Gated community in Indonesian peri-urban: security or segregation?
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Abstract. As showed by several researches, large scale gated community in peri-urban shows a mixture of three aspects: security, prestige, and life style. However, with increased number of middle and high class and result of social and economic gap, security has become the basis of such development. Security aspect is manifested in exclusive design area which tends to reinforce both spatial and social segregation. Looking at very different situation in Indonesian context, where large scale gated community is not a form of exclusive enclave, it is interesting to study connection between security and segregation. Gated community with gate, wall, or barrier, might be a form of security or function of segregation between classes, or could be both. This paper explores the discourse of security and segregation by observing gating element of the gated community. Three gated communities in Surabaya’s peri-urban, Indonesia, are used as a case study. This paper finds gated community is a way to gain security and did not mean to segregate.

1. Introduction

As Roitman [1], states, most of the gated communities are located in peri-urban, where the most affordable land exists. Most gated communities are built with security features such as fences, gates, walls, portals, security guards, police, CCTV, and so on. These features well known as gating, and is researched within context of gated development or gated community.

Gating concept exists long time ago, from fortress city - which is an effect of western colonialism in Asia - to Forbidden City in China, and family residential in Bali. Gating in urban planning theoretically understood as a part of enclave urbanism [2], splintering urbanism [3], architecture of fear [4], and city of walls [5]. The most common perception about gating is that it is representing social exclusivism [6] and unreality life [7]. Sennett [8] states gating is one of many ways to limit togetherness or what he called public realm in a way to control social contact. Or, as Atkinson and Flint [9] write to limit people with whom to talk and meet, which is only to —people like us.—

Gating is also considered as source of social and spatial segregation. Gated community with fences, walls, guarded portals, CCTV, etc. makes our social life more segregated and fragmented. Gating makes separation between what is —inl and —outl or between —mel and —youl. Even though there is no research that proves living in gated community is safer than in non-gated one, The Have group mostly prefer living in residences with gate and wall around [5][7][10].
Besides being discussed as shape of social-economic inequality, segregation in gated community is discussed by looking at interactions between residents. Interaction generally divided into two groups: interaction between residents in one gated community, or interaction between residents of gated community with its surrounding. Spatial segregation generally related to security features such as gate, wall, barrier, security guard, CCTV, swing up portal, and others. This phenomenon happens almost in all cities in developing countries such as Latin America [5][10][11], China [12][13], and South Africa [14][15]. Almost all features are adopted from US where the topics residential segregation and gated community come from as written by Blakely and Snyder [16] and Massey and Denton [17].

In Surabaya, the second biggest city in Indonesia, most large-scale gated communities are not fenced nor surrounded with walls. Three gated communities in Surabaya that become study case shows different characters from what had revealed in western literature. While gated communities in Surabaya were not in form of exclusive enclaves surrounded by wall, the main streets can be accessed publicly without security check. Same situation happens in parks, playgrounds, polls, markets, schools, and any other public facilities, that they can be accessed easily.

Research by Ginting et.al [18] in CitraLand Surabaya, one of the biggest high-class residential, shows the outer part of the residential is directly connected with streets, lanes, and villages (or kampung) around. These interesting facts pop up some questions: Do gated communities in Surabaya cause segregation? And, how does gating relate to security and segregation? Does gated community with security features a form of security or function of segregation, or maybe both? This paper explores the discourse of security and segregation by observing gating element of the gated community. Three gated communities in Surabaya’s peri-urban, Indonesia, are used as a case study.

2. Method
The method we use here is inspired by Roitman [19] and Blakely and Snyder [16]. Roitman [19] states the analysis of urban segregation is based on the assumption that the social practices of gated community residents, in addition to their viewpoints, can lead to intended and unintended segregation. Segregation is intended when it is consciously pursued by social actors; and it is unintended when social actors are not aware of it as an outcome of their social practices and viewpoints or did not pursue this outcome. Table 1 shows Roitman’s relation between wall/barrier and social practice.

| Social Practice         | Viewpoints                          |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Restricted Access       | Wall/barrier for security            |
| Unintended segregation  | Other group as positive              |
| intended segregation    | Wall/barrier for security            |
|                         | Older group as negative              |
|                         | Wall/barrier for social differences  |
|                         | Other group as positive              |
|                         | Wall/barrier for social differences  |
|                         | Other group as negative              |

Source: [19]

Roitman defines these *neighbourhood social practices* as: (1) use of public space; (2) institutional communication between gated and non-gated communities; (3) charity work benefiting poorer neighbouring communities; (4) job opportunities for outside communities; (5) social relations and settings for socialization; (6) shopping; (7) schooling; (8) religious practices; (9) sports and (10) use of...
public transport. She breaks down gating aspect to analyze intended and unintended segregation as shown by Table 1 below.

Blakely and Snyder [16] define three major categories of gated community: lifestyle, elite, and security. They categorize those threes to reflect varying degrees of social dimension named 1) sense of community; 2) exclusion; 3) privatization; and 4) stability. Sense of community is the preservation and strengthening of neighborhood bonds. Exclusion is separation from the rest of society; while privatization is the desire to replace and internally control public services. Lastly, stability is the need for homogeneity, predictability, and similarity.

Table 2. Major categories of gated community

| Sense of Community | Lifestyle | Elite | Security Zone |
|--------------------|-----------|-------|---------------|
| Exclusion          | Tertiary  | Tertiary | secondary |
| Privatization      | Secondary | Secondary | Primary |
| Stability          | Primary   | Tertiary | Tertiary |

Source: [16]

As this paper concerns with security and segregation and don’t consider much about lifestyle and elite, it emphasizes on how authors define security zone. Within the security zone, neighborhoods are trying to strengthen and protect a sense of community, but their primary goal is to exclude the places and people they perceive as threats to their safety or quality of life [16].

This paper argues security and segregation has different level of meaning. Security happens as manifestation of fear and reflected in gating system as protection to belongings. Security happens not only in rich gated communities but also in poor areas to protect them from unwanted social contact. Segregation is another aspect of development of gated community. As Roitman [19] clearly states, security occurs almost everywhere where there is gate or fence or barrier, but not automatically influences segregation. Some security features act as unintended segregation while some successfully features give impact as intended segregation.

This paper builds a methodological frame to explain security and segregation as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Methodological frame for collecting and analyzing data

| Gated Community as | Indicators |
|--------------------|------------|
| 1. Manifestation of security aspect (fear of urban crime) | Used to protection of belongings and avoidance of unwanted contact |
| 2. A form of segregation, both social and spatial segregation | - Privately used in housing cluster/block |
| | - Gate/fence to restrict public access, separates —inside and —outside |
| | - Separates between social-economic groups |

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Gated Community, GRD, or simply Residential?

Most researchers relate residential segregation with the term gated community. But in Indonesia, the term gated community is not widely used in its relation with segregation. Indonesian researches usually use the term large-scale residential and new town. Firman [20] states the development of new town in the Jabodetabek (or Jakarta Metropolitan Region) has reinforced spatial segregation. Firman
notes spatial segregation occurs where only one specific group of society – for example Chinese only – occupied the area and ignore others. Firman proves this spatial segregation phenomenon by analyzing three elements: 1) polarization of upper class group in exclusive residential area; 2) the design of new town is segmented in several social classes where there is no interaction between classes; and 3) some new towns managed by private developer not government and applying rules that prevent interaction and socialization which encourages segregation.

Another study by Winarso et al [21] mention the process of peri-urbanization in the Jakarta Metropolitan Region has generated spatial segregation because peri-urban is built for interests of one group of high-class society. Leisch [22] states the new town development in Jakarta Metropolitan Region (JMR) was built to meet the desire of certain classes of people to have a secure and comfortable residential, provide an opportunity to invest, and - for developers - to make big profits in no time.

First of all it has to be noted that there are significant differences between gated community in the United States and Indonesia (especially Surabaya) in at least two spatial and management issues. Spatially, what is considered as gated community in Indonesia is not always a private and high-level system security. By management, developers who build gated community are also bound to local government regulations so that the aspect of privatization is not as high as in United States of America.

This issue needs to be put forward because almost all theories about gated community and segregation comes from the United States. Some researchers write about gated community and segregation in Indonesia, also refer to theories from the United States, especially refer to Blakely and Snyder [16] as a pioneer of this field. See for examples Leisch [22], Firman [20], and Firman and Rakodi [23]. In the western literature gated community is defined as a residential area with characters: 1) limited by a wall or fence; 2) have security systems such as CCTV, security officer, access card, etc; and 3) restrictions on access to public spaces. Blakely and Snyder [16] state gated communities are residential areas with restricted access such that public spaces have been privatized. Meanwhile British researchers Atkinson and Flint [9] state gated communities can be defined as walled and gated residential developments that restrict public access. Low [7] states gated communities restrict access to streets and services that should be available for public and private, while Bickford [24] defines gated community as residential development that limits access to residents, their guests, and service people. Meanwhile Grant and Mittelsteadt [25] add gating as attempt to control access to the gated community, and to affirm between which are “inside” and “outside”. As written by Leisch [22], most gated community in Jakarta are fenced (or gated) with certain security systems. He writes most of the new land developments are gated with more or less effective security measures. There are residential areas surrounded by walls and fences but with an open gate and sometimes no security guards.

Looking at the above definition, it is clear that gated community is residential built with private characters that restrict public access. This situation is different from gated community in Surabaya. Most gated community with more than 500 ha area is not a closed enclave and not set by gate or wall. This paper proposes to name of gated community in Surabaya residential development (RD) or residential to be short. This term is inspired by Bowers and Manzi [26]. They use the term GRD or gated residential development to replace gated community because the term "community" is a little speculative and debatable. Bowers and Manzi define GRD as a neighborhood built with fence or wall that separates it with surroundings. They wrote Gated Residential Developments (GRDs) are generally defined as master planned neighbourhoods that have been constructed with a boundary fence or wall, which separates them from their environs. Right of entry is controlled either by security personnel, operation of gates or by electronic entry systems – page 3. The term residential is more suitable to be used when this term is associated with topics segregation. This is because spatial segregation and social segregation are associated with settlements or housing and are termed residential segregation by Massey and Denton [17] and not the gated community segregation.
3.2 Residential in Indonesia
Planning and designing residential in Indonesia, as has written by scholars, is an adoption of residential spatial forms in United States and Europe. The forms of cul-de-sac, classical or modern architecture style, and names like Diamond Hill, Buena Vista clusters, Esplanade Park, and others, reflect the reality of upper and middle class of Indonesian who like to imitate “West” in particular United States. Although Indonesia has its own tradition within gated residential, for example in Bali by Bunnell et all [27], developers nowadays forget the cultural heritage and try to be modern in all sense.

Previous researches show residential design in Indonesia is more symbolic than functional. Housing is not designed solely to fulfill the function of safe and comfortable (or what we called as security aspect), but as part of lifestyle and prestige. Leisch [22] who observes gated communities in Jakarta concludes three important about gating: 1) gating happened because the increasing number of rich people who want protection for himself and his property; 2) stay within the gated community is a prestige symbol to show a high level of modernity; and 3) especially in Indonesia, Chinese are always “different” and separated because of differences in welfare level and religion differences. The Chinese are the ones that occupy most gated community in Indonesia.

In Indonesia, large-scale residential and new town began to be built in Jakarta in the 1950s. The first new town was Kebayoran Baru on the suburb of Jakarta in the 1950s, then followed by Pondok Indah in the year 1970s. The development of the new towns grows fast and reaches the number of 30 new towns in the 2000s. These towns own area between 500-6000 ha with high class facilities such as hotels, office, international schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities such as water park, golf, and others [23].

3.3 Gating in Surabaya: Security or Segregation?
The most interesting fact about residential design in Surabaya is that most residential (especially those above 500ha) take form NOT as a closed pod or enclave, as is commonly found in the United States. Most gated communities in the United States are exclusive that require visitors to get checked before entering the residential. In Surabaya, Pakuwon City, Galaxi Bumi Permai, and CitraLand for example, can be easily accessed through the main roads and almost without a security check point at all. Main road of the three residential are primary roads which connecting the residential to other areas and used publicly for daily mobility (Figure 2).

Figure1. Surabaya’s gated communities at peri-urban
Figure 2. Accessible main road (left Pakuwon City, right Araya Bumi Permai)

The three residential are not massively walled like the dramatic photo of Low [2] (2004) in United States to explain the position of "inside" and "outside" of the gated communities. Boundary (but doesn’t function as a border) between these residential with their surroundings is the public streets used publicly by anyone for everyday activities. One interesting point is that the main roads in these residential are occupied by the big and expensive houses while the smaller houses usually take place deep inside the main roads. Especially in CitraLand, the largest new town in Surabaya with almost 2000 hectare land, the environment is very friendly marking by blended-connecting streets between CitraLand and kampung around. This situation is more interesting considering CitraLand is populated by The Have group which is socially and economically different with characters in the surrounding kampung. Some professional photographers brilliantly capture the duality life in CitraLand titled Theater of Life [24] (Figure 3).

Figure 3. CitraLand: Theater of Life
Source: [29]

Ellin [4] writes gating is a new way to get protective devices. In past some people designed a cul-de-sac and minimize sidewalk or pedestrian path. Now they add fence and security guard complete with CCTV monitor. She writes: “the lack of sidewalks and cul-de-sacs of the earliest suburban developments are protective devices, but we have now taken this more by actually gating our neighborhoods and installing guards or video monitors at the entryways” - p. 9.

In CitraLand, as written by Ginting et al [28] there are several gates which is designed interestingly as welcome sign. One of the gates at southern part of CitraLand was designed as a beautiful curves
turning into a photo-spot icon of the Surabaya (Figure 4). This situation gives antithesis to most gated communities (especially in west) where entrance gates are usually act as a barrier to keep people out. Sennet [8] writes the boundary is not the end nor the edge. Boundary should welcome visitor and doesn’t mark as a keep-out statue.

![Figure 4. Welcome gates in CitraLand](image)

Our observation along the main roads where the best plot was built shows important findings. First, right along the main roads, some big-expensive houses are built without massive wall or fence. Some do that but not all. Most houses are designed with a high fence but not massive and some even without security checkpoints. This proves that being on the main roads where busy mobility occurs every day is not a reason to feel insecure and fear. Second, gates usually build in clusters or block of housing which is more private than housing at main roads and size plots are generally smaller.

Almost all clusters in residential build swing up portals and guard booth so that only the residents who own access card can enter into the cluster (Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Various gating system in Surabaya's residential](image)

Some different situations occur in Pakuwon City where clusters not only build checkpoints and swing up portals but also build iron fences as high as 3 meters. The fence is not meant for separating between inside and outside residential but between one cluster with another cluster (Figure 6).

Those residential do not build wall or fence for separating the residential with its surroundings. Security features such as checkpoints, gates, and swing ups portals are built at clusters not main entrances. Thus one residential might have dozens of gates and guard booths depending on the number of clusters. Several clusters in Pakuwon City design multi gates: guard booths, swing up portals, and fences at once. By reviewing the theoretical studies on gating and segregation above, this paper summarizes few important findings. First, when associated with the notion of spatial segregation as dominance spatial of a particular group (in terms of income levels, race, religion, ethnicity, etc.), NO spatial segregation occurs based on socio-economic class in Surabaya. Separation or segregation that occurs in the form of clusters in the residential is not intended to give a distinction
in terms of socioeconomic status, but as a form of protection and sense of security. Second, gate and or wall that gives "boundary" on each clusters do not separate residents by social class but only for security reasons. Third, gating does not mean to define "inside" and "outside" or "me" and "you" but serves as a security feature only for limiting mobility of people and vehicles. Referring to Roitman [19] gating in Surabaya's residential explains unintended segregation.

4. Conclusion
As scholars define segregation as spatial dominance of a particular group in terms of income levels, race, religion, ethnicity, etc., this paper concludes there is no segregation occurs based on socioeconomic or racial class in Surabaya. The gated communities do not build gates or fences to separate residential with its surroundings. Segregation occurs in the form of clusters or block inside the residential. On the one hand, the absence of gates and fences as well as appearance of accessibility of main entrance, shows the nature of openness. On the other hand, all clusters are almost entirely provided with security features, blocking access to private houses and therefore exhibit segregation. This is not intended to give a distinction in terms of socio-economic status between residents, but rather as aspects of security.
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