists in the form of high-end cafes, restaurants, and shops. As quasi-public space is highly favored, the emergence of high-end cafes, restaurants and shops are inevitable, making the area unaffordable and threatening the working-class with displacement due to the high land price. Thus, the proliferation of high-end cafes and restaurants that are actually quasi-public spaces is often seen as a sign of a neighborhood that is gentrifying.

Although the term gentrification is more intended for deteriorating area, similar phenomena have been happening in Kebayoran Baru, a relatively middle-class sub-district in South Jakarta, in the past ten years. This raises questions like whether the phenomena are considered as gentrification or perhaps second-wave gentrification. Buildings that once were middle- and upper-class houses were converted into quasi-public space in the form of high-end commercials, dominating Kebayoran Baru’ streets. Tax rose almost two times higher in 2015, threatening residents especially retirees for not being able to afford the high price (personal interview with Hendra I. Lubis and Lucia H. P. Sitompul, April 2020). Such quasi-public spaces not only invade housings directly, but also attract crowds, making the neighborhoods uncomfortable for living. This added another reason for former residents to move to another area, leaving their former houses empty for another quasi-public space conversion.

This paper aims to understand spatial transformation in and its relation to the production of quasi-public space in Kebayoran Baru. This research is focused on the phenomena happening in some collector streets near Sudirman Central Business District (SCBD); Gunawarman, Senopati and Suryo Street.

2. Gentrification and The Factors

Gentrification according to Ruth Glass [4] in Lees, Shin, and Lopez-Morales [2] is a reasonably long-term process of neighborhood change, involving dwelling-by-dwelling rehabilitation to convert working-class accommodations into those for a more affluent class. Hence, it can be understood as a process of renovating, rehabilitating and beautifying an area that is considered deteriorating in order to fit into middle- and upper-classes taste and gain profit from them as consumers.

The area later becomes dominated by middle- and upper class, making the area unaffordable and later displacing the working class. Although the process seems driven by middle-class consumption, it is more a corporate-led process [2]. This is due to the shift of our perception towards land-ownership. The concept of land-ownership has gradually moved, from a place to live and cultivate food for survival to property or commodity. As majority of the world sovereign countries rely on capitalist market, land is perceived as an important commodity that is able to produce huge profit [5, p. 229].

According to Harvey’s diagram on circuit of capital [6], production activities to gain profits always have to be done in order to keep the economy going. In this case, products refer to the land in the urban space as the sellable commodity. Therefore, land speculation to gain maximum profit by landlords and developers is inevitable.

The government also has its role on gentrification. Ideally, the government should make sure that the growth and development in the city happens evenly and in control. This can be done by making regulations such as zonings. However, according to Harvey’s diagram, at the same time the government still need the revenue streams in the form of taxes paid by the producers (landlords and developers in this case) in order to function. This is why areas that are considered decaying and not profitable often become the object to urban ‘rehabilitations’ or ‘renewals’ which often involves evictions and sacrificing the worker-class residents to be displaced. This is what we call gentrification and thus it is understood that the process is caused by multiple actors and factors rather than single.

2.1 The Roles of Developer, Landlords, and Other Parties in Gentrification

According to Davidson [7] in Lees, Shin, and Lopez-Morales [2], gentrification as a global habitat is less about class formation and more a corporate creation. The concept of land-ownership has gradually moved, from a place to live and cultivate food for survival to property or commodity. Due to the
domination of capitalist market in the world, land is perceived as an important commodity that is able to produce huge profit [5, p. 229]. Therefore, land speculation by landlords and developers may occur and is inevitable.

Referring to previous understandings about gentrification, the process usually happens in a deteriorating, disinvestment-suffered area. This raises question on why developers and landlords are attracted to areas with such qualities. Smith [8] stated rent-gap theory which he believes causing those areas being perceived as attractive. Rent-gap is the gap between potential and actual ground land value [8]. Gentrification may occur if the gap is wide enough, enabling the developer or landlords to buy the property with low price to later rehabilitate it and sell it with satisfying price [8]. Such condition is highly beneficial for developers and landlords since they can spend very little amount of money and gain huge profit by pushing the selling price into maximum value. Thus, the higher the gap, the more prone to gentrification an area is.

Another major role held by the developers, landlords and other parties is negotiating and convincing state government and investor. Usually, gentrification occurs in areas that are not favorable, associated with criminals and marginal communities. Investor would normally avoid areas with such qualities as they are perceived as unsafe. However, developer and landlords would negotiate with the investor in order to convince them to finance the rehabilitation. This happened in an example about rehabilitation of Society Hill in Philadelphia, as OPDC—a public-private institution—negotiated with bank to remove the redlining in Society Hill and finance the project [8].

Reinvestment in a gentrified area could occur before and after the rehabilitation. Investor could finance the project after being convinced by landlords and developers before the first renovation began. Investor could also finance the project after the first renovation is done and has good feedback and beneficial. The rehabilitation and renovation transform the area to be acceptable by the middle- and upper-class. These classes later dominated the rehabilitated area, raising the land price, making it unaffordable and causing displacement for the working class. The process could occur both slowly and rapidly.

2.2 The Roles of State Government in Gentrification

State government holds complete control over city regulation. This includes giving permission, dividing city into zones based on the land-use, and other regulations. Ideally, the regulations and zonings should be enough to control growth and development of the city. As what Harvey said about key actors on housing market [9, p. 166], government also imposes and administers a variety of institutional constraints on the operation of the housing market by making zoning and land-use planning controls. However, political and economic forces are powerful to influence the government into changing some regulations affecting the city. As already mentioned before, the government needs the economy to keep on going and making profits to function. Thus, the government might make decisions and regulations that would facilitate developer and landlords to transform a decaying area and make it profitable [9].

In addition, Sassen [10] in Smith [8, p. 36] stated that economic and political shifts as cities found themselves competing in the global market, causing re-marketization of public functions through deregulation, privatization of housing and urban services, and dismantling of welfare services. In this context, gentrification became a hallmark of the emerging “global city” [10] in [8, p. 37]. Referring to the previous statements, gentrification can be a sign of world city emergence as it able to be the tool to swipe away the poor, marginal communities, and slums.

Due to the pressure from global competitions, state government has the tendency to develop the city into a more acceptable shape; free from slums, criminals, and marginal communities, which can be achieved by using gentrification as a strategy. Not only is it able to remove the “unacceptable” elements of the city, the process will also bring more income in the long-term. Hence why, the government often grants permission for rehabilitation projects that later will cause gentrification in an area. This is aligned with the following statement:

“Slum eradication for the expansion of middle-class consumption and the realization of the state’s entrepreneurial spatial agenda that is ‘slum gentrification’ is not only goal to open up new space for real
The middle-class consumption patterns are presumed to result from the higher incomes and the greater spending power of this group [8]. Higher spending power enables them to consume luxuries in order to show their social status. The middle-class has a tendency to create high-end impression on themselves which is usually shown through daily activities, fashion and culinary taste, and the places they visit. These characteristics are stated by in the following statement:

“…They go in for instant rather than deferred gratification, making a positive virtue of their expenditure, and treating the self-indulgent as an ostentatious display of good taste. Sensual pleasures, so far from being outlawed, are the very field on which social claims are established and sexual identities confirmed. Food, in particular, a post-war bourgeois passion…has emerged as a critical marker of class.”[12] in [8, p. 91]

According to the statement above, it is understood that the middle-class has the tendency to consume luxurious things in order to impress people and show them how rich they are, which according to Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries online is called “conspicuous consumption”. Therefore, people from this social class rely so much on what they consume to show their identity.

Samuel [12] in Smith [8, p. 90] also stated that the new middle-class are outward looking rather than inward looking. They have opened up their homes to visitors, and exposed them to the public gaze [12] in [8, p. 91]. From those statements, it can be understood that the middle-class has the strong urge to seek for validations that they have a certain social status. These validations can be easily achieved nowadays with the existence of social media or social networking.

Social media affects consumption patterns, including middle-class consumption. Wilcox and Stephen [13] in Thoumrungroje [14, p. 15] stated that emergence of online social media made electronic word-of-mouth (EWOM) became a pervasive and influential source of product information due to the strong ties of the network members, in such a way that it influences the type of information presented on the networking site. This encourages the users, including the middle-class, to do conspicuous consumption. The luxuries they consume show a certain image and favored prestige, which will give positive feedbacks for the social media user [14]. Therefore, it can be understood that the existence of social media has a strong influence on middle-class consumption.

The middle-class consumption more or less contributes to gentrification. Davidson [7] in Lees, Shin, and Lopez-Morales [2, p. 87] stated that planetary gentrification is a capital-led colonization of urban space related to globalization and neo-liberalization. In addition to the previous statement, Lees, Shin, and Lopez-Morales [2, p. 87] stated that middle-class gentrifiers can be consumers and sometimes crucially deploy their class power to transform neighborhoods. Therefore, it can be understood that the consumption is powerful enough to guide decisions relating to city developments, land uses and zonings, whether directly or indirectly.
4. Gentrification in Kebayoran Baru

In the past ten years, there has been a significant change of land use in Kebayoran Baru, from what was predominantly residential to commercial. Lands and houses that were once being used for residential or offices are converted one-by-one into commercials in the form of high-end cafes, restaurants and shops. These changes had been happening in Gunawarman, Senopati and Suryo Street.

These cafes and restaurants that emerged in the past ten years are quasi-public space. Quasi-public spaces are open spaces that look and feel like public places, open to all; however, in fact private spaces that are only conditionally made available to the public [15, p. 2] Quasi-public space looks like a public space, but it is actually a controlled and strictly monitored by private security guards, CCTV cameras to control and/or prohibit unwanted group of people to enter—usually young people with low incomes, homeless, and non-costumers [16, p. 27].

These luxurious commercials that have been proliferating in Kebayoran Baru are judicially public spaces which ideally would serve anyone from every social classes. However, they are in fact exclusive spaces serving only certain classes, normally middle- and upper-class. With Jakarta’s rapidly rising middle-class population, these cafes, restaurants, and shops are highly favored, escalating Kebayoran Baru’s popularity. This resulted in dramatic spatial transformation and higher property prices in Kebayoran Baru, signifying gentrification in the neighborhood. In order to understand the transformation that has been happening in the past 10 years, this research uses archival studies and interviews with former and current residents of Kebayoran Baru.

4.1 Spatial Transformation in Kebayoran Baru

Originally planned as a satellite city of Jakarta, Kebayoran Baru was built in the 1950s as the new town, aiming to be the new home for employees of national or state-owned institutions. It was filled mostly with houses of many different types, based on the dweller’s position in the company. This situation was relatively stagnant until the 1980s (personal interview with Sita Ramayanti and Hendra I. Lubis, April 2020).

In general, the sub-district was home for many middle-class families, except for the urban village of Senayan. The area was considered as the only kampung in Kebayoran Baru, which was even called as slum by some people (interview with Andri Syahreza, April 2020). However, this area was located in the middle of Segitiga Emas Jakarta or Golden Triangle of Jakarta, soon-to-be business district in the city at that time. Senayan is located near two main roads of Jakarta, making it a strategic location for business districts. This caused the urban village inevitably became the target of eviction for mega projects, which finally occurred in 1987 [17], causing displacements of the worker class residents. The area later was transformed into one of Jakarta’s private business district, SCBD (Sudirman Central Business District), marking the first wave gentrification in Kebayoran Baru.

The existence of SCBD brought huge impacts to its surrounding neighborhood. Collector streets around the business district—including Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suryo Street—underwent a traffic modification in the late 1990s; from two-ways into one-way roads. This was done as a prevention for the predicted high traffic caused by SCBD. This modification is seen as the first trigger of land conversion in the streets around SCBD (personal interview with Arie F. Rajab, May 2020). As the result, the speed of vehicles passing those streets increased, making them slightly unsafe and uncomfortable as residential area.
Not long after the modification occurred, in 2003 the state government issued 3-in-1 regulation which only allowed private transportations with three or more passengers to pass Sudirman Street—one of the main streets that are directly connected with SCBD. This caused even more traffic entering Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suroy Street, making the area crowded and even more unsuitable for residential purposes. This triggered the former residents to move out, leaving their former houses empty and later selling or renting them.

Along with other changes in the neighborhood, those residential houses were starting to be converted into commercial purposes. In the early 2000s, many houses in those collector streets were used as offices for small companies (personal interview with Rozan Anwar, April 2020). The conversion was violating the zones that were established by state government, as those streets are in fact considered as residential zone. However, there were no attempts made on stopping the violations.

The land-use conversion from residential for office purposes lasted for about a decade. These house-offices dominated the collector roads along with some other commercials, mostly shops and services like restaurants, hairdressers, and laundries serving the executives who worked in SCBD. There were already some cafes and few high-end restaurants, but the existence was not dominating the streets. This condition changed in around 2012 and 2013 as lots of houses, house-offices, empty lots, and other...
buildings in Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suryo Street were converted into high-end cafes, restaurants, and shops.

These new commercials were created only to serve middle- and upper-classes, hence why they are considered as quasi-public spaces. The emergence of these quasi-public spaces began with constructions and renovations that started around 2012. These projects were done both by building from scratch on empty lands and by renovating existing buildings which majority were houses, to convert them into restaurants, cafes and shops. The conversion was not only done from residential to commercial as many home-Offices were converted as well. The renovations were done to fit the middle-class taste through the trendy facades and luxurious interior.

The area gained even more popularity among middle-class youngsters for the trendy cafes and restaurants. As it brought satisfying results, land-use conversion from houses into high-end commercials began to happen even more, changing the dynamics of the area which is now perceived as “elite” or “for rich people only”. The proliferation of these trendy cafes and restaurants invaded Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suryo Street. Nowadays, it is less-likely to find houses which are still being used for residential purposes in those streets. However, this is actually violating the zoning as the streets are in fact registered as residential area.

Figure 5. An example of land conversion from residential to commercial in Senopati Street. In the picture, the red rectangle shows the renovation, while purple rectangles show the commercial use. The construction began in 2013 to renovate the house. The renovation has completed in 2015 and was used as a high-end café. The commercial function did not change until now in 2020 although the café already changed into a high-end lounge.

Google Street View and Author’s Documentation (the images have been compiled and emphasized for this paper)
The land-use plan and actual land-use are showed in Figure 6 – Figure 9 above. The colors indicate the land-use: yellow for residential use, purple for commercial use, orange for mixed use, brown for socio-cultural use, tourism, and public facilities, pink for foreign country representation, and green for open space. Through Figure 6 – Figure 8, it is understood that the streets were actually planned in a residential zone. The plan did not undergo much changes from 2003 until 2019. However, it is shown...
in Figure 9 that in 2019 the actual land-use in those streets is completely different with the plan. This is due to the proliferation of commercial uses.

The rapid multiplication of these elite quasi-public spaces gave a dramatic spatial change into the streets and the area. It became extremely crowded, making it uncomfortable for living. Residents moved to another area not only due to the noisiness and extreme crowds, but also due to the doubled tax caused by the existence of high-end cafes. The area became even more unaffordable, threatening people especially civil servants’ pensioners from not being able to pay the tax. These phenomena are clear signifiers of gentrification in the area, which can be considered as second-wave gentrification, following eviction in Senayan as the predecessor.

4.1.1 Indonesian Economic Condition, Government’s Regulations and the Relations to Gentrification in Kebayoran Baru

The origins of gentrification in Kebayoran Baru can be traced back until the late 1980’s. The process is related to Indonesian economic condition that experienced stagnancy after the oil-boom. Due to the condition, Indonesian government decided to made many deregulations to attract both foreign and local investors as the attempts to boost the economy. The deregulation that had huge impacts was known as Pakto ‘88 (Paket Oktober 1988). As the result, lots of new companies and banks emerged and many investors came to Indonesia especially to Jakarta as the capital city. This triggered many huge construction projects like shopping malls and offices, resulting property boom in Jakarta Metropolitan Area at that time [18]. Many superblock projects started to pop up in the form of business districts, huge offices, luxurious hotels and high-end shopping malls that were concentrated mostly in Sudirman Street, M. H. Thamrin Street, Gatot Subroto Street and Kuningan. These areas are later known as Segitiga Emas Jakarta or Jakarta’s Golden Triangle since in the 1990s.

Not long before the deregulation was done, Urban Area Master Plan of Jakarta 1985-2005 (RUTR DKI Jakarta Tahun 1985 – 2005) was created with predictions that Jakarta would experience rapid population growth which would lead to the need for a lot of facilities, job opportunities, and many infrastructures to support the citizens’ life [18]. This encouraged the government to create beneficial condition that will attract investors to help the government providing those facilities [18] by creating regulations that would support the master plan. One of them is by issuing Governor’s Decree no. 540 in 1990 that regulated land eviction procedures, resulting many evictions to happen in Jakarta for mega projects like business districts. This includes the eviction in Kampung Senayan, Kebayoran Baru that happened to be located in the center of Jakarta’s Golden Triangle to build Sudirman Central Business District (SCBD).

Figure 10. Superblocks project in Jakarta concentrated in Sudirman Street, M. H. Thamrin Street, Gatot Subroto Street and Kuningan Area (known as Segitiga Emas). SCBD is one of the superblocks projects located in northern part of Kebayoran Baru, in the center of Segitiga Emas.

A. Kenichiro, Only Yesterday in Jakarta, 2001 (this image has been emphasized for this paper)
Pakto '88 was not only giving huge impacts in Jakarta economically and spatially, but also in the citizens’ behavior. As many foreign investors came, these expatriates brought new culture that later was imitated by local citizens.

4.2 The Role of The State, Developers, and Landlords on Second-wave Gentrification in Kebayoran Baru

The role of the state, developers, and landlords on gentrification in Kebayoran Baru can be traced since the first-wave as they had full authority on granting permission for the developers to build SCBD, causing displacement for the worker-class residents. The existence of SCBD gave huge impacts to Kebayoran Baru, especially the surrounding area. The construction of the private business district began in the early 1990s until late 1990s. The location of SCBD was formerly a kampung in the middle of Jakarta’s Golden Triangle and was surrounded by Jakarta main streets like Sudirman Street and Gatot Subroto street. This means the kampung—which was considered as slum by some people—was in a such strategic location, making it prone to gentrification.

According to an example about gentrification in Harlem, an area with beneficial and strategic location—close to an area with high land values but despite the proximity, suffer from disinvestment and have low land values—is prone to gentrification [8]. This is the case with kampung in Senayan as the developer saw its potential to be converted into an area with higher incomes like a business district, which of course would serve middle - and upper-classes. This is aligned with Smith’s [8, p. 30] statement on how gentrification is a process by which poor neighborhoods in the inner city are refurbished through influx of private capital or middle-class renters. This later will cause the middle-class to start occupying the neighborhood which previously considered poor and suffered from disinvestment, transforming the area into a middle-class neighborhood that is no longer affordable to the working-class.

The eviction started in 1987, displacing the former residents and marking Kebayoran Baru’s first wave gentrification. The whole process happened due to the contribution of the state and developers. As stated in SCBD’s official website:

“Year 1992 – 1993. Jakarta State Government trusted our company to transform 45-hectare slum in the heart of Jakarta’s Golden Triangle into a modern central business district” [17]. In that statement, it is explicitly stated that both parties wanted to get the kampung (which in the statement was written as ‘slum’) removed to build a bigger, “better” area with higher incomes which they referred as “modern central business district”.

As already mentioned above in the previous sub-chapter, the issuance of Governor’s Decree no. 540 in 1990 also encouraged evictions in DKI Jakarta. The regulation provided detailed descriptions on requirements as well as procedures on land eviction in Jakarta. It was implicitly stated that the state supports land eviction in order to realize Urban Area Master Plan of Jakarta in 1985-2005 (RUTR DKI Jakarta tahun 1985 – 2005). As the result, a lot of places in Jakarta including Senayan suffered from evictions and displacements since the late 1980s.

The traffic modification done on the streets nearby was actually beneficial to SCBD. Although this was done as a result of the developer’s obligation to assess and modify the surrounding areas when deemed necessary, the modification actually works as an enabler for SCBD to provide convenient access to the business district. However, this traffic modification resulted inconvenience for residents as it allows vehicles to pass with greater speed, making the area less safe for residential purposes. The condition became even worse after the state issued 3-in-1 policy in Sudirman Street which was directly connected to Kebayoran Baru. This caused more vehicles entering Kebayoran Baru in attempts to avoid Sudirman Street, making Kebayoran Baru’ streets became even more crowded. This triggered conversions to be done in the buildings that once were houses, started with home-offices on the streets of Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suryo Street as former residents move out of the area.

After almost a decade, the home-offices were replaced by cafes. Following the success of a few pioneer renovations and cafes, developers, landlords, and entrepreneurs were encouraged to reproduce another quasi-public space in the form of high-end cafes, restaurant, and shops in those streets. The land
conversion is, however, against the zoning as those streets are actually in a residential zone. The state had previously proposed a zoning change for the streets from residential zone to commercial zone, following the domination of cafes, restaurants and shops. However, this failed to be executed after there were protests from developers, landlords, and business owners due to the higher tax it would cause (personal interview with S, staff of DCKTRP DKI Jakarta, May 2020).

It is understood that the developers, landlords, and business owners prefer to keep violating the regulations in order to gain maximum profits by selling the property with high prices but only spend little cost. Although Kebayoran Baru was not suffering from disinvestment, the phenomenon can be reflected to Smith’s [8] rent-gap theory. Another factor that suits to the theory is the tax increase in 2014. Following the sub-district’s abundance of high-end commercials and high property values, there is a possibility that the state seen this as a potential to maximize the tax. By doing this, the state can gain more money for state budget.

The state’s role on the second-wave gentrification is also visible in Kebayoran Baru Area Arrangement in 2016 (Penataan Ruang Kawasan Kebayoran Baru 2016). It was stated that Kebayoran Baru is economically attractive, hence why it is necessary to be very cautious on planning and developing it in order not to disturb the residents and intrude surrounding areas. However, in fact there were a lot of points that did not fit to the statement. On the same regulation, the state gave a lot of dispensation on zone-based land-use by considering a lot of collector roads as active corridors:

“Active corridors are residential corridors with non-residential land-use or other supporting functions which are allowed to be re-regulated through reorganizing the activities that are allowed to take place in those corridors.” (Jakarta State Government, Kebayoran Baru Area Arrangement, p. VIII). With many collector roads considered as exceptions, this implicitly shows the state’s support for the land conversion against the initial plan.

Although the streets that are being observed in this research are not considered as active corridors, in reality the proliferation of high-end cafes and restaurants in those streets are also left untouched. In addition, in Kebayoran Baru 2016 Plan, it is stated that cafes in Senopati Street are considered as Kebayoran Baru’s potential to strengthen the sub-district’s character and identity as a strategic socio-cultural area. This is contradictory to the state’s previous statement on having to be cautious when planning and developing the sub-district in order not to disturb and intrude the residents and surrounding areas.

Thus, it is clear that the state has been being noncommittal to the regulations that they had previously made. It can also be understood that the state tends to prioritize economic activities in developing the sub-district even though it would bring huge impacts on the urban space of Kebayoran Baru. The noncommittal attitude of the state brings benefits to developers, landlords, and business owners as they have more freedom on running their business while avoiding high taxes.

4.3 Middle Class Consumption and Its Role on Gentrification in Kebayoran Baru

The existence of high-end quasi-public spaces in Kebayoran Baru would not be as proliferating as today if there were no consumers and high demands. Just like its purpose, these cafes and restaurants target on Jakarta’s middle-class, hence why their existence is crucial on gentrification in Kebayoran Baru.

Jakarta’s new middle-class or consumer class started to emerge since the 1990’s, after Pakto ’88 which caused a structural transformation in Jakarta both spatially and socially. As mentioned by Kenichiro [18], Pakto ’88 brought a lot of expatriates to Jakarta which triggered the emergence of shopping malls, apartments, and big office buildings. These expatriates brought new culture which was considered luxurious at that time and later became imitated by local citizens such as socializing in cafes and playing golf for the executives [8].

Encouraged by their increasing purchasing power, Jakarta’s middle-class lifestyle became modernized, internationalized as the impact of imitating the expatriates, and consumptive. This became the initial definition of Jakarta’s middle-class based on their consumption, hence why they can also be called consumer class. These phenomena are aligned with Lees, Shin, and Lopez-Morales’s statement [2, p. 83] that the discussion about the new middle-class in the global south refers to a newly emerging
or expanding, modernizing middle-class with new spending power and associated interest in consumerism.

In the past 20 years, the middle-class in Indonesia have been increasing rapidly. The number of middle-class grew from 1.6 million in 2004 to 50 million in 2011 [3]. With the huge increase, social class polarization in Indonesia has the potential to be even worse. As their purchasing power grew, the middle-class now can afford luxurious goods and activities. As the result, nowadays they tend to have the euphoria and become more materialistic, making them doing conspicuous consumption frequently. According to Pambudy [19, p. 20] in Jati [3, p. 14], the development of technology, information, and continuous commodity innovation cause the middle-class into an apathetical actor which prioritize material fulfilment.

Wilson [20, p. 3] also stated that the middle-class in Indonesia, especially Jakarta, desire security, lifestyle and convenience. He also stated that they tend to seek spatial separation from other social and economic groups within gated estates, apartments towers, shopping malls and private vehicles [17, p. 3] Referring to the statements, it can be understood that the middle-class in Jakarta lives exclusively, especially from people with lower social status. As the result, public spaces which allow them to interact with other social classes, especially the worker class, are no longer favored. At the same time, there is a trend for the middle-class youngsters in to do activities not at home (personal interview with Rozan Anwar, April 2020), making quasi-public spaces not only favored but somehow needed.

Related to Kenichiro’s [18] statement, this is the result of the evolution of the middle-class culture that started to emerge after Pakto ’88; mall and café culture which initiated consumptive middle-class behavior and their tendency to exclude themselves from other social class. Jakarta’s middle-class started to get used to being in exclusive public spaces and left the public space instead. This tendency keeps on happening since the 1990’s until now.

Cafes and restaurants that have been proliferating in Kebayoran Baru seemed like the answer for the need for public space and the middle-class exclusive behavior. Their fondness to do conspicuous consumption making them rely on what they consume in order to show their identity as the middle-class. Referring to Samuel [12] in Smith [8], the middle-class also have the desire to expose their lifestyle as they crave the recognition of their social status. Nowadays, the desire for the exposure can be easily fulfilled with social media. In 2010, two social medias—Path and Instagram—were launched, offering features like photos and location sharing. The two social medias soon gained popularity among Indonesian. Path CEO stated that Indonesia had 4 million Path users, which was the largest number in the world [21]. Path and Instagram also gained popularity among Jakarta’s middle-class as they made the perfect tools to expose their lifestyle. This happened almost at the same time with when the first wave of renovations in Kebayoran Baru began.

A new trend called “makan cantik” (literal translation from Indonesian: the word “makan” means eat, and “cantik” means pretty) emerged among Jakarta’s middle-class. The term can be described as an activity which takes place in certain restaurants (or cafes) in order to show it off through social media [22, p. 90]. Gunawarman and Senopati Street as one of the first location that underwent the renovation to create new cafes and restaurants often became the place where the middle-class headed to for doing makan cantik. With the existence of social media and internet allowing information to spread quickly, this area gained even more popularity for the high-end cafes and restaurants. The middle-class as consumers have the desire for novelty values, increasing the demand for high-end cafes and restaurants. This caused the land conversion to produce those high-end quasi-public spaces grew, expanded, and dominated Kebayoran Baru’ streets.

5. Conclusion
Gentrification is a process that has been happening in Kebayoran Baru since almost 30 years ago. Although generally the area has always been occupied by middle-class, there was an area which considered as kampung that suffered from eviction for the construction of SCBD. This marked the first-wave gentrification in Kebayoran Baru, hence the gentrification that has been happening in the past 10 years can be considered as the second-wave gentrification.
In general, second-wave gentrification in Kebayoran Baru is the result of the first-wave gentrification that was triggered by commercial and political interests, mostly due to the government, developer, landlords and business owners’ contribution. The process can be traced back to the late 1980’s, related to Indonesia’s economy condition at that time and the deregulations that were made to improve the situation. This transformed many parts of Jakarta including Kebayoran Baru both spatially and socially and became a proof that gentrification is also strongly related to political economy condition of a country. In Kebayoran Baru, the process started with the eviction in Senayan to build the mega project of SCBD, causing displacement of the lower-class citizens. This later affected its surrounding urban space, followed by traffic modification to support the CBD and 3-in-1 policy. The regulations affected the streets of Gunawarman, Senopati, and Suryo spatially as they became unsuitable for living. This triggered land conversion from residential to high-end commercial which later is seen as another potential for developers, landlords and business owners to gain more profit. This is one of the consequences of capitalist system as lands are perceived as sellable commodity, making speculations inevitable. Ideally, the state would make attempts to control the process. However, this is not the case in Kebayoran Baru. From the regulations and actions that were taken, it is understood that the government tends to support its transformation to be the new ‘playground’ for Jakarta’s middle-class, allowing the sub-district to be gentrified for the second time.

In addition, the middle-class population in Jakarta has been rapidly growing. Although they are not considered as the main factor of gentrification, their behaviors also have impacts on the gentrification that has been happening in Kebayoran Baru. With their consumptive and exclusive attitude, their desire of doing conspicuous consumption like makan cantik to show it off on social media is very strong. The consumption takes place on quasi-public spaces in the form of high-end cafes, restaurants, and shops in Kebayoran Baru. As these high-end quasi-public spaces become highly favorable, the proliferation is inevitable and replacing residential uses in Kebayoran Baru’ streets. The high crowds they attract caused many residents to move out from Kebayoran Baru. These high-end quasi-public spaces also triggered the tax increase, threatening current residents especially pensioners to seek for other areas that are more affordable. This second-wave gentrification is a little bit different with the first-wave as they threaten the displacement of middle-class instead of working-class residents.
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